Avenues to Integration
In the Liberal American Jewish Day School:
A Means to Dual Identity Development of the Modern American Jew

By Melissa De Lowe

'Educate a child based on his path;
When he is older, he will not depart from it.'
-Proverbs 22:6

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of
Requirements for Master of Arts in Religious Education Degree

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion
School of Education
New York, New York

March, 2008
Advisor: Dr. Lisa Grant

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....ii

Chapter 1: Introduction.....1
I. Changing Needs of the American Jewish Community.....1
II. The Necessity for Integrated Identity Development in Jewish Education.....2
III. Personal Interest.....4

PART I: Research.....9
Chapter 2: Thesis Proposal.....9
I. Purpose of the Study.....9
II. Proposed Questions.....10

Chapter 3: Definitions.....11
I. Liberal American Jewish Day School.....11
II. School Culture.....11
III. Integration.....12

Chapter 4: Literature Review.....15
I. Why Integration?.....15
II. Why Day Schools?.....18
III. Avenues to Integration.....19
IV. Critiques/Current Shortcomings.....25

PART II: Field Study.....29
Chapter 5: Research Methodology.....29
I. Description.....29
II. Layout.....29

Chapter 6: The Rodeph Sholom School.....32
I. The School.....32
II. The Curriculum Method to Integration.....34
III. Obstacles.....48

Chapter 7: The Solomon Schechter School of Manhattan.....53
I. The School.....53
II. The Structural Method to Integration.....56
III. Obstacles.....62

Chapter 8: Conclusions.....68
I. Implications.....68
II. Applications.....70
III. Further Research.....72

Appendix.....74
Bibliography.....75

Acknowledgments

I will be forever grateful to a number of individuals for their endless support, keen observation and advice, and big hugs during this 'year of the thesis' and throughout my life:

To Jo Kay, for your openness to my personal journey in this program, for allowing me to learn towards my career in day school education, and for your open door all year.

To Lisa Grant, for your constant presence, your willingness to help me through this process, and your thoughtful editing and suggestions. You are so busy with your own valuable work in this field, which made your attentive interest towards my thesis that much more meaningful to me. Your positive attitude and eagerness to be a part of all that goes on in this community is an inspiration.

I feel profoundly thankful for the experiences that I had in The DeLeT program in Los Angeles, as they lead me toward this project: to Laura Lauder, without who's brilliant vision and generous philanthropy, the program would not be; to Dr. Michael Zeldin, the master of integration, who watered the buds of interest in this subject that I was just realizing grew within me and modeled the most valuable learning, and Luisa Latham, Rabbi Tali Hyman, and my incredible mentors, Jodi Subel and Julie Schimmel, models of integrated beings and astounding educators, whose master practice will forever influence my own. DeLeT took me by surprise, lead me on my path to integration, and shaped me into the beginning day school teacher that I have been developing along my journey ever since.

To my incredible study sites, the Rodeph Sholom School and Solomon Schechter of Manhattan, my gratitude for your participation in this study is endless. For each individual that not only let me into their classrooms and offices, but enthusiastically shared their vision and practice, ideas and examples, the simple fact that you opened your arms to me, an outsider to your school and observer of your practice, must serve as a model to all educators. Your willingness and enthusiasm to help me learn shows just another level of the honorable commitment to lifelong and depthful learning that is seen throughout your school and exemplifies the school's firm belief and confidence in its vision and practice. The value and influence from my experiences at each of your schools cannot be adequately expressed.

To my mom and dad, you raised me to believe that I could be anything I wanted, and I couldn't have made it to where I am today without that model. Your endless support in my life endeavors and choices show your commitment to the enduring understanding of this study- *'Educate a child based on his path; when he is older, he will not depart from it.' (Proverbs 22:6)* Though I have found my own way to manifest this path that you paved, you gave me the values and love of life that inspires me to do this holy work today.

To all of my friends, who somehow sensed those desperately needed back rubs and big hugs in stressful times, who expressed interest in my subject and willingness to hear out my diatribe of fervent opinions while giving me gems of knowledge and thoughts to add to my understanding, I am so thankful for each of you. To my dear friend, Sandi Intraub, one of my greatest teachers and best of friends, your integrative self inspires me every day. Thank you for all of our thoughtful conversations, even when they made me think I had to start all over!

Shayna, my beloved, you support me in all that I do, and this was no exception. Our life together will always be inspired and shaped by this important conception of Jewish living, and I look forward to supporting each other in the continued development of our own dual identities and the growing identity of our Jewish home together.

I don't know who will read this study in the future, but to those who do, I urge you to consider and develop this method of teaching, learning and living in your own professional and personal practice as I will in my own. Together, through our personal growth and professional improvement of the integrative method, we can envision and create a more whole world in which to live. As educators, we may inspire the entire world, one integrated mind at a time.

Chapter 1:
Introduction

Changing Needs of the American Jewish Community

There have been few periods in Jewish history where interaction with secular society has not been the normative experience of the Jewish people (Holtz, 546). Throughout time and in each geographical setting, Jews have engaged with the larger secular world while maintaining traditions and practices that distinguished them from their non-Jewish neighbors. While the permanence of the Jewish religion and people has been threatened by a multitude of cultural and political influences throughout time, continuity has always prevailed as Judaism has remained central to the lives of those who practiced the tradition.

In the most current trend, however, the various economic, political and social circumstances that led to mass Jewish emigration to America from countries all over the world, often experiences of the Holocaust, caused a social phenomenon of separation from religious practice and institutional Jewish learning which has lasted several generations. Today, the vast majority of the youngest generations of American Jews have connection only to the most basic Jewish practices and ideas that have been maintained throughout this period. Most are almost entirely acculturated into secular American culture, and find that their daily life contains very little Jewish content. Without the institutional connections and education that has maintained the Jewish people throughout history, this social phenomenon has caused drastic assimilation and subsequent loss of Jewish identity for many Jewish Americans.

Concurrently, in response to a recent cross-cultural surge of ethnic exploration, and a consequent trend of post-Holocaust revitalization, American Jews have begun to

explore their own cultural and religious traditions in order to seek meaning and identity in an increasingly complex world (Elkin, 14). Jewish professionals seek new conceptions of what it means to be Jewish, and how to express the relevance of Judaism and Jewish practice in the context of this contemporary condition.

In a world that promotes secular idealism and individualism, children as well as adults may find it difficult to lead dedicated Jewish lives while still immersing themselves in the modern world. Pressures in society turn youth away from religiosity, and young American Jews struggle to synthesize their dual identities as Americans and as Jews. In education, even though students accept certain seemingly inapplicable secular subjects as a part of their Western learning, there is much resistance to Jewish studies, coming from a feeling of 'cultural irrelevance' (Holtz, 549). Thus the challenge for liberal American Jewish educators is to find strategies to guide their students to reconnect to a conception of Jewish identity as central to their existence *while* maintaining interaction with the greater secular world.

The Necessity for Integrated Identity Development in Jewish Education

In the most general sense, the development of personal identity is crucial to an individual's ability to develop mature understanding of their life experiences. Whether something is learned in a classroom or in life, a number of skills must be integrated to utilize knowledge for full appreciation and comprehension of any situation; one must be able to explain the account, to interpret meaning, to apply understanding to diverse contexts, to have perspective of the big picture, and to empathize with the perceptions and experiences of others (Wiggins, McTighe, 44). Most importantly though, in order to gain a mature understanding of any experience, an individual must have self-knowledge,

or the ability to perceive one's personal beliefs and ideals. The development of strong personal identity allows an individual to approach any situation both with awareness of their social biases and unique practices as well as consciousness of the necessity to put their values into action.

"Jewish education serves as the vehicle through which we train successive generations of Jews to negotiate their own way, as Jews, in the American arena" (Zeldin, 1998). In order to seek meaningful Jewish identity development while fully engaged in the secular world, many believe that one must be able to integrate Jewish and secular values and practices rather than compartmentalizing them as two separate identities. One solution to the issue of assimilation and loss of Jewish identity is to create Jewish educational programming that fosters Jewish and American identity development through an integrative approach, to cultivate understanding of the possibility of incorporating each identity into all of life.

As one manifestation of this type of programming, an integrated Jewish day school program prepares students to become autonomous individuals and autonomous Jews (Zeldin, 1998, 582), participating in the modern world while actively using their Jewish knowledge and values in each part of their lives. The day school provides an avenue for educating the 'whole child', taking responsibility for the social, emotional, spiritual, cognitive, physical and creative growth of students within their sociological context. As children experience education as a microcosm of the larger world, if the curriculum and culture of the school integrates secular and religious content, so should students ultimately integrate each aspect of their American and Jewish identity. This will allow healthy and authentic development of individual. It will create an environment

conducive to healthy identity formation and will combat assimilation. In the long run, if Jewish Americans learned to think of Judaism as a natural and fluid part of their everyday lives, we could ultimately return to more traditional, yet progressive minded culture of religious practice, cultural observance, and community participation. Jewish values and Torah could be authentically integrated back into our businesses, home and family lives, and social relationships, reinstating the historical social norm among American Jews to identify strongly as Jews in any context.

Personal Interest

My own interest in education stretches back to second grade, where I began to take notes on aspects of teaching that I admired in each of my elementary school educators. Throughout high school, I continued to observe my teachers, both at public school and in Jewish youth groups, and was thrilled to take opportunities to teach and to learn. When I applied to Brandeis University in the winter of 1999, in the most basic sense, I had a developed understanding of my yearning to teach, and I already knew that my passion was in the field of Jewish Education. I had strong opinions about various needs of the current American Jewish population, I believed in progressive education for American Jewish youth, and I loved every program in Jewish education with which I was involved at the time. Since that time, I have completed a BA in Near Eastern and Judaic Studies and Sociology, a Certificate in Day School Teaching through the DeLeT program of the Hebrew Union College in Los Angeles, a year and a half of post-bachelors studies in Israel, and two years of full-time day school classroom experience. I have worked in summer camps, youth groups, religious schools, and day schools. These paths that I have

chosen during my own educational journey have profoundly changed my conceptions of Jewish education and have ignited my personal interest in the subject of integration.

During my time at Brandeis, through three years of religious school teaching, youth group advising, and my position as a summer camp educator, I began to notice a disjunct between the actions of parents to send their children to these programs and their own involvement in the Jewish community and tradition. This brought my attention also to a trend among the children, where, just like their parents, there was a clear separation between Jewish and American secular identities. What Jewish involvement they had seemed entirely isolated from anything else with which they took part. Even at this time, I understood this phenomenon as a threat to the continued existence of religion and culture in the American Jewish population. I remember a moment in my classroom in those years where a student said to me (in reference to our discussion about Shabbat observance), 'I can't go be Jewish on Saturday, I've got soccer games then.' We spent the next twenty minutes of our class talking about how to 'be Jewish' on the soccer field, referring to the concepts of *tzedek* and *chesed*. Rather than denouncing this child's perception of the separation between his Judaism and the rest of his life, I learned in that moment that through validation of each of this child's identities, I was able to move my students to see that Judaism can be a part of all that we do. While I did not yet have the vocabulary to describe the theory, my eyes and ears were open to different manifestations of this conception of integrated identity development.

After graduating from Brandeis, my time in the DeLeT program, a fifteen month day school teacher training program housed on the Los Angeles campus of the Hebrew Union College, was probably the most important professional step that I took during

those years. At the time, though I was very focused on informal education, I thought, simply, that DeLeT would give me an opportunity to learn educational theory and technique from highly skilled educators. Now that I have taught in a day school for two years, it is clear to me that my interest and place is in these schools. While there is so much work to be done, my vision for integrated identity development among American Jews can be best realized through the day school system.

During my time in DeLeT, I observed not only that the progressive Jewish day school is the modern context where one could most fluidly and authentically teach the integration of secular and religious life, but more profoundly, that this development of integrated identity was deeply affected by the structure and curriculum of the school. I quickly learned that even if Jewish and general studies are taught in the same building, it does not certainly mean that our students are learning the skills to integrate their Jewish and secular lives. In my journal on October 8, 2004, I wrote: 'In a school that is so dedicated to merging modern life with ancient values, why do our third graders experience each part of their identity at strictly separate hours of the day?' At this particular school where I taught that year, students learned that you study math, language arts, social studies and science in the morning and Judaic studies in the afternoon. The subjects were taught by different teachers and in a different language. The students knew that they must speak English from 8:00-12:00 and Hebrew from 1:00-3:00.

Even in this structure of separation, when you spent enough time in the school, it was clear that the concept of integration was valued by school administrators and teachers and implemented in various ways. There were sporadic signs of interaction between secular and religious subject matter, as teachers did make deliberate efforts to

bring the two into dialogue. Seldom though did there seem to be time for two teachers to plan their curriculum together. I learned through my studies and interest that like this school, while many are deeply interested in the idea of integration, progressive American day schools often lack teachers skilled in both subject areas to teach an integrated curriculum. Also, they are often anxious about blending the Jewish and secular curriculum when the general curriculum mandates a quantifiable amount of time and material in general studies subjects. Throughout the year, I saw my students internalize this institutional separation of Judaic and secular content and incorporate its implicit notion of compartmentalization into their daily lives and into their conceptions of the world.

Concurrently with these realizations, I was given the opportunity to develop and teach curricular units for general studies and Judaic studies as well as in the integrative method. When my students talked about the connection between Martin Luther King Jr. and various *tzadikim* in the Jewish world, or related characteristics of positive social relationships with their classmates to the biblical commandment that it is 'not good to be a man by himself', I saw the possibility and importance of authentic curricular integration. Discussions about God and Torah can introduce not only religious spirituality and a strong moral system, but also endless possibilities for application into everyday modern secular life. Torah can teach our youth about friendship, about the importance of knowing one's history and the history of those around you, and about the significance of language, concepts directly relating to their secular education. An open dialogue about God prepares our students to look at the bigger picture in life, to ponder

their place in the world and their responsibilities to their own communities and to the world at large.

My personal interest in this thesis is to extend my understanding of different conceptions and designs of curricular integration in American Jewish day schools and integrated identity development amongst American Jewish youth. I am interested in seeing where, how and to what extent schools embody an integrative model, and how different theories of integration affect the culture of the school and its students. I hope, through this study, to develop a strong conception of how to implement an integrative approach in my teaching throughout my career. Ultimately, I would be thrilled to be a part of a school that authentically embraces this model.

PART I: Research

Chapter 2: Thesis Proposal

Purpose of the Study

While most liberal American Jewish day schools value the theoretical concept of integration, due to both fundamental and logistical issues, thus far, efforts to create a working integrative curriculum and culture in the day school have mostly failed. The purpose of this study is to observe how current model schools implement integration of secular and religious content into their curriculum and culture in order to conceptualize which structures of staff, curricula and culture can make integration a successful endeavor. In this study, I am interested in seeing how different schools utilize an integrative model, and to what extent different focuses and designs of integration change the culture of the school and the identity development of its students. I will also look at how educational leaders at these schools conceptualize integration in their own classes and departments, to see how individual efforts effect the larger institution. Based on these observations and extensive background research, I will suggest different strategies and educational models of integration that encourage individuals to develop a strong Jewish identity while engaging in a secular society. While the results of this study will be presented as a vision for the future of integration in the American Jewish day school, I will also endeavor to use these findings in my future practice as a day school educator and throughout my own career in Jewish education.

Proposed Questions

This study will focus on the integration of secular and religious life of the Jewish day school as a strategy to integrated identity development. The following questions shape the course of this study:

1. The current methods of integration in American Jewish day schools are, on the grand scale, failing to develop integrated identities in their students. Do these programs simply need rethinking and restructuring, or is there a fundamental impossibility or contradiction in this instructional approach? What are the obstacles which contribute to this breakdown in transmission? What can be done to make these educational models more effective?
2. What are some logistical challenges that arise when implementing a fully integrated curriculum in a Jewish day school? If there is no way to avoid them, how can we prevent these challenges from impeding the constructive outcome of this educational model?
3. How do different schools do currently implement the integration of secular and religious subject matter into their curriculum/culture?
4. What structure of staff, classroom and schedule make integration possible in these schools?
5. How can I use current case study findings and research to propose methods for integration in the American Jewish Day School as well as give examples of curricular and structural models imbued with the value of integration?

Chapter 3: Definitions

Liberal American Jewish Day School

This study focuses on integration in the liberal American Jewish Day School. For the purpose of this study, 'Liberal American Jewish Day School' refers to schools which acknowledge the necessity for interaction with the larger secular world and promotes a dynamic program that teaches both secular and Jewish studies curricula in the same environment. Liberal Jewish day schools need not necessarily subscribe to a certain denomination of Judaism, but they must place value on the concept of pluralism in learning both Jewish and secular subjects. Students are encouraged to think and reason in the process of developing Jewish identity and to develop the skills to engage in the modern world while living an active Jewish life (regardless of what form that may take). Its students learn about current and past world-wide Jewish and non-Jewish communities and about human rights for all people. They study Torah as text as well as a guide for life decisions and taking action in the world. They are also taught the importance and value of the study of non-Jewish texts as other models for moral living. They learn to acknowledge other world voices and influences and to act with compassion for and in acknowledgement of the beliefs and practices of others.

School Culture

In this thesis, the study of school culture includes every aspect of a particular school community outside of its written curricula. It may be the atmosphere or climate of the school experienced by one who enters, as well as various school-wide events, rituals, and rules explicitly or implicitly laid out by the community. Informal interactions between administration, teachers, parents and students, logistical decisions for the

construct of the building, teacher and student schedules and classrooms, individual classroom and hallway bulletin boards and displays, the school website and informational packets, and the atmosphere and content of staff meetings all play a part in the creation of school culture. The culture and structure of a school should be in line with its values and written curricula as it profoundly affects the learning of its students. If created within these constructs, it may be utilized as valuable implicit curricula, supplementary to the written curriculum for each grade level.

Integration

Integration is, on a basic level, the joining of various subject areas into correlation with one another. The Latin root of the word is 'to make whole or renew' (Schachter, 153), implying that authentic integration will allow a more complete or enlightened understanding of various subjects as they are grounded in interaction with one another. It is related to the word 'integrity', showing the soundness of its implementation and its moral principle. In the school, efforts to integrate bring aspects of the school's learning environment into relationship (Zeldin, 1998, 580). It is important that integration be seen as a process, not a product of a single development or individual understanding (Malkus, 2001, 2).

Many educators consider integration simply in terms of finding connections between religious and secular ideas and expressing those connections in the classroom. In the context of the Jewish day school, the planning of curricular integration is not simply creating juxtaposition of similar content in secular and religious studies (Margolis, Schoenberg, 95). Instead, an integrated curriculum must be made up of a variety of

specific approaches, infrastructures, and characteristics that are developed by the school as a part of its larger vision (Malkus, 2001, 11).

Michael Zeldin proposes four alternative approaches to curriculum integration. While juxtaposition is certainly one legitimate form of integration, there are actually a number of curricular methods to integration in the Jewish classroom (Zeldin, 1998). According to Zeldin, the opposite of integration is 'compartmentalization', where there are entirely separate tracks for each subject area. This ideal differs from a model that fully rejects the concept of equality in secular and general studies, where Judaic studies are seen as the source of the real values of the school and community (Schachter, 154). Instead, while the two subject areas are set up as totally separate, with no interaction between the two, they are valued equally. Three other models, 'coordination', 'integration' and 'interaction', serve as alternative ways of organizing integrative curriculum, each having varying features. 'Coordination', the term given to this previously discussed concept of juxtaposition, is a structure of separate curriculum with efforts to find parallels and similarities between subject areas. 'Integration', under this construct, is when a single unified curriculum is established with consistent contact between secular and religious subjects. It is the profession of one world view incorporating both general and Judaic studies as two fully valued sources of knowledge and approaches to the world (Schachter, 154). Lastly, 'interaction' is the perspective of integration where curriculum of different subject areas is created independently, but with intended and thoughtful dialogue between subject areas. This four-part perspective on integration counters the older 'melting pot' model, where the distinctiveness of both Jewish and secular studies is lost. It prefers the development of strategies for interaction

between the subjects while maintaining the authentic identity of each. Any given school may practice a range of approaches within one building (Schachter, 156). Zeldin claims that the most successful institutions employ a combination of each of these integrative techniques.

When studying integration, it is important to note different types of integration that may be found in the classroom and school, and the possibility that each may create different results in the classroom. While curricular integration has been the focus of most previous research, this study has been fashioned to explore the uses and effects of curricular integration as well as alternative integrative approaches which encourage integrated identity development. It will pose questions about vision, structure and practice, whose answers may envision future definitions of integration for the American Jewish day school.

Chapter 4: Literature Review

Why Integration?

"A central concern in Jewish thinking is to overcome the tendency to see the world in one dimension, from one perspective, to reduce history exclusively to God's actions or to man's action, either to grace or to man's initiative. The marvelous and the mundane, the sacred and the secular, are not mutually exclusive, nor are the natural and the supernatural, the temporal and the eternal, kept apart. The heart of the relationship of God and man is reciprocity, interdependence. The task is to humanize the sacred and to sanctify the secular." -Abraham Joshua Heschel

While its classification and implementations have evolved, integration of secular and religious subject matter is not a new concept in Jewish education. Early conceptions of integration came from the general notion that we must harmonize Jewish and secular identity in order for both to exist in a modern context (Zeldin, 1998, 584). While this theory arose from a positive notion of duality, it risks blurring the distinctiveness of Judaism and ultimately, threatening Jewish continuity. Rather than teaching Judaism as distinctive from but in interaction with the modern world, Jewish values were synthesized with modern ideals, in an effort to blend into secular modern society.

From this original conception, the envisioned role and rationale for integration in Jewish education has evolved tremendously. As part of a recent trend of ethnic exploration in the United States, Jews (and other ethnic groups) began to explore their own cultural and religious background in an increasingly complex and impersonal world (Zeldin, 1998, 585). In order to support this surge of exploration, Jewish day schools arose rapidly and in great numbers. The issue of integration promptly became a hot topic in these new schools, and educational leaders and schools which promoted an integrative curriculum shifted over time from the older integration paradigm to a progressive interactive one. Integration was re-conceptualized as incorporating a continuum of possibilities, rather than as a single choice between compartmentalization and integration of teaching and learning (Pomson, 533). Rather than simply blending general and Judaic

studies, an interactive dual curriculum with multiple strategies of integration would allow teachers to present Judaism in authentic interaction and tension with modern ideas and values. According to this progressive conception, different styles of integration may exist side by side, and various implementations of integrative curricula may succeed. It was conceived that students who experience this integrated curriculum would learn more than specific facts or skills: they would learn a way to look at the world and develop the skills to face the complex challenges that Jews meet in the modern world (Zeldin, 1992, 14).

"The most fundamental question of American Jewish life: how to live in two worlds at once, how to be both American and Jewish, part of a larger American society and apart from it." (Zeldin, 1998, 579) Fundamentally, if students internalize the basic structure of schooling as their own approach to life, then the development of integration in the curriculum and culture of day schools would significantly lessen the disconnect between the students' American and Jewish identities (Malkus, 2001, 1). It would aid in the development of positive and healthy Jewish identities for individuals in daily interaction with the modern world, and would give students the skills to participate as citizens of their country and as members of the Jewish community (Zeldin, 1998, 581). The development of a fully-integrated program would give children the ability to integrate skills acquired into each subject studied (Schachter, 158).

In a theological sense, integration may act as a response to the Jewish conception of the unification of God (Margolis/Schoenberg, 134). It offers students a holistic world-view, exemplifying the possibility of maintaining the core of Judaism while adapting to the modern social construct in which we live (Zeldin, 1998, 581). The educational theorist, John Dewey, called for the unity of theory and practice, mind and body,

community and school (Margolis/Schoenberg, 134). Integration provides this unified process for how teachers and students must work and think (Malkus, 2001, 55-56). Educationally, it offers an avenue for educating the 'whole child', taking responsibility for the social, emotional, spiritual, cognitive, physical and creative growth of its students (Zeldin, 1998, 582) and promoting the formation of healthy identities. It responds to progressive curriculum theory which stresses unifying structures of knowledge and spiral curriculum. Rather than teaching Judaism as a separate entity from the rest of the state mandated program, an integrative curriculum responds to the liberal American Jewish population's desire to interact with American society (Margolis/Schoenberg, 134) while expressing to its students the school's consideration and value for the dual heritages of the American Jew (Zeldin, 1992, 13).

From a social perspective, integration socializes students into their autonomous roles as American Jews and prepares them to participate in the North American and world Jewish community (Zeldin, 1998, 581). The long-standing motto of the Haskalah was the idea that one must 'be a Jew at home and a man outside of it' (Lookstein, 37). Contrastingly, and in line with the changing needs of modern liberal Judaism, the enduring understanding projected by an integrated education is that one may be a human being and a Jew in *all* realms of life. When integrating secular and religious subject matter, the dissonance between what happens in school and what happens outside as well as between Jewish and American identities is diminished (Ingall, 18).

Why Day Schools?

Jewish day schools are one manifestation of the nationwide trend of cultural exploration (Zeldin, 1998, 584). As of 2000, an estimated 205,000 students were

studying in elementary and secondary Jewish day schools (Schick, 1). Enrollment has significantly improved since then, and day school education has become an increasingly major component of American Jewish education. In New York state, there are 82,500 day school students (Schick, 3), 40% of the total U.S. enrollment. While it is important to note that the majority of these statistics refer to Orthodox day schools (97% of New York City enrollment is in Orthodox schools), the liberal day school movement also increased significantly.

The inspiration for an integrated curriculum of Judaic and general studies must begin with a theological assumption about the unity of all aspects of the world. Likewise, this assumption must lead to the academic commitment to the educational theory of holistic education (Pomson, 529). Logistically, day schools have the unique composition and structure to wholly enact this authentic and qualitatively different theory of Jewish education. Differing from all other Jewish educational institutions, the day school fits this dual inspired model and has the opportunity to engage students in a spiral curriculum of both general and Judaic studies (Pomson, 530).

The rise of Jewish day schools in America is a possible means to undo the bifurcated nature of the education of American Jews through an integrated curriculum and culture (Malkus, 2001, 13). Because day schools arose in response to the threat of assimilation, they strive to address the tension between the role of the Jew and the role of the Jewish people in secular society (Lukinsky, 1). Like other educational institutions, the Jewish day school could successfully continue to utilize the more easily organized 'subject-centered' approach to curriculum planning, but it would eliminate its unique potential and purpose to pursue the integrative ideal (Margolis/Schoenberg, 5). Because

both secular and religious subject areas are taught within the same institution, the day school has the unique opportunity to create rich and authentic Jewish-American experiences.

Avenues to Integration

"Learning is not just derived from curriculum but also the way time is structured, relationships amongst staff, types and distribution of teaching strategies, methods of inquiry, the quality and distribution of resources and materials, arrangement of the physical environment, parent involvement and informal activities" (Schachter, 154). Zeldin applies Bolman and Deal's four organizational frames as a means to facilitate integration: the structural, human resources, political and symbolic frameworks of organization and implementation (Zeldin, 1998, 587). The structural frame embodies how the school day is organized and how teaching responsibilities are assigned to each educator. Human resources accounts for each participant's need for security, satisfaction, and encouragement in the process. The political frame recognizes interest groups that hold shared goals, in this case connecting the necessary assemblies to make integration happen. An individual's attachment and commitment to an organization affects how they see the organization, how much they will contribute to it, and how they will act. In the symbolic frame, a school must incorporate rituals, stories and symbols to encourage attachment of all constituents to the promoted educational ideal. If all shareholders in the educational process are not on board with the concept of integration, its implementation will not succeed. The delicate blending of each of these frameworks is essential when constructing a vision and implementation of integration within the school.

While definitions of integration vary from school to school, each contains this dual need for school structure and written curriculum conducive to the variety of

integration promoted by the school (Margolis/Schoenberg, 133). Integration is fostered through the development of specific school infrastructures (Malkus, 2001, 55-56). The structure of the school and logistics of teacher scheduling provide several unique opportunities for integration in a day school. Ideally, the faculty of the school embodies the concept of integration valued at the school, reflecting a dual commitment to Judaism and Western culture (Lookstein, 38). Because the day school acts as a microcosm of the larger Jewish community, the integrative strategy chosen and the way it is embodied in the school is a powerful implicit example to its students (Lukinsky, 4).

In order to make integration flow throughout the school, it would be beneficial for the entire faculty to act and be considered as one unit (Lookstein, 38). According to many theorists, team teaching of secular and religious subject matter is an essential core infrastructure for an integrated program (Malkus, 2001, 169). When one teacher is the general studies specialist with strong Judaic background and the other is Judaic-focused with a strong background in general studies, the possibility for team-written integrated curriculum and spontaneous integration in the classroom is constant (Margolis/Schoenberg, 152). Arguably, a bifurcated model of day school education, spending half the day in a Jewish studies classroom and half the day in a general studies classroom with different teachers, may impede the success of an integrated curriculum (Ingall, 20). Whether or not the curriculum is team taught or split between specialists, it is of vital importance that teachers see their potential to connect with their partner educator, whether or not they will actually produce team-written integrated curriculum. Constant communication between educators develops awareness of the core scope of their

students' studies, allowing the possibility to juxtapose learning and to aid students in their application of knowledge to diverse contexts.

Scheduling is another structural consideration that may significantly aid or impede integration in the school. In order to give teachers the opportunity to integrate curriculum, schools must rethink how time is scheduled to provide the flexible scheduling needed for teacher collaboration (Malkus, 2001, 173). There must be deliberate planning time set into the schedule of each teacher in order to create integrated curriculum (Malkus, 2001, 175). Student scheduling must be carefully thought through as well, as there are significant hidden messages in the specific structure of a student's day that are internalized as part of the enduring understanding of the integrative model. If a student experiences distinctly separated times of the day to speak Hebrew and English, to learn in general and Judaic studies classrooms, and to learn from general and Judaic teachers, they will internalize these aspects of their daily lives as distinctly separate. If in a bifurcated model, even just mixing up these classes throughout the daily student schedule will aid in the development of integrated identity (Holtz, 550).

Beyond concepts of school structure, the development of written curriculum has been usually considered the crucial consideration for the integrative model (Malkus, 2001, 175). By this conception, a macro-vision of curriculum with goals and enduring understandings addressed must be developed with specific definitions and a vision of integration in mind. For a school that values written integrated curriculum, there are a number of possibilities as to what may be integrated and how it may be organized. The method may embody integration of Jewish culture and Western civilization, Jewish and American lives of each child, or Jewish studies and general studies, and each send

different messages to learners (Zeldin, 1992, 13). Each of these conceptions of integration acknowledges the realities that American Jews face today, but conceives of their relationship to one another differently. A curriculum may acknowledge the religious world simply as the practices of a religious community or encompassing the thoughts, decisions and morals that enter every aspect of a child's life. An integrated curriculum engages Judaism and the secular culture through the transmission of knowledge, skills and values that students will need to succeed in every aspect their environment. Using Hebrew throughout the curriculum is a unique example of curriculum integration, as it allows students see the applicability of Jewish culture in a modern context (Malkus, 2001, 55-56). Based on the idea that Judaism provides a distinct world view which holds continued relevance for contemporary Jews in American society, integration can help transmit Judaism as a system of practices and beliefs that are in constant engagement with the social and cultural environment of the American Jew (Zeldin, 1998, 583).

There are several educational strategies through which integration may be implemented. Each school often puts into practice more than one method. Where explicit connections are not encouraged, a parallel study of related topics (even if in different classes with different teachers) is one possible approach (Zeldin, 1992, 14). Secondly, study in one area of knowledge may be purposefully placed into the context of knowledge, skills or values from another discipline. In this case, a single curriculum is the focus, while the other content area enriches its learning. Because of the reality that the Jewish day school must offer a high standard comprehensive secular education (Lookstein, 37), this type of curriculum is often organized around disciplines of the

general studies curriculum and then injected with Jewish knowledge and content (Zeldin, 1998, 584). Jewish history and culture is put into context with secular learning through core general studies courses (Holtz, 551).

Scripted integration in the curriculum provides explicit connections between Judaism and the general studies curriculum. Either teacher may teach this type of integration, showing similarities and differences between the disciplines that they have integrated (Zeldin, 1998, 584). It is possible to begin with both curricular areas, either placing each in the context of the other or presenting the curricula as parallel. In this case, two cultures are taught in the same place and environment, with equal rights and equal time and the ability to flow between one another (Lookstein, 38). Ideally, the teacher's aim will be to help students discover the relationships between Judaism and Western modern culture. Whether or not the understanding is explicitly transmitted, substantial planning with other teachers and flexibility of curricula is needed to maximize the possibility of students seeing the connections and internalizing them as a part of their personal identity.

The unique structure of the Jewish day school also provides the opportunity for theme-based learning, where inquiry comes out from the presentation of a theme, topic or issue (Malkus, 2001, 166). In this method, integrated curriculum is characterized by interdisciplinary units organized around central themes (Malkus, 2001, 55-56). Even if subjects are actually taught separately, the theme of a particular unit is thoughtfully incorporated into curriculum planning by each teacher, and students experience the integration of the theme in each subject that they learn (Ingall, 23). Authentic integration through theme-based learning needs some form of synthesis and unification of different

forms of knowledge and their disciplines (Pomson, 543). By building diverse curricula around a theme, inquiry in various disciplines is encouraged and organic integration occurs (Ingall, 23).

The planning for theme-based integration begins with the identification of organizing themes or centers for learning experiences (Pomson, 533). The subject matter of each discipline becomes a pool of resources to draw from for each theme, as well as for related issues and activities within each classroom. Ideally, this curriculum should work toward a culminating event, using multiple disciplines to come to some greater enduring understanding (Pomson, 542).

Thematic integration addresses how Judaism is relevant within a contemporary Western context, but does not place Western culture over Judaism (Holtz, 552). It is important that theme-based curriculum not always begin with a Jewish concept and then throw in general studies, but instead that it equally utilizes general and Judaic structure and content in order to transmit a concept of dual existence to its students (Pomson, 544). It must include the development of curriculum that is not seen as secular or Jewish, but both, an amalgam of each discipline organized around a specific theme or problem. While this approach is one of many manifestations of integration, it is notably difficult to translate every concept of general and Judaic studies into the context of the other. There must be a delicate balance of curricular approaches in order to maintain the dynamic nature of the curriculum (Malkus, 2001, 171). Curriculum must not be set or static, as the power of the message of integration will be lost. Using this technique throughout the curriculum is fundamentally inorganic and will ultimately fail to transmit genuine understanding of this approach to its students (Pomson, 544).

Critiques/Current Shortcomings

The clearest general critique of the integrative method of teaching in the Jewish school is total rejection of Western culture being taught as a part of the educational experience. At its extreme, secular learning is deemed as either evil or irrelevant and religious studies are the only focus of the educational institution (Lukinsky, 5). There are a number of classic liberal responses to this critique; first, from a religious standpoint, the Jewish notion of the oneness of God and the extension of God's creation to all aspects of life refutes this conception of Western culture as unholy (Lukinsky, 9). Likewise, there is the educational perspective that subjects should not be fragmented or deliberately separated, as it hinders students' abilities to apply knowledge to various contexts. Sociologically, revolution in general culture and moral climate, gender role changes, globalization, and changing family dynamics make it essential that schools integrate the secular and religious lives of its students to develop healthy social wellbeing and personal identity in its students. Under these contemporary conditions, it is critical that schools acknowledge the diversity and complexity of their students' lives, within their classrooms and beyond school walls (Lukinsky, 10).

As noted earlier in this chapter, one shortcoming of current integrated programs is the absence of a constructed definition of integration from which to create curricula (Schachter, 156). In many of these programs, when asked the definition of integration and its goals, individual educators within the school will answer with entirely different conceptions and objectives than the school literature, which subsequently inspire very different implementations of integration. From a research perspective, lacking

understanding of definition makes it difficult to discuss the merits of integration and how to augment efforts toward integration.

As the American Jewish day school movement has grown, a number of logistical issues and concerns have arisen within these schools when considering implementation of any conception of an integrative program. The latest census, taken of the 2003-2004 school year as a follow-up to the comprehensive 1998-1999 study, shows nearly 700 day schools in the United States with an enrollment of close to 200,000 students (Elkin, 14). Because of the rapid growth of the day school movement and the difficulty in building infrastructure and personnel at the same pace with its increase in numbers, there are many areas that need attention within each school before the possibility of implementing a solid integrated program may exist.

As the majority of these schools were not initially established with an integrated program, restructuring curriculum and school structure would take significant advocacy work for financial support through fundraising, advertisements, and endowments (Elkin, 2). Even if a school had the financial means to hire the appropriate person or team for advocacy programs, they must also deliver the expertise and technical support to implement such a program. The amount of expertise, organization and money that must go into the creation of a successful integrative program within a single school can be a significant deterrent for schools to carry out such an endeavor.

While many liberal schools encourage integration and would prefer a fully-integrated staff and curriculum, they are unaware of the logistics that will keep them from success in this effort (Schacter, 156). In the majority of current endeavors at day school curricular integration, there are failures in all four commonplaces of the school: within

the subject matter, teachers, students and milieu (Pomson, 530-1). Also, many programs developed to integrate written curriculum without creating the school structure needed to support and encourage spontaneous integrated experiences fail in the effort to transmit the method to its students as a way of life.

In regards to the subject matter itself, it may be difficult to transfer the philosophy of integration into specific detailed curriculum. The teachers that execute written integrated curriculum must also embody this concept, as it is not possible to authentically teach this technique without genuine models of integrated beings. Because there are few programs that prepare teachers to teach both general and Judaic studies, there are consequently few qualified integrated educators. Teachers lack experience in all subject areas, nor are they trained in integrative curriculum development. There is a need for increased staff interaction and staff meetings, different scheduling patterns, and an increased financial package for teachers to compensate for their time and effort in the classroom to create an integrated curriculum (Schacter, 156).

The development of any integrated program assumes of its students an inherent commitment to their religion, yet studies show that (because of absent developmental readiness) most students do not begin their education with this strong sense of commitment (Schacter, 156). Likewise, a school with integrated curriculum is less likely to succeed when families do not share the same integrative goals and their homes do not model the integrative method that students experience in school.

Depending on the model of integration as well as the milieu of the school itself, there may also be an issue with the authenticity of written integrated curriculum. To avoid superficial integration, the institution must acknowledge what distinguishes each

discipline from the other before finding areas that may be logically integrated (Bennett, 152). When trying to create connections where they do not naturally exist, or forcing integration into all moments of the educational experience, not only does the method come across as unrealistic to students, but the myriad genuine experiences of integration lose their power. Likewise, the school must not be a sealed environment with no outside influence (Lookstein, 37), as this will also ultimately reduce the authenticity and perceived value of the secular curriculum.

"Integration can only occur within individuals. Therefore, the specifics of each school program must depend upon the particular talents of the teachers, the concerns of the community and the needs and abilities of the individual students" (Margolis/Schoenberg, pg 133). The curriculum itself is only successful when it acts as a model of the larger vision and culture of the school. It must be supported throughout the school's infrastructure, staff and community. When this is established in the liberal Jewish day school, it will act as a powerful educational tool that fosters deep and meaningful student learning and the development of healthy integrated identity amongst its students (Malkus, 2001, 11).

PART II: Field Study

Chapter 5: Research Methodology

Description

The intention of this study is to take specific findings from field research examples and apply them to a broader concept of integration in liberal American Jewish day schools. In each site, from formalized interviews, classroom observation, and an intensive study of the school's information packet, website and general school culture, I will be presenting connections, patterns and differentiations in curriculum and culture. The intention is not to find the greatest examples of the integrative method, but instead to look closely at two schools that value the concept of integration in order to establish different models of integration as well as to determine which structures of school and strategies of implementation work best in the context of these day school classrooms. I will use these data along with the current literature on integration to suggest broad possibilities for integration as well a general proposal of needed reform.

The greatest limitation to this study is a matter of logistics; the amount of time spent in the schools is quite short, and cannot therefore produce long-term results and analysis. Recognizing its limitations, this study will not strive to make blanket statements about all day schools nor will it claim decisive truth or precise accuracy in data. Instead, the valuable information gained from a short study at two schools will be used to propose broad possibilities for integration in American Jewish day schools.

Layout

I decided to focus on two Manhattan day schools, simply because of the logistics of travel to each school for observation. In many senses, characteristics of the liberal

Jewish community of New York and its day school families are significantly different than other population samples in the United States. The particular sites, the Rodeph Sholom School and the Soloman Schechter School of Manhattan, were chosen because of their expressed interest in the integrative method, their willingness to allow observational research in the school, and their strong general reputation in the New York Jewish Community. The two schools have a significantly different structure of curricula and classroom, providing the possibility for more extensive and widespread information and ideas.

The particular study in each school was focused on the fourth grade, so as to compare similar curricula and classroom time. Two full days were spent in observation at each school at this grade level, and interviews were conducted with various members of the administration and teachers at grade level. Interviews were guided by a set of pre-written open-ended questions (See Appendix I) and focused on the vision and implementation of integration in all areas of the school.

The normative-ideational approach was used to lay out this study, where the researcher begins examination with a conviction of what is right (Rosenak, 25). This particular site study begins with the basic conviction that the integrative method is possible and constructive, and then looks for areas within each site school where it exists. Current literature focuses on extensive logistical challenges and structural failures in the majority of schools that employ an integrative model. This field research, however, focused first on finding authentic integration that *is* happening in the site schools as well as aspects of school structure which augment integrative efforts before analyzing various problems with the model and its current implementation.

In the following chapters, the data collected through interviews, classroom observation, and written materials of the school will be synthesized into separate chapters for each site with specific examples of integration and descriptions of methodology rather than any systematic database of information.

Chapter 6: The Rodeph Sholom School

The School

Rodeph Sholom School, the only Reform Jewish day school in New York City, was established in 1970, and currently serves over six hundred students, from nursery through eighth grade, in their Upper West Side converted brown stone buildings. The school, which was established by its affiliated synagogue just a few blocks away, is currently only peripherally connected to the daily life of the synagogue, acting as an independent entity with divergent vision and practice.

Newly written by a review committee lead by school administrators and parents, the day school relates its mission as follows:

Rodeph Sholom School, a Reform Jewish Day School, fosters intellectual curiosity through a challenging independent school academic program in nursery through eighth grade. At the heart of RSS is a warm, vibrant community, where students are guided by Jewish knowledge, values, and ethics to become self-confident and socially responsible leaders.

In the 2007-2008 Parent Handbook, given to all current and prospective families, the school states its commitment to a certain educational vision imbued with holistic learning and integrated curriculum. The vision includes a "commitment to the fullest development of each student's intellectual, esthetic, ethical, and athletic promise". It recognizes that "for American Jews to live a complete life, they must assimilate two traditions of knowledge and history: their legacy of Western culture and American civilization and their heritage of Jewish culture, practice, and history". The tagline on the front page of the school website illustrates the ideals of the school as "educating the

whole child...a sound intellectual foundation infused with the enduring traditions and ethical values of Reform Judaism". Through a commitment to 'morality, ethics, and service', Rodeph Sholom School envisions the development of Jewish identity through interaction with the secular world. The headmaster of the school, Paul Druzinsky, states: "Our Jewish values ensure that good citizenship and a commitment to raising ethically minded children is at the forefront of all that we do".

Hiring at Rodeph Sholom is a complex endeavor, as while General Studies teachers stay with one grade throughout the day in the elementary school, Judaic Studies teachers are hired as subject specialists. Non-Jewish or non-practicing Jewish teachers are considered for General studies. All teachers must be able to meet their students at their developmental level, helping them grow in all areas of their academic and identity development. Every teacher in the middle school sits as advisor to a number of middle school students, which ideally includes academic and spiritual guidance from a Jewish perspective. The school is dedicated to hiring qualified, flexible thinkers who, regardless of their religious background, must be willing to learn about Reform Judaism, in order to reinforce the Jewish values and practices of the school. The Jewish identity of the school is placed in front of each candidate, and the applicant must be willing to promote that vision and practice.

In its bifurcated school structure of separate Judaic and General studies subjects and teachers in the elementary school, each class of students at the school is set up with two General studies co-teachers who divide subjects by their own teaching strengths and appropriate scheduling. Like its other specialist subjects, separate Judaic studies teacher comes into the classroom during Judaic studies time slots, during which the General

studies teachers are given scheduled preparation time and break. Though general subjects like math and reading are grouped differentially by level, Hebrew language is taught to the entire class by other specialists who come into the classroom at the appropriated time. This is also often team-taught, with pull-out accommodation for students needing remediation from a specialist. Also contrary to the general studies program, due to logistics of hiring pools, Judaic studies and Hebrew teachers are often hired with significant content knowledge, but little teaching experience.

The school is currently striving towards hiring diverse Jewish role models for their students in their Judaic and Hebrew staff, modeling an integrative ideal through their staffing choices. In this current year, the school has purposefully placed English and Judaic Studies teachers in part-time Hebrew teaching capacity, and have hired international faculty to promote diverse conceptions of Judaism and Jewish practice. While the General studies teachers are not required to speak Hebrew, many have taken personal initiative to learn.

The Curriculum Method to Integration

In the curriculum method to integration, the origin of vision for integration is housed in written curriculum rather than structure of school. It is by this method, with numerous variations, that most previous research on integration in day schools has been conducted, and where most current attempts at integration in day schools begin. It is important to note that this means to integration is about origin of vision, not what surmises onward from there. A school employing the curriculum method to integration ultimately may develop some elements of unified school structure, but integration is first infused into its curriculum, rather than focusing on building structural components

conducive to the integrative ideal. Schools may have significantly varying conceptions of successful curricular models of integration, but it is the essential focus on the development of curriculum as the school's focal means to integration that defines this term.

The Rodeph Sholom School is a classic example of a school which values the curriculum method to integration, but has not yet developed a fully-unified school-wide curricular model. In its structure, with two team teachers in general studies, a Judaic studies teacher who comes in three days a week and a Hebrew specialist every day, significant coordination between teachers and curriculum writers would be needed to create a fully-integrated program. Tammie Anagnostis, a fourth grade general studies teacher, explained the current place of integration at Rodeph Sholom: "It does come down to a lot of personal decisions. Administration has made it clear to us that it's a school value and we are moving towards creating a school-wide approach to this. Right now, integration is ground-up and written into curriculum by each individual teacher." In the section about the day school, the synagogue's Membership Guide explains this structure differently, exemplifying a gap between the stated ideal of the school and the actual daily implementation of curriculum in its classrooms: "Integrated throughout the curriculum is a program of Judaic studies designed to transmit Jewish heritage from the Reform point of view."

Over the years, Rodeph Sholom has struggled to bring a clear sense of goals and objectives to their school-wide Judaic studies curriculum. The decision to create a new position of head of curriculum development was partially in response for this need to unify Judaic studies curriculum and the development of a master scope and sequence for

all curriculums. Laurie Piette, who had previously held the position as head of the English and History departments, acquired this position and has significantly guided the school's vision of Judaic studies towards fruition, making integrated curriculum development possible within the school. Because of personnel issues, and because implementing any vision requires time, training, and hiring of faculty, Piette felt that she had to employ additive change rather than any larger systematic change to integrate curriculum in the school.

In 2002, when Rodeph Sholom was building their middle school, Laurie Piette joined the staff to help coordinate curriculum for the new, pre-K-8 model. She took position as chair of the English department, focusing on the development of good pedagogy for teachers in grades 2-8. Since then, the Judaic Studies department has undergone a transitional period, passing through three directors in five years. When the middle school was being developed and Piette came on board, the Judaic Studies head was not quite ready to integrate curriculum with other disciplines, though Laurie as well as the head of the History department were eager. In developing curriculum, Laurie found that the easiest integration with Judaic Studies was with English and History, and she decided to go ahead independently with this endeavor.

In the English department, themes for literature studies were chosen at each grade level with Jewish content. In fifth grade, students learn about the Jewish journey to America, under the theme of 'new beginnings'. Sixth graders engage in the theme of 'Identity and Community', reading books on Jewish identity and community as well as the Holocaust as a historical crisis of the Jewish people. Seventh graders focus on the theme of 'Metamorphosis', reading The House on Mango Street and comparing its

description of Holy Communion to their own impending *b'nei mitzvah*. In eighth grade, through the theme of 'Justice and the Appropriateness of Taking Action-*Tikkun Olam*', students relate their own experience as members of a minority religion to historical Jewish experiences. They read The Chosen, Night, and To Kill A Mockingbird, to find connections and differences between different minority experiences and their own. An eighth grade end of the year unit on contemporary Israeli and medieval Jewish poetry emphasizes the importance of integration of Jewish subjects outside of the Holocaust into History and English.

Over the subsequent years, as she developed aspects of integrated curriculum in the English department, Laurie transitioned to chair of English and History, giving her greater opportunity to integrate between the disciplines. At this time, the school was already on their third director of Judaic Studies since Laurie came on staff, and some Judaic Studies faculty felt that every year, Judaic curriculum was scrapped and started from scratch. Charlie Sherman, the Judaic Studies teacher for the upper elementary classes, said: "If you look at the student schedule as three sections of Jewish studies, five of Hebrew, one for *tefillot,* and one section for *Kabalat Shabbat*, then you only have ten moments in the week to be Jewish. But, if you put it all over the hallways, bring it into all the classrooms, and integrate *mitzvot* and Judaism into their vocabulary, then you've really got it." In order to create this macro-design of integrated curriculum and culture, the school needed a specialist in curriculum design. Laurie was able to utilize master teachers within each field in order to fill in her own gaps of knowledge in various disciplines, while employing her own breadth of knowledge and expertise in curriculum design to create an explicit, holistic master curriculum. A curriculum map for Judaic

studies was created, with attention paid to identifying places for integration. As noted by Laurie, this program, while still needing significant development in the coming years, is heading in a great direction for integration. Charlie agrees: "Integration is more on the radar here than it ever has been before. It makes us into a Jewish day school rather than a bone fide religious school meeting at better hours for kids".

Especially in the lower grades, Social Studies remain the nexus of integration. In the first grade, Israel is used as the model to teach the market, mapping, math curriculum and sciences. The Social Studies curriculum culminates in a mock *shuk* experience, where first graders sell products to the rest of the school, and all proceeds of sale go to *tzedakah*. In the older elementary grades, students study other ethnic and religious communities in New York, from Indian to Chinese to the *Chabad* community of Brooklyn. The religious component of each community is examined, with writing assignments to process their study of world religions in comparison to American Reform Judaism. Students also apply their knowledge and skills in an in-depth study of communities in Israel during the third grade. Examples of juxtaposition abound in Social Studies, where studies of Mesopotamia coincide with the Babylonian Exile and effects of Diaspora Judaism, Islam in Spain is compared to the Golden Age of Judaism in Spain, and historical accounts of ancient Egypt are looked at next to study of the biblical Exodus.

The Curriculum Guide, published for prospective and current families, though organized by separate subjects, explicitly mentions interaction between disciplines throughout the curriculum. In the middle school, the Curriculum Guide states that "whenever feasible, teachers integrate across subject disciplines often simultaneously

engaging multiple learning modalities". Developed with integration as a focused objective, the program content and methodology of the middle school are noted to be "inextricably linked to interdisciplinary study with special emphasis on the subjects of English, History and Judaic Studies". While general and Judaic disciplines are taught in different classrooms, with different teachers and assorted classmates, there is an emphasis on Jewish values entering all aspects of school life. The advisory program, which encourages healthy socio-emotional development and teaches stress management skills, is a central area of integration in the middle school. "Advisory meetings often deal with social issues that reach beyond the immediate school community. Torah portions and current events often serve as fruitful starting points for discussions." As all teachers in the school are advisors for middle school students, even if teachers are not Jewish themselves, they must be able to approach all aspects of a child's learning and dual identity.

While integration may be implemented throughout the curriculum, demonstration of the curricular method to integration may be best understood by highlighting a number of specific curriculum projects, events and experiences in the school that employ a variety of curricular approaches to integration. The following are multi-faceted examples of curricular integration manifested through school-wide programming at the Rodeph Sholom School:

TAMCHUI

The natural ability to create integrated curricula around social action has been exemplified in past years through the "Tamchui program". The term *Tamchui*, meaning 'community collection plate' in Aramaic, was what our sages used to fulfill people's

basic human needs. In this context, the Rodeph Sholom community gathers funds for three organizations with basic needs. Students engage in a wide-spread integrated curriculum to learn about these organizations, ultimately deciding where funds should be allocated. This program is an exemplar of curricular integration, as it uses multiple methods to integrate learning throughout the school while empowering students to develop an integrated understanding of the world and their place in it. Students in all grades at Rodeph Sholom have the opportunity to meet representatives from three different organizations, learn about the organizations in their classrooms in all subject areas, and consider the significance of their donations and social action work through their experiences.

In order to empower students to make a difference and take ownership over the Tamchui project, students run bake sales, raffle tickets, and create performances to fundraise for these organizations. To develop understanding of the power of education and their ability to make change, they are given the opportunity to teach others about Tamchui and the organizations that they are supporting. The program nurtures and encourages the community's motivation and desire to give to others by connecting students with other children in need.

Every year, Tamchui has a theme, which has ranged from homelessness to hunger to Israeli relations with other communities. Representatives come and do a presentation of their organization and curriculum is written and split between general and Judaic subjects in the classrooms. Students learn about the concept of *tamchui* in their Judaic Studies classes, connecting it to the Jewish concepts of *tzedakah* and *tikkun olam*. In general studies subjects, students are able to transfer their learning about *tamchui* to other

disciplines, learning about voting percentages in math, communities in need and the value of giving in Social Studies and English, and creating art and music for the organization presentations and fundraisers in their specialty classes.

Though students decide where their money will be allocated, after nominations from the community, it is the staff of Rodeph Sholom who engages in the process of choosing organizations to be presented each year. There are a number of guidelines to this process, each thought through to purposefully impart implicit messages to its students. Firstly, every organization chosen is, in some way, in aid to children in need. Because it is easier to feel empathy for someone in a similar life stage, this thematic choice helps students to develop authentic connection to the individuals that benefit from their donations. The three organizations chosen must represent local, national and international aid, Jewish and non-Jewish organizations, and at least one connection to Israel, placing value on Jewish sense of responsibility to all human beings. This complementary implicit curriculum reinforces the school's vision of integrated identity development, where students are given the opportunity to fully engage in authentic interaction with the world around them, using a Jewish perspective to guide their actions and words.

Tamchui is a beloved program at Rodeph Sholom. It takes over the school for months before the actual allocation of funds go to chosen organizations. It is a big part of the school community spirit, creating connection between parents, teachers, administration and students. There are decorations hanging from the ceilings and hallways, school-wide fundraising events and curriculum components throughout the school and at every grade. All Tamchui donations for the school year are allocated to

these three organizations, in proportion to the percentage of votes they receive, and all members of the school community have voting power. This means to allocate funds teaches the basic value that every vote counts, which is reaffirmed in curriculum during election years and in every democratic decision making process in the school. From a fully integrated perspective, students learn the possibility of making a difference in the world and the importance of their individual and community voice.

TU BISHVAT PROGRAM

Modeled after the integrative method of Tamchui, Rodeph Sholom School has started this year a joint Science and Judaic Studies *Tu Bishvat* program. Students studied their carbon footprints along with the chemical properties of pollutants. They studied the environmental importance of trees, grounding this understanding in Jewish text. In a component of action, students engaged in a fundraising effort that both reduced each student's personal footprint and generated money for the congregation's own environmental efforts.

KABALAT SHABBAT

Kabalat Shabbat services at the Rodeph Sholom School are a strong example of integration sprinkled throughout the curriculum. The services take place in the middle of the day each Friday, gathering a community of grades together in a separate space from the rest of their learning. While the program is naturally based in Judaic content, all staff attends and participates, and aspects of secular learning are incorporated throughout the service. A clergy member from the synagogue reads a story each week during *Kabalat Shabbat* services, which connects the day school to synagogue and gives opportunity for integration of secular literature and Jewish studies.

Students are given a choice to wear *kippot* during prayer, modeling the values of personal autonomy and informed choice in the Reform movement. Fourth graders both choose the prayers and lead the service, applying what they have learned in their year curriculum on tefillah and leadership. The honor of lighting candles and blessing the wine and *challah* are given to those celebrating their Hebrew birthdays, uniting Western tradition and Jewish practice. The liturgy is integrated with music, both in song as well as with a piano player and instruments handed out to the students.

Each week, three fifth grade students prepare and give *divrei torah* to the school community. This project gives students the opportunity to integrate what they have learned about writing and speech in their English classes with their study of Torah and interpretation. Each *d'var torah* has some aspect of Torah exegesis and interpretation followed by personal application in a modern context.

The service is dedicated each week by the service leader to a group or individual of inspiration to students. Students are briefly told about the recipient of the dedication and their contribution to the world. For example, during the week of Veteran's Day, the service was dedicated to all the soldiers in Vietnam, emphasizing the equal importance and necessary respect for those who gave their lives during the war and for those who survived and live among us today.

MIDRASH HOUR

Midrash Hour is a combined theatrical performance of the day school and the religious school of Rodeph Sholom, exemplifying authenticity of integration of the arts and other general disciplines with Judaic Studies. In the Curriculum Guide, we learn that "students play an active role in songs composed for the Midrash Hour as a part of the

integrated curriculum with Jewish Studies". Throughout the day school curriculum, students learn about the theme of Midrash Hour, which this year was '*mitzvot*', and then each grade helps to create music, dancing, costumes, and props as a part of the performance. Student choirs from both the day and religious schools learn the created music and students, teachers and clergy members participate in the performance itself. Hebrew language is incorporated into song writing sessions, which uses English poetry writing skills and Judaic content to create songs relevant to the theme.

SHALOM AMIGO

Shalom Amigo is a 7th grade middle school experience, a year long exchange program with a Jewish Day School in Mexico City. The program began as a correspondence program in Spanish class, which helps students learn about the rich culture and Jewish community in Mexico. This pen pal exchange created significant connection between these Mexican and American Jewish students, and a one week exchange program with Mexican friends was established to augment integrated learning about Spanish, the country of Mexico and Mexican Jewish communities. Students had the opportunity to spend time in the homes and synagogues of their Mexican peers. They spoke Spanish, English and Hebrew together, showing the connective power of language. Upon return, students were given the opportunity to process their experience through writing and presentations, in various classes and in various languages.

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT DAY

Faculty Development Day highlights the importance of modeling curriculum integration for educators so as to create a culture of integration throughout the school. This year, the day focused on the usefulness of incorporating research and educational

theory from secular education as a means to inform Jewish education. It discussed the role of questioning in Judaism and the importance of text study, linked with Bloom's taxonomy across the board. By addressing this pedagogical concept, which may not have been conceptualized by teachers otherwise, the school models this value of explicit curricular integration for the development of integrated identity and practice amongst learners.

UPPER ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL FIELDTRIP CURRICULUM

The middle school curriculum is supplemented by a series of trips each year, each with some aspect of general and Judaic learning woven into one trip. The trips are thoughtfully chosen as developmentally appropriate for each grade, both in depth of content and the number of nights students spend away from home. The fourth grade trip to Teva, a Jewish nature study camp, integrates Jewish studies with science and leadership. In the Curriculum Guide, the fourth grade trip to Teva is described by Paul Druzinsky, as an experience "where students explore the science world through the lens of Jewish eyes". The trip coincides with *Sukkot* and allows for a hands-on exploration of the natural world through study and discussion of Jewish texts.

In sixth grade, students go to Washington D.C. In the school newspaper, the 'Rodeph Sholom Reporter', a middle school History teacher noted that "this trip gives the students a chance to make real connections between what they are seeing and what is happening in their lives and in the world". There is integration of secular and Jewish activities, experiences and learning. Students go to the Vietnam War Memorial and to the Holocaust Museum, and curriculum is developed to juxtapose the two world experiences and create connection to both American and Jewish history. Upon visiting

the museum, Holocaust studies are also juxtaposed to contemporary world issues of genocide and responsibility of action as Jews and human beings.

In the seventh grade, students study the American South and the civil rights movement which is learned side by side with historical movements for Jewish civil rights throughout the world. They travel to Atlanta, Georgia, visiting the Southern Poverty Law Center and speak with civil rights activists, contemporaries of Martin Luther King and Abraham Joshua Heschel.

This series of trips culminates in the eighth grade trip to Israel, which students anticipate from their earliest days at Rodeph Sholom. A whole year integrated process of preparation precedes this trip, as both general and Judaic teachers write and implement curriculum to prepare students for the educational, emotional, and spiritual experience of visiting the state and homeland of Israel.

Outside of these macro-examples of integration at Rodeph Sholom, one may find integration throughout individual grade curriculum and culture. A plethora of integrative examples emerged when observing the fourth grade classroom of Tammie Anagnostis, general studies teacher and Tamchui Coordinator. Because Tammie splits general studies subjects with her co-teacher according to their personal abilities and scheduling, they are in constant communication about curriculum. Dedicated to integrating general studies curriculum with the Judaic content that her students learn from their Jewish studies teacher, Tammie has made it a personal goal to consistently look for those connections.

The fourth grade classroom bulletin boards are covered with examples of integrated lessons and student work surrounded by both Hebrew and English instruction. Student work from an English unit on memoirs displays sample writings about Israel and

Jewish holidays. While the general studies library is filled with English books, many of them have Judaic content. The job chart and day schedule are written in Hebrew and English, and a number of reference charts for the use of Hebrew during all times of the day are displayed clearly at the front of the room. A community contract of behavior, called the '*kavod* contract', is also exhibited throughout the course of the year, with class-constructed secular and Jewish values to govern classroom behavior. As Tammie noted "Integration will look different in each classroom. Many grades at Rodeph Sholom are moving towards an integrative method, where general studies teachers are working more closely with Judaic Studies teachers in order to better integrate." Tammie's fourth grade classroom shows the positive effect of individual teacher commitment to the curricular method to integration. "While the subjects are separated" she said, "there can be teacher collaboration in curriculum building. It has to be personally driven."

Charlie Sherman, the Judaic studies teacher for this fourth grade class, is also committed to the integrative ideal. He imparts Jewish values in every aspect of classroom life. Before beginning a quiz competition in culmination of a month of learning, he told his students "*kavod* for one another is more important than whether or not you get the answers right". By presenting universal morals and values from a Jewish lens in the context of the classroom, Charlie helps students learn to approach every aspect of life from their identity as a Jew. "It is the most important mitzvah of the Torah", he said, "to treat your neighbor as you would want to be treated."

Even outside of its written curriculum, the integrative ideal can be seen throughout the culture of Rodeph Sholom. In the narrow, white hallways outside of the fourth grade classroom, posters with the slogan 'Jews come in all colors' are displayed

with historical facts about different Jewish ethnic groups around the world. An advertisement for a fully-subsidized Israel trip for Jewish educators at day schools is displayed in the teachers' room. You do not have to be a Judaic studies teacher, nor a Jew, to go on this trip, demonstrating the school's dedication to helping all teachers to become integrated selves. Even lunchtime becomes an integrative experience at Rodeph Sholom, where the salad bar and buffet is filled with international as well as traditional Jewish and Israeli food choices for staff and students. Students discuss the value of food in the world in an open forum before the community recitation of *birkat ha'mazon* after the meal. Each of these implicit complements to the written integrative curriculum of the school aids in transmission of the message of the curriculum method to its students, staff and school community.

Obstacles

Obstacles and challenges that arise in the curriculum method to integration are multi-faceted, generally as well as specific to the Rodeph Sholom School. Even when a plethora of brilliant individual examples of curricular integration can be found in a school, because of various structural and logistical issues, it is extremely difficult to employ this method consistently throughout the school. For any Jewish day school, regardless of its structure, the breadth of general studies curriculum requirements can make ideals of this method difficult to bring to fruition. Many schools find it easier to integrate curriculum in earlier elementary grades, as there are less quantifiable requirements, and then struggle to continue curricular integration in the older grades.

Specific to Rodeph Sholom, but also applicable to many liberal day schools around the country, are number of challenges. The general structure of the school can

make the curriculum method to integration difficult to implement across the board. As concurred in much of the research literature, because the staff is structured as two separate entities, general and Judaic, most of the staff does not have knowledge and training in both subject areas, logistics of scheduling brings lacking awareness of the curriculum taught by the other teacher, and there is often not enough scheduling time for teachers to join together in creating integrated curriculum.

The attitude of teachers and their level of commitment to the integrative ideal, while idyllically in line with the school, may also be an obstacle to the curriculum method to integration. Particularly in general studies, where it is possible to see integration as taking away from general studies rather than enriching its curriculum, individual staff can be a detriment to the model if not on board with the value of the model. After identifying how the school envisions integration, it is important to consider how the teachers' and administrators' personal understanding fits into that ideal. These logistics must be considered, because even if every teacher values the integrative method, their awareness of the school's conception and method of integration will significantly affect the logistical probability of consistent implementation of this method of integration in their classrooms.

In any school, the teachers' understanding of the integrative method will significantly affect the school's culture and practice. If individual teachers are not aware of the vision of the school, their practice may not be guided by the school's vision, significantly deterring from the success of the philosophy. For example, when asked a self-definition of integration, Rodeph Sholom's fourth grade teachers answered with a range of different conceptions. Tammie, fourth grade general studies teacher, said that

integration must be "a natural flow of secular and Judaic studies, an organic way for each to come out, so that kids don't see things as separately Jewish and non-Jewish". She focused on integration as a mindset, not a curriculum style, describing a structure of school that must be set in order for integration to succeed. When asked from where this structure must come, she said: "It needs to come from the teachers, in the classroom, creating an integrated mindset for its students". While her conception of integration was knowledgeable and from a place of personal experience and practice, it was notably not within the school's stated conception of practice. Samantha, another fourth grade general studies teacher, noted that "integration must be guided by each teacher's knowledge and background in the other". Charlie, Judaic studies teacher for the same set of students, claimed that the key to authentic integration is in the development of integrated curriculum from both general and Judaic subjects, a concept in line with the school's curriculum method to integration. Contrary to Tammie's grassroots approach, Charlie said: "Integration needs to come top-down. It must be sold to the top-administrator of the school. In fact, it won't happen if that person refuses to put a stamp on it". Charlie has made it one of his professional goals this year to sit in on general studies staff meetings, in order to create opportunities to integrate curriculum with his colleagues, a goal supported by administration. Just like any other vision of the school, it is important that educators have a clear conception of the school's understanding of integration, so that this vision may be incorporated into their own practice. While diverse means of implementing integration throughout the school may be positive, divergent conceptions of the method to integration amongst partner teachers and the school philosophy represents a significant obstacle to its implementation on a grand scale.

Another struggle for the Rodeph Sholom School is one faced by many New York City schools. There is just not enough space for the school to function as one entity. The school is housed in two almost entirely separate buildings, with different divisions and offices for general and Judaic studies, making it very difficult to create collaborative effort and communication to integrate curriculum. Likewise, the school has seen significant staff turnover over the past few years, especially its administration. Because of all of this change, a number of administrators and teachers noted difficulty in expressing the vision of Jewish education that the school embodies. A previous divide in the faculty, with teachers reporting to different people in different departments, made tremendous difficulty in bringing staff members together. The division in faculty was seen as far as the staff lunch tables, where faculty eats lunch with their own department, even speaking different languages at each table. Noting its detriment to the school culture and practice, Laurie Piette, Director of Studies, has worked to change this model during this school year, making significant efforts to bring general and Judaic staff together to create integrative curriculum and general collaborative effort and relationship. Now, division heads supervise staff in their division, and there is a single, integration supportive headmaster. She noted that in order for unified staffing in a bifurcated structure to succeed, faculty would need to continue to be developed over the coming years to create significant change to the culture of the staff community.

The milieu of a school can also be an obstacle to the integrative method. At Rodeph Sholom, many parents voice their concerns that there is 'too much Judaism', and feel like the general studies curriculum will be threatened by the integration of Judaic studies throughout the day. Samantha Platt, another fourth grade general studies teacher,

noted: "On curriculum night, I had all these notes to talk about integration: *derech eretz*, my students as *mentsches*, etc, and all parents wanted to know was about the math curriculum. They want general studies to be primary." As in any concern of the school, everybody is looking at curriculum under a microscope, all with different agendas, and it is difficult to gain support from every subgroup of the school community.

Perceived authenticity of integrated curriculum by students seemed to be the greatest obstacle noted by teachers when asked about the actual implementation of this method. During interviews, a number of teachers noted particular challenges in the approach to integrating curriculum and implementing that curriculum in the classroom. "It's hard to integrate the curriculum without feeling like I'm throwing on the Jewish tag line to something secular" noted one teacher, while another said that she felt like she was "throwing in blurbs, rather than having it all fit together naturally". Many noted that integration seemed most authentic when the children came up with it, and the teacher then took it to a higher level. Beyond logistics of scheduling, staff and school structure, the greatest challenge to the curriculum method of integration is just this idea: how to present integrated curriculum to students in a way that they will internalize as authentic and natural, and conceivable to replicate in their own lives and in any context.

Chapter 7: The Solomon Schechter School of Manhattan

The School

The Solomon Schechter School of Manhattan was founded in 1994 as an initiative of the United Synagogue of Conservative Judaism and rabbis from nine Conservative synagogues in New York City. Subsequently, a group of parents and lay community leaders came together to develop the school's mission. The school opened in the fall of 1996. Its academic program was envisioned and structured under the leadership of Dr. Steven Lorch, who continues as Head of School to this day. The school has continuously grown, adding classes each year, and graduated their first eighth grade class in 2006. As a Solomon Schechter day school, kindergarten through eighth grade is housed in two Conservative synagogues, the Park Ave Synagogue and the Society for the Advancement of Judaism, but they are not officially affiliated with these synagogue communities.

The school's mission is included in its View book, which is given to current and prospective families. It reads as follows:

Our mission is to cultivate textpeople. A textperson is someone who finds meaning in the world through confident, active and skilled learning. We value understanding-scientific discovery, Torah, the arts, worldly experience, and knowledge of every kind-both for its own sake, lishmah, and because it grounds our search for significance in the rigorous pursuit of truth. At the same time, the textperson is a mensch, a full person, whose learning and knowledge are grounded in moral sensitivity.

We believe as Jews that the act of study is itself of moral significance. To cultivate textpeople, we educate in this spirit, promoting intimate, child-centered learning

that is also profoundly respectful of the subject matter. As individuals and as a community, we strive to model this link between learning and menschlichkeit in our classrooms, in our financial aid policy, and in all interactions among our students, teachers, parents and friends.

On the school website and in various other school materials, Solomon Schechter of Manhattan states a number of values and visions for the school that come out of this mission statement. The school states its commitment to deep engagement in learning, *menschlichkeit*, team teaching and integrated, theme-based curriculum. "We believe that all learning should help develop three key spiritual traits: joy, self-reflection, and moral and religious sensitivity...An integrated Jewish curriculum is especially well suited to cultivating individuals who aspire to spiritual meaning, and who have the skills to find that meaning in Jewish tradition" (View Book, 13). The vision includes the creation of a school culture and structure that cultivates the children's love of learning and their ability to life fully as Jews and as Americans. With bilingual team teachers who teach all subject areas, the school values integrated learning and teachers that model this integrated vision.

Solomon Schechter of Manhattan states its most fundamental task of schooling as helping children 'learn to use their minds well'. There is an explicit belief that every subject studied in the school is given serious attention and respect by its staff, so as to be modeled by its students. In the school View Book, Dr. Lorch emphasizes this commitment: "Cultivating learners through [exploration, discovery, and expression] means addressing the child's mind and hands, soul and heart. Just as these are integrated in every person, we integrate them in the child's experience of learning in an atmosphere

of warmth and mutual respect. As a result, our children become powerful and resourceful learners, knowledgeable and committed Jews, and kinds and caring members of their communities." At Solomon Schechter, educating the whole child through a unified holistic structure of education is seen as a means to integrated identity development.

The value of *menschlichkeit*, defined in the View Book as the complex culture of wholesome and caring social values, is central to the envisioned culture of Solomon Schechter of Manhattan. It is the moral tone set in the classroom, an imbedded Jewish life representing humans as being created in the image of God. This value manifests itself in the school through the giving *tzedakah* during *Kabalat Shabbat* services, a Common Cents Penny Harvest paired with text study about *tzedakah* each year, visits to community institutions such as community gardens, hospitals, and food pantries and various expressions of the school's love for the state of Israel. The school models this behavior through its admissions process, which was created as a blind and confidential system of sliding-scale tuition in order to respect every family. This dedication to modeling Jewish values in every aspect of the school is explicitly noted in the View Book: "Children learn *menschlichkeit* and love of Jewish values when their school models those same qualities. By doing so on every institutional level, we are building a precious resource for the entire Jewish community-one child, one teacher, one family at a time."

In an article in the January-February 2008 edition of the school newspaper, 'Daf Kesher', Dr. Lorch expressed how like in the financial aid process of the school, this value of *menschlichkeit* must permeate every aspect of school life at Solomon Schechter: "The *menschlichkeit* into which we socialize students is straightforward: show kindness

instead of indifference, do something instead of waiting for someone else, let go of small resentments before they grow big, and feel good as a result...One test of a school community's moral fiber is the consistency with which it cultivates goodness in its students. Another is its ability not to lose its moral bearings as the terrain becomes trickier. We hope that our financial aid process is living up to our high standards of moral sensitivity."

The Solomon Schechter school of Manhattan strives to use this same value of *menschlichkeit* in their staff hiring process. They are dedicated to hiring all Jewish classroom teachers in the elementary school. Every teacher must speak Hebrew fluently and be able to act as a model of Conservative Jewish ideology and practice. Every elementary teacher must be able to teach all subjects in their respective grade, as general and Judaic studies are taught together in one classroom by the same teachers. Team-teachers divide curriculum by their personal abilities, rather than any obligatory structure. Hebrew language is leveled by ability rather than grade, so students have the opportunity to learn with other students and teachers, but every teacher in the school teaches a Hebrew class. The middle school model has greater separation between general and Judaic subjects, departmentalized between three core curricula: Judaic, Sciences, and Humanities, in order to prepare students for high school. To augment its natural ability to integrate in a more bifurcated middle school model, staff meets twice a week to build curriculum and community.

The Structural Method to Integration

In the structural method to integration, authentic integration originates from and is grounded in specific choices in school structure rather than in written curriculum. By this

philosophy, if a school begins by creating an integrated structure, curriculum and culture may follow. By hiring teachers with content and pedagogical knowledge in both general and Judaic subject areas, the structure may support seamless learning in one classroom for its students. Student and teacher schedules, staff meetings, and department communication are all crucial to the creation of opportunity for organic integration in the structural method.

Unlike in the curriculum method, which is driven by individual implementations of curriculum, integration in the structural method must not be focused on individual examples, but the establishment of a school culture and way of life. Ongoing opportunities for various approaches to integration are created by specific infrastructures, hiring and scheduling within the school. The development of written integrated curriculum is not necessarily an essential component of this approach. Like in the case of Solomon Schechter of Manhattan, a school fully dedicated to this method as a technique of integrated identity development, it is possible to focus exclusively on school structure and culture rather than planned integrated curriculum in its implementation. Solomon Schechter strives towards its vision of integration by maintaining team-taught unified classrooms, thoughtful scheduling, and programmed communication between departments and educators which models and is conducive to the integrative process. The school's View Book explains the effect of school structure on student identity development: "Integrated teaching helps our students to develop into well-rounded people. In each elementary class two full-time, fully-qualified bilingual co-teachers work together across all areas of the curriculum, English and Hebrew, math and Torah." A fourth grade teacher noted: "We understand that as educators of all subject areas,

religious and secular, we must elevate with sparks of sanctity everything in the world, helping students find meaning in every aspect of their learning." Though integration may not be planned specifically within a school's written curricula, through specific school structure designed to augment spontaneous integration, it may happen organically and consistently within the construct of daily learning.

It is important to note that though its application has evolved tremendously over time, previous research and practice has been almost exclusively in the curricular method to integration, and the concept of structure as the focal driving force of integration in the day school rarely considered. In the research literature, structure of school is addressed from its role as a possible obstacle or supplement to curriculum, rather than the possibility that structure could serve as original integrative piece.

Solomon Schechter of Manhattan is not the first school to focus on structure as a means to integration. The school is revolutionary as a model of the structural method to integration, though, because it does not simply employ an integrated structure as *one* means to integration, but is organized around the belief that structure, not curriculum, must be the core of integrative efforts. Because of this focus, the school administration does not encourage integrated curriculum development and explicit training for its teachers in the integrative method in order to keep integration natural and spontaneous, transpired by nature of various structures in place in the school. Ironically, as previously mentioned, the school literature and some classroom practice are considerably influenced by the mainstream curriculum method to integration, even though the school is not structured according to this model. Unlike the curriculum model, the structural model to integration is inherently conducive to include aspects of the curriculum model as well.

By its definition, the structural method to integration envisions an essential focus on integrated structure rather than curriculum in order to create authentic integrative opportunities and experiences. Unlike the curriculum method to integration, the structural method challenges the conception that integrated curriculum can be successful without an integrated structure. It also challenges the notion that the integrative ideal and method must be communicated explicitly to students in order for it to succeed. On the contrary, Head of School, Dr. Lorch, declares with conviction: "Label it, and you cheapen it."

Ironically, the development of this structural model at Solomon Schechter of Manhattan did not originate from any vision of integration. Lorch, when hired as Head of School before the school opened, developed this structural model to create a full-Hebrew immersion day school (which never, in fact, happened). It was only after the model was in place, without language immersion implemented, that Lorch conceptualized its potential for integration. Though it was not at the forefront of his mind when creating this model, the concept of integrating secular and religious life is not new to Schechter's head of school. In 1977, Lorch wrote his doctoral dissertation on the convergence of Jewish and Western culture, and has significantly developed his understanding of integration in Jewish day schools since that study.

In order to understand the process towards structural integration in the school, it is important to also understand Lorch's particular methodology and vision of integration in the school. According to Lorch, the primary ground of integration is an orientation towards inquiry, inquisitiveness, reflectiveness, and flexibility of thinking. In his words, in the integrative model, the skills that students or teachers bring to subject matter

become applicable in any context. He considers establishing consistent habits of mind as crucial to the integrative process. For example, *Tanach* must be questioned in the same way as a Shakespeare play or the Declaration of Independence, so as to appreciate the beauty and complexity of each aspect of study. Along with the integration of habits of mind, skill integration and subject matter integration provide the other pieces to this method. By this conception of skill integration, the same procedural set that one would use to look at a piece of literature is what is used for a biblical story. Likewise, the same standards of writing, planning, composing, peer editing, and revising, may be applied to any subject area and in any language. A guiding factor to his decision to integrate structurally rather than through curriculum is his conception that subject matter integration is the least important to the process of integration. It is the factor that must be least planned, as to the extent that it is planned, it loses its freshness to the students and the power of its enduring understanding. "The key to subject matter integration is the 'aha' moment, which is not really a moment, but the point and the process. The discovery is hard to replicate if the teacher knows exactly where it is going. Instead, the learning ends up contrived and inauthentic." Lorch does not advocate written integrated curriculum because of this conundrum of authenticity: "There's a reason that integration is so hard. It's not because people are bad educators! As I have come to understand the problem, the nature of the powerful integration experience involves emotional elements and cognitive jumps that are difficult for teachers to make happen for kids unless it is something also just happening for the teachers."

Upon the school's opening year, by the time Lorch realized that he couldn't recruit enough parents to send their children to an immersion school, he had already hired

teachers under this structure of school. While immersion never happened, the structure remained as envisioned. It did not take long before Lorch recognized a plethora of advantages to the co-taught, unified structural method. Secular and Judaic integration became an integral part of the school and a developed vision of excellence for Lorch as Head of School. He consciously continued this structure of school each year with a conceptual focus on what he calls the 'one-world model', or the unity of all aspects of school life. Rather than the two worlds of learning left side by side and leaving the student to do the integration, the one-world institution has exemplars throughout the system that guide the learner toward the development of integrated identity. He believes that this structure of school gives opportunity to children to observe teachers interacting with each other as models of *menchlikite* and *g'milut hasadim*. Teaching becomes a public and social event, and students notice the way that the two teachers can enrich one another in planning and reflection.

In this construct, Lorch believes that educators do not have to make effort for integration to happen, as every teacher is naturally an exemplar of an integrated person. His educators are conversant with Jewish and Western subject matter, they care about both, and they are able to find and talk about the points of contact between the two worlds. Integration is structurally built in so that it is not possible to slip through the cracks. The conversation is never forced to happen, but all teachers have that frame and filter by which to structure their teaching. By his understanding, if integration is built into the curriculum, we are taking away the power of the message. "The one-world structural model of integration that we have is as good of a model as I have found. It is the fertile ground out of which spontaneous integration will occur. Teachers are not just

living within their own discipline, so the likelihood of cross-fertilization is higher and the possibility of it being fresh is also greater."

Obstacles

Though different from the curriculum method, obstacles and challenges that arise in the structural method to integration are also multi-faceted, generally as well as specific to the Solomon Schechter School of Manhattan. For any Jewish day school with an integrated school structure, the major obstacle to its success will be that while the structure of school may allow the *opportunity* for spontaneous and planned integration to happen, if these connections do not actually happen consistently, the message will be lost. Even if weekly meetings are set for teachers to collaborate on curriculum, if they do not frame those meetings and their classroom experiences with integration in mind, the structural method has not succeeded. Despite its structure, if teachers are not trained to recognize and develop spontaneous integrative teaching moments, and are not dedicated to its ideal, integration cannot be supported in the classroom. In the long run, if students do not internalize this unified structure of school as a lifestyle choice, the method has not succeeded. Even if integrative curriculum is purposefully not written, significant amount of ongoing work and preparation would be involved to actually create integrative experiences within the structure of school.

From the perspective of Steven Lorch, Head of School at Solomon Schechter, integration is a value of the school, and the structure of school supports this value, but this vision must not be expressed to its students upon implementation or its message loses its power. At this point, Solomon Schechter of Manhattan has made the philosophic decision not to explicitly express the crossover between subjects to its students. It hopes

to transmit their message about integrated identity development through this implicit structure of the school and consequent spontaneous, authentic integration that happens in the classroom. While this method may be philosophically sound at Solomon Schechter, if a school with this structure were to decide to integrate curriculum, though the structure and culture is already set for its success, it would take a tremendous amount of thought and preparation for teachers and administrators to develop this model. As Gary Pretsfelder, Head of the Upper Elementary Division, stated: "Most of our teachers think that way anyway, it would be a matter of consistently sitting down to do it, to rethink the flow of the day and weave subjects in the curriculum".

Like in the curriculum method, failing to communicate the school's vision of integration to teachers and administrators may be a significant obstacle to the success of the structural method to integration. Similar to the example of Rodeph Sholom, where teachers educating the same group of students noted entirely different self-conceptions of integration, at Solomon Schechter of Manhattan, there seems to be a gap between administration and teachers in their notions of integrative practice. Pretsfelder corroborated with his colleague, Steven Lorch, in his basic definition of integration. "Integration is the teaching of two different subject areas in ways that deliberately find and make connection/relationship such that a student's learning of one subject is complimented by the other and vice versa." Like Lorch, he asserted that Solomon Schechter does not necessarily focus on interdisciplinary study of general and Judaic, but integration instead happens more in the 'culture and seams of the day'. "I like to think of it as integrated culture. The values of Judaism flows throughout all of what we do and say." He noted that by virtue of having teachers who do everything, there is opportunity

for more quick cross-references than planned units, more skills and themes, which makes the integration subtle and intangible, yet very real. "There is a level of subtle nuanced integration happening throughout the school, all the time."

The teachers of Solomon Schechter noted a slightly different understanding of what integration is happening within the school and how it comes about. One fourth grade teacher called integration 'the black belt of education', a practice most difficult for teachers to master and most important to gain. After difficulty giving a self-definition, she said: "There needs to be a more distinct vision from the school. Integration must be curriculum based, but it is not always possible. The subjects at Solomon Schechter are seen as fundamentally separate and not equal, as secular studies is held in higher regard, and that's not conducive to integration." If every teacher was instead fully aware of the school's approach to integration, instead of acting as an obstacle, teachers may be able to utilize this vision's ideal structure of school and their dual role as general and Judaic teacher to materialize ongoing integrative experiences in the classroom.

This teacher considered this method to integration as something actively valued in her classroom, but difficult to implement on a regular basis, as it is not built into the curriculum itself. She noted easier connections made between Judaism and the arts than with other secular subjects, and has made significant effort to write her own integrated curriculum in these realms. "Solomon Schechter does not value the integrative process in its practice. The structure, yes, but practice, no. I don't know, maybe they would say yes, but I have never been told that." Even if aspects of integration still occur naturally, it is a great obstacle for teachers to be entirely unaware of the supreme value the administration places on integration and the development of integrated identity amongst

students. Communication between administration and staff is imperative to this process and the overall success of the structural method to integration.

During interviews, a number of teachers noted particular challenges in actual implementation of integrative experiences in the classroom. "Free time, what's that?" exclaimed one fourth grade teacher. She meets with her partner teacher on Tuesdays after work, as there is not official time written into their schedule to meet and they don't find the time during their busy day. "It is a part of the school culture to do collaborative work; it's just that it's assumed that you will do it on your own." She acknowledged that lacking time to collaborate with other teachers has been a significant obstacle to integration in her classroom. In order to prepare for integrative opportunities, set times for collaborative curriculum building and communication of classroom happenings are of tremendous help.

Teachers also noted various implicit messages sent to students that are unconstructive to the structural method to integration. For example, at the present time, at Solomon Schechter of Manhattan, there is an unequal amount of time in the schedule given to secular and religious subjects, which may implicitly express to its students an inherent inequality between subjects. While students learn each subject in the same classroom and with the same teachers, the classes are still separated on the schedule and taught as independent curriculum. While the school expresses its dedication to full-immersion Hebrew learning and the use of Hebrew throughout the day, in practice, it is difficult to maintain that ideal. Hebrew is spoken during Hebrew class and scattered into other Judaic studies classes, but is rarely heard in secular classes. Another fourth grade teacher expressed that "Hebrew language is an ideal integrative piece in the classroom;

students should see that we can speak Hebrew at any time. For integration to work, Hebrew needs to be in the classroom at least half the time, but it's just a reality, it's really not consistently there. The only time we speak significant amounts of Hebrew is when I teach Hebrew. It works then because my class is smaller and they are all at the same level. In all the other classes, there are always a couple of students who don't understand, so you naturally fall back into English."

Like in the curriculum method, the attitude of teachers and their level of commitment to the integrative ideal can also be an obstacle to the structural method to integration. If teachers think of secular and Judaic subjects as independent rather than interdependent, integrative opportunities will be lost within the structure. Hiring educators with a philosophy of integration that coincides with the school philosophy will greatly augment the integrative experiences of its students. Likewise, teachers and administrators must model this style of thinking and living. As noted in the research literature, a logistical obstacle to the structural method to integration is a shortage of educators with great enough mastery of subject areas to lead authentic connection making between secular and religious subject areas for their students.

Like the Rodeph Sholom School, Solomon Schechter of Manhattan must also consider the logistics of New York City space. The school also does not function as one entity. The lower elementary school is housed in an entirely separate building from the rest of the school, with different divisions and offices for general and Judaic studies. Educators and administrators must put forth an intensive amount of work to create collaborative effort and communication between the school divisions.

Like in any value or practice taught in school, another obstacle to the structural method to integration is that this model is not often replicated in the students' homes. A fourth grade teacher noted that "the kids that have the strongest positive identity are those that see it paralleled at home." Especially because the value of the integrative method is not explicitly expressed in the school, nor is the disparity between school and home life addressed, students can feel a sense of confusion about these conflicting messages. Conversely, students who experience the same structure of integrated American and Jewish identity in their home have a greater ability to internalize this method as authentic and plausible.

While in a school like Solomon Schechter of Manhattan there are not significant philosophical obstacles, the greatest challenge to the structural method of integration is the groundwork that must come after its conception: the school must devise a plan of how to bring its integrated structure of school into conversation with the learning. Once this occurs, integration may actually happen, consistently, with depth, and with constructive affect on the ongoing identity development of its students.

Chapter 8: Conclusions

Implications

"The day school must develop within its students the ability to relate all the various aspects of these educational and general life experiences within an overall philosophy of life...to participate within a rich and authentic Jewish-American civilization, in which each cultural heritage enhances the appreciation of the other...to convey to its students a knowledge of Judaism which recognizes that Jewish values and personalities have helped shape mores and customs throughout time, and can continue to guide Jews as they interact with modern society and culture (Zeldin, 1998, 583)." The research literature shows that day schools must be structured as a microcosm of the ideal larger Jewish community, so that the school structure, the curriculum chosen and the way each is embodied can act as powerful conceptual modeling that will be absorbed by its students and implemented throughout their lives (Lukinsky, 4). Rodeph Sholom School and Solomon Schechter of Manhattan are two institutions with an entirely different embodiment of the integrative method and practice. In my research, I have considered what implications about the ideal model of integration for the liberal American Jewish day school may be gained from each institution. There are abundant values as well as obstacles to both methods, and that each would benefit from the systematic implementation of the other. The ideal conception of integration in the American Jewish day school is a conscious balance of both the structural *and* curriculum method to integration.

Why do day schools struggle to transmit to students a sense of dual identity through the integrative method? The answer lies mostly in the lacking concern and

consciousness for the dual importance of curriculum *and* school structure when implementing integration. Research has focused on what types of curricular integration successfully transmit a sense of integrated identity to its students and how structure may compliment those curricular ideals. For the most part, it has not considered the importance of systematic development of an integrated program with the original intention to implement *both* methods. In this dual model, each would supplement the other, significantly lessening the obstacles confronted overall. It is most important to gain from this study the realization that in order for each day school committed to the integrated ideal to execute integration successfully, a new vision for structural and curricular integration must be created systematically and implemented authentically and thoroughly.

I once overheard a day school parent retell a story about an early education student, in the hallways of the school, stating the following: 'I am not a Jew. I only study Hebrew. I speak English.' The parent thought it was hysterical, and I found it to be the underlying failure of Jewish day schools in the integrative method of learning. While, to be clear, this certainly did not speak as critique to the overall practice of the school, as it was a passing and underdeveloped statement of a toddler, it is certainly indicative of a larger enduring issue in the implicit learning from school structure and curriculum. This child understood that Hebrew (a conceivable metaphor for 'Jewishness') was only a part of his life at certain times of the day. He had internalized his experience studying Judaism and living as an American; in his terms, he 'spoke' American, not Jewish, and in our terms, his dual identity was already separated. If we use just one of the structural or curriculum methods to establish the integrative approach to Jewish education, and ignore

the individual needs of each school, the holistic nature of the approach will not be transmitted to our students. We must teach integration as a way of life with a school structure that models that way. Likewise, if curriculum is conversant with disciplines of both secular and religious content, our students may internalize their developing Jewish identity in conversation with each aspect of life.

Integration of secular and religious life as a means to dual identity development is a complex endeavor and it will always have obstacles, but through this study, the strong need for reconceptualization is clear. By this dual method, the curriculum and structure of the American Jewish day school must reflect the possibility of integrated identity for its students and nurture its development. Ultimately, all learning may be internalized, not purely as peripheral studied knowledge, but with deep connection to the life, practice and identity of each child.

Applications

Zeldin's application of Bolman and Deal's four organizational frameworks as a means to facilitate integration may now contextualize various components that must exist in the vision and application of a successful model of integration. These frameworks include the importance of applying both the structural and curriculum method to integration in this vision, but also encompass additional important factors for consideration. The structural framework, which embodies how the school day is organized and how teaching responsibilities are assigned to each educator, speaks to the central need for the structural method to integration. The curriculum method to integration is encouraged at its core by the symbolic framework, which considers how this connection to integrated identity may be put into systematic practice within the

school. The two other frames are also important to consider when building a new vision for integration. The human resources and political frameworks recognize interest groups in each individual school and their personal and communal needs, all crucial components to the successful development of the dual method to integration.

In application, because of the individual needs and capabilities of teachers and families as well as logistics of particular communities, there is no real possibility for a normative curriculum and structure for all day schools. "We can suggest outlines for the structures and content of the day school program. We can urge the employment of full-time teachers who personify the integrated ideal of the school, and demand that Hebrew teachers' colleges begin programs for their education. We can list those facts, concepts, skills and dispositions which can be integrated and correlated throughout the school and suggest procedures for teacher in-service training. We can recommend structures which will help avoid the creation of artificially dichotomized educational experiences. But in the end, the process of curriculum planning and implementation must take place in each school and classroom." (Margolis/Schoenberg, 5-6) As this short case study and thesis suggests, in the context of research and personal practice of integration in the American Jewish day school, it is possible to develop and suggest imperatives for curriculum and school structure. Ultimately though, these constructions must speak to the needs and logistics of each individual community. Application of such research developments can only be utilized in order to create a program that transmits an authentic message of integration of secular and religious life, while personalizing its application and embodiment to the needs of all constituents of the institution.

Further Research

Systematic changes toward the integration of both curriculum and structure must be made by leaders of liberal day schools in America in order for integration to succeed as a strategy in identity development. The greatest questions that remain unanswered from this research project are about the pragmatics of implementing this dual model in schools that have already been established and the long term affect of this integration on day school students once implemented. Further research on day schools that take on this systematic change may help further our understanding of how integration can be best implemented. In order to determine the enduring effect of the integrative method on the developing Jewish identity of students, long term analytical research must be conducted on alumni of day schools that embrace integration.

A number of large-scale theoretical and logistical questions arise to be considered in future research as this short study comes to a close:

1. Would students internalize a long term understanding of integrated identity through their experiences in a fully integrated school?
2. Should the idea of integration be made explicit to students or would this take away from the perceived authenticity of the integration?
3. In an integrative program, should distinctions explicitly be made between Jewish and secular content? If there is no distinction made, would students cognitively file what they have learned about Judaism in the same category as secular ideas and ultimately lose touch with their Jewish identities?
4. Is it possible to create a strong model of integration for older students that have a more mandated Judaic and general curriculum?

5. Are there enough qualified teachers to teach a fully integrated curriculum? How might we train teachers in this method?
6. Does the integrative method work as a learning style for all students? Is it possible to incorporate all kinds of integration as well as bifurcated material into the classroom as a tool of differentiated learning?

Rather than separating their identities or assimilating into secular society without any Jewish identity at all, integrated education has the potential to guide our students to actively participate in American secular life as Jews. In the long run, if educators can prepare our youth to face the greater world as dedicated Jews, we can look forward to a rich future in Jewish life and continuity with dedicated Jewish leaders for the next generation.

Through this project, it has become clear that helping our children realize that they can continue to be Jews *while* they identify with secular life is our greatest challenge as Jewish educators, and it should be our greatest ambition. The enduring understanding that is communicated by an integrated curriculum and school structure is the most important learning that students may gain from their early Jewish education. Through this dual method, we may develop our students' awareness of communal and world responsibility, religious observance and celebrations, and a strong set of values to take with them as they walk out of the doors of their respective institutions of learning. If successfully done, our children will enter society with the ability to healthfully integrate their everyday lives. Stepping into the modern world can be a daunting endeavor for a young adult, and it is our challenge to develop in our students a strong sense of identity to guide them on their path.

APPENDIX

Appendix I: Guiding Interview Questions

Guiding Interview Questions: Head of School

-Tell me a bit about yourself and how you got to this school
-How would you define 'integrated curriculum'?
-Why is integrating the curriculum important to you? What is the value?
-What is needed to make integration happen in a school?
-How do you see 'integration' being implemented in your school curriculum?
-Where else does integration take place in the school? Is it intended?
-Can you give a few specific examples of integrated curriculum in your school?
-What are the obstacles in your community to creating a full-integrated curriculum and culture?
-Can you give a few examples of challenges that have come up to achieving integration in any aspect of the school?

Guiding Interview Questions: Teacher

-Tell me a bit about yourself and how you got to this school
-How would you define 'integrated curriculum'?
-Why is integrating the curriculum important to you? What is the value?
-What is needed to make integration happen in a school?
-How do you see 'integration' being implemented in your school curriculum?
-Where else does integration take place in the school? Is it intended?
-Can you give a few specific examples of integrated curriculum in your school?
-What are the obstacles in your community to creating a full-integrated curriculum and culture?
-Can you give a few examples of challenges that have come up to achieving integration in any aspect of the school?
-How do you integrate in your own classroom?
-What strategies must one utilize to create authentically integrated learning experiences?
-Do you work with your co-teacher to integrate curriculum?
-What helps you integrate in your classroom?
-What keeps you from doing it?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Eisen, A.M. (1998) Rethinking Modern Judaism: Ritual, Commandment, Community. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Elkin, J. (2000) *A Vision For Day School Excellence.* Sh'ma, 31 (575), 1-3

Holtz, B.W. (1980) *Towards an Integrated Curriculum for the Jewish School.* Religious Education, 75 (5), 546-557.

Ingall, C. (2006) Down The Up Staircase: Tales of Teaching in Jewish Day Schools. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary.

Lookstein, J.H. (1978) *True Integration.* Jewish Education, 46 (4), 37-38.

Lukinsky, J. (1978) Integrating Jewish and General Studies in the Day School. In M. Nadel (Ed), Integrative Learning: The Search for Unity in Jewish Day School Programs. New York: American Association for Jewish Education.

Malkus, M. (2001) Portraits of Curriculum Integration In Jewish Day Schools. Doctoral Dissertation, Jewish Theological Seminary, New York, NY.

Malkus, M. (2002) *The Curricular Symphony: How One Jewish Day School Integrates Its Curriculum.* Journal of Jewish Education, 68 (1), 47-47.

Margolis, D. and Schoenberg, E. (Eds) (1992) Curriculum, Community, Commitment: Views on the American Jewish Day School. New York: Behrman House.

Perkins, D.N. and Salomon, G. (1988) *Teaching for Transfer,* Educational Leadership 46:1.

Pomson, A. (2001) *Knowledge that Doesn't Just Sit There: Considering a Reconception of the Curriculum Integration of Jewish and General Studies,* Religious Education 96 (4)

Rosenak, M. (1987) Commandments and Concerns: Jewish Religious Education in Secular Society. Philadelphia: JPS.

Schick, M. (2000) A Census of Jewish Day Schools in the United States. New York: Avi Chai Foundation.

Solomon, B.I. (1978) *A Critical Review of the Term "Integration" in the Literature on the Jewish Day School in America.* Journal of Jewish Education, 46 (4), 4-17.

Wiggins, G. and McTighe, J. (1998) Understanding By Design. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Zeldin, M. (1992) *To See the World as Whole.* Jewish Education News 13 (3).

Zeldin, M. (1998) Integration and Interaction in the Jewish Day School. In R. Tornberg (Ed), The Jewish Educational Leaders Handbook. Denver: A.R.E.

Zeldin, M. (2000) *Day Schools as Organizations of Jewish Learning.* Sh'ma, 31 (575), 1-3