



## LIBRARY COPYRIGHT NOTICE

[www.huc.edu/libraries](http://www.huc.edu/libraries)

### Regulated Warning

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

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

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

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

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE - JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION  
California School

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA  
School of Social Work

/ EVALUATION OF HEBREW UNION COLLEGE-  
JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION  
SCHOOL OF JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICE CURRICULUM /

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

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

by

LESLIE GOLDEARB, MARIE-JEANNE LAMBERT AND DEBRA SCHLOSSBERG

May, 1983

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE - JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION  
California School

in cooperation with

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA  
School of Social Work

EVALUATION OF HEBREW UNION COLLEGE-  
JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION  
SCHOOL OF JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICE CURRICULUM

Thesis approved by

Gerald Bubis

Michael A. Lipp

Mona Miller

EVALUATION OF HEBREW UNION COLLEGE-  
JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION  
SCHOOL OF JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICE CURRICULUM

by

LESLIE GOLDFARB  
MARIE-JEANNE LAMBERT  
DEBRA SCHLOSSBERG

---

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

May, 1983



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. . . . .	i
ABSTRACT. . . . .	v
INTRODUCTION. . . . .	vii
CHAPTERS	
I. LITERATURE REVIEW. . . . .	1
II. HISTORY OF TRAINING PROGRAMS IN JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICE. . . . .	14
III. HISTORY OF THE SCHOOL OF JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE-JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION, LOS ANGELES. . . . .	32
IV. METHODOLOGY AND DEMOGRAPHICS . . . . .	47
V. THE ROLE OF HEBREW UNION COLLEGE AS REFLECTED BY REASONS FOR ATTENDING SCHOOL . . . . .	57
VI. THE ROLE OF THE CURRICULUM . . . . .	81
VII. ALUMNI IN THE WORKPLACE. . . . .	105
VIII. CONCLUSION . . . . .	125
BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	133
APPENDICES . . . . .	137

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank our advisors, Gerald Bubis, Bruce Phillips, and Michael Signer for their time, worry and faith. They have been of inestimable value.

To the Bar/Bat Mitzvah class of 1983 our thanks for their love and unfailing support without which the past two years would not have been quite as special and this thesis would never have been written.

There are several others who deserve special mention: our typist Sarah; Aaron for his tolerance and nurturance even when times got rough; Judy for her friendship, support and help throughout the writing of this thesis; and to Punch, A.B. and Faux-Pas for being warm and cuddly.

Most of all our thanks and love for each other. We stayed friends.

## ABSTRACT

Thirteen years ago, the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion School of Jewish Communal Service was created in order to graduate individuals responsive to the complex and changing demands of a dynamic field. In this, the bar mitzvah year of the school, a special task force has been set up to conduct a comprehensive curriculum review. In order to undertake an assessment of this scale, it was necessary to solicit information from graduates of the program. Among the questions asked were: "What are the orientations and motivations of graduates? Which aspects of the curriculum have been most relevant to them? In what ways does a Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion School of Jewish Communal Service education impact upon the workplace?"

This team of researchers sought to find the answers to these questions. We used as our instrument a questionnaire. The responses were used to measure the effect of sex, program enrolled in, last year of attendance, and job title on alumni perceptions of those areas.

Our research shows that Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion School of Jewish Communal

Service alumni feel that they received valuable formal instruction and informal training in most aspects of the Jewish component in practice. Graduates feel that the school is successful in meeting the needs of its students. Where gaps were indicated in the curriculum, recommendations were made.

## INTRODUCTION

As part of an evaluation of the School of Jewish Communal Service at Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, this study addresses alumni perceptions of motivations for enrolling, curricular offerings and professional realities. The education of Jewish communal workers is the prime mandate of the school. There are several degree programs available and one Certificate program for those already in the field.

The delineation of the Jewish component is complex. The school offers course work in many aspects of Jewish knowledge as well as social work and other related fields. The hypothesis governing this study is that the Jewish component is the reason that people enroll in the school. This motivation transcends age, background, extent and nature of Jewish affiliation, practice, and gender. Thus, the student body is diverse. The standards of the school are such that in addition to being a highly diverse group of students, enrollees are highly qualified.

The structure of the inquiry flows from the historical background to the implications for curricular response. Chapter One addresses perspectives of the training of Jewish communal workers in the literature. It also

presents the differing views of definition of the Jewish component in education.

A general history of training and education programs can be found in Chapter Two, while the specific history of the birth and development of the School of Jewish Communal Service is covered in Chapter Three. The next chapter discusses methodology of the study. The demographic materials related to the alumni responding are also discussed.

Findings from the study are analyzed in Chapters Five, Six and Seven. Chapter Five explores the reasons people enroll in the school. Curricular offerings are examined in Chapter Six. In Chapter Seven, recognition of alumni in the work place as well as the perceptions of the impact of the school on alumni are presented. The concluding Chapter Eight discusses the implications of the findings along with curricular recommendations.

The entire questionnaire is reproduced in the appendix. Similarly, comments made on the questionnaire are listed, with enumeration of job titles.

## CHAPTER ONE

### LITERATURE REVIEW

As a profession, Jewish communal service has proven to be recalcitrant to any formal definition. Even with the multicplicity of potential specializations in other professions, each can be explicated. Medicine has definite limits as does dentistry, or law, etc. Jewish communal service, however, is an amalgam of fields of service demanding diverse skills: community organization, public administration, group work, counseling, research, vocational rehabilitation, family life education, religious education, secular education, grant writing, etc. The definition given by Reisman that Jewish communal service is made up of "those professional personnel who perform a range of social work functions within the network of Jewish social welfare agencies"<sup>1</sup> is both too broad and too limiting. The functions of Jewish communal servants often do stem from social work, however they often also come from other disciplines. The professionals in the field include everyone from line worker to upper level executive. Thus education for the field becomes extraordinarily complex.

---

<sup>1</sup>Bernard Reisman. "An alternative perspective on training Jewish Communal Workers," Journal of Jewish Communal Service, 52, 1976, 338.



Traditionally, social work has been seen to be the paradigm for Jewish communal work. Couple a solid social work background with strong grounding in Jewish social structure, formal organization and history, and one should have a well prepared professional. The Jewish civil servant, however, has a multitude of roles and it is the preparation for these roles that is the locus of our study. Social work alone is not sufficient; social work with a Jewish background has not proved sufficient. There is a need for evaluation of the programs. Questions relating to the nature of who chooses Jewish communal service as a career, development of a potential standard set of qualifications demanded by the field (at least in the United States), what most distinguishes the Jewish communal worker from others, the satisfaction of professionals, etc., stems out of an examination of the application of course work (i.e., professional preparation) to the realities of the profession.

At present the literature regarding social work education and specifically Jewish communal service education, tends to lie in three areas: evaluation based on competency; motivational studies; directional studies. These areas will be examined separately in order to delineate the arguments more clearly. Questions and issues of methodology will be discussed in a later chapter.



The area of competency refers primarily to social work itself. As Bubis pointed out "The guild and gate-keeper roles of any group in power suggest that social workers will continue to demand the Master's degree as the best preparatory education for communal service under Jewish auspices."<sup>2</sup> For this reason it is incumbent on any study or evaluation of preparation of Jewish communal workers to look at the social work component of their education.

The major evaluative study of social work graduates came out of the University of Michigan covering the years 1968-1972. In this Norma Radin compared self ratings of graduates of social work schools<sup>3</sup> with a rating by their supervisors. Contrary to patterns of practice in the Jewish community, findings of the study revealed that the majority of social work graduates shifted "away from community practice and group work as the major method of practice [...] into casework."<sup>4</sup> In part this may be due to the restricted number of casework opportunities in the Jewish community. Much may also be due to the greater

---

<sup>2</sup>Gerald B. Bubis. "Introduction: Professional Education," The Turbulent Decades, (New York: Conference of Jewish Communal Service, 1980), p. 1201.

<sup>3</sup>Norma Radin. "University of Michigan Study," 1973, p. 1.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 4.

emphasis placed on community practice including administration and fund raising within the Jewish community. In a voluntary community, such as the Jewish community, one where emphasis is placed on volunteer and lay involvement, the paid communal servant is called upon to deliver service in many areas. This is in direct contrast to general social work practice where more emphasis is placed on direct service (e.g., casework). Since our current study is limited to alumni reaction, no comparisons can be made with the material from supervisors.

An earlier study of social work motivations by Pins<sup>5</sup> queried 2771 first year students as to their vocational choices. While this study did not evaluate programs of training per se, the information concerning who chooses social work applies in terms of curricular needs. Unfortunately there has been no such extensive study since the early 1960's. A related study in 1966 examines the characteristics of career choice and practice concentrations.<sup>6</sup> The study was designed to obtain information concerning economic, personal, academic, and sociological backgrounds

---

<sup>5</sup>Arnulf M. Pins. "Who Chooses Social Work, When and Why? An Exploratory Study of Factors Influencing Career Choices in Social Work," Council on Social Work Education, New York: New York, 1963.

<sup>6</sup>Deborah Golden, Arnulf M. Pins, Wyatt Jones. Students in Schools of Social Work: A study of characteristics and factors affecting career choice and practice concentration, Council on Social Work Education, 1972.

of the students. There was as well an attempt to discover the determinates influencing career choice. This study was conducted on entering students (their self perceptions) and did not attempt to follow them into the field to see what, if any, changes had occurred. There is therefore little current material concerning when, why and who chooses social work, much less information concerning who chooses Jewish communal service.

In a collection of articles, Arkava and Brennen explored yet another dimension of demands for accountability in social work schools. While focusing on field performance criteria for social work education evaluation, what evolved was a parallel plan of curriculum development. The qualified practitioner is shown to be the ultimate goal of a well planned curricular offering. This is in contrast to the quantitative studies that have assumed that qualitative outcomes resulted naturally from the programs. Varying inventory scales have been used in the past to delineate successful programs: value inventories, knowledge inventories, skill assessment scales, etc. Since these have posed problems of reliability, validity, verisimilitude and others, Arkava and Brennen opted to start with the end product, the practitioner. This competency-based model of education "refers to an entire program" rather than to specific performance objectives growing from

a particular course.<sup>7</sup> The rationale for this education is simply stated, "Social work education has as its responsibility the preparation of persons to fulfill social work roles in ways of demonstrable benefit to others. Being effectively helpful requires the social worker to act, to engage in practice behavior. This behavior is the operationalized definition of integrated knowledge values and skills expressed humanly. It is a holistic expression of the person, representing affective, cognitive, and psychomotor resources of the moment."<sup>8</sup>

Returning to the Jewish field, we find in an overview of the role of professionals, presented at the International Conference of Jewish communal service, Goldman referred to the training of Jewish professionals as "a primary goal."<sup>9</sup> He linked this to the survival of Israel and the Diaspora, further stating that "determined and planful efforts to recruit and educate must be a primary goal of the Jewish communal profession."<sup>10</sup> There is no question that the field itself considers the

---

<sup>7</sup> Morton L. Arkava & E. Clifford Brennen. "Quality Control in Social Work Education," Competency-Based Education for Social Work, p. 16.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., p. 27.

<sup>9</sup> Ralph I. Goldman. "The Role of the Professional in Developing and Shaping Jewish Communal Policies and Strategies," International Conference of Jewish Communal Service, Jerusalem, August 23-28, 1981.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., p. 31

preparation of its workers as the most important issue in the creation of qualified professionals.

Widespread interest in the methodology of social work, in particular social group work, was demonstrated by many Jewish social workers in recreational and cultural settings. Jewish community centers were in agreement that the values of the group work process were necessary. There was, however, disagreement regarding the degree of "emphasis on the clear-cut ideological objectives of greater adherence to 'Jewish values,' and on the extent to which programs should center around this objective."<sup>11</sup> For many, a sectarian emphasis was in direct opposition to an "underlying non-sectarian and humanistic values of social work which encouraged the individual to reach out from his own group to others [...] irrespective of religion."<sup>12</sup> This question of expression of commitment was reflected in a major position work by Oscar Janowsky in 1948. For him, the center was clearly the locus of Jewish identification.

The most important conclusion of the Survey is that the Jewish center should have a Jewish purpose--that it shall be an agency with which the Jew might identify himself in order to satisfy his specialized Jewish needs. From this premise, it follows logically that the program of the

---

<sup>11</sup>Louis Kraft. A Century of the Jewish Community Center Movement, (New York: Jewish Community Center Centennial Committee, 1953).

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 129.



Jewish center should devote primary attention to Jewish content, without, of course excluding or ignoring the general activities which are essential for a well-rounded center program.<sup>13</sup>

The Janowsky report, as it is known, clearly stated the centrality of Jewish content in the Jewish community center. This centrality of Jewish component has been reiterated by Solender, Barron and Toubin in terms of applicable to any forum of Jewish communal work. "An organized program for the recruiting and training of qualified Jewish professional workers is essential. At present, we are critically lacking in sufficient quantity of such workers. The Jewish preparation of those whom we have attracted often leaves much to be desired. Recruiting activities must be organized on a board community basis. Training resources must be improved and conditions of work made more attractive."<sup>14</sup> Thus it is the motivation that becomes the focus of training, combined with appropriate and adequate Judaic information.

For some time, this Jewish preparation is an overlay to basic social work techniques. In a major position paper on the subject of social work and Jewish

---

<sup>13</sup>Oscar Janowsky. The JWB Story, New York: The Dial Press, 1948, p. xxiii.

<sup>14</sup>Sanford Solender, Henry Barron, Isaac Toubin. "National Programs for Jewish Commitment, Knowledge and Culture," The Turbulent Decades, Graenum Berger, ed. 1980, pp. 1074-1078.

training for work in a Jewish center, Gold and Pins clearly stressed that social group work must be the core of the basic foundation. The professional education of center workers must include this foundation on which a Jewish component and professional experience must be added.<sup>15</sup> This position has influenced and been reiterated by many others.<sup>16</sup>

The contrasting position was presented by Reisman in 1972. In an article concerning center work he stated that "the compatibility of an earlier era has been breached and it is no longer functional for the fields of Jewish communal service to be as dependent on social work for training of their personnel as they have been."<sup>17</sup> For him the divergence lies in the increased necessity to place emphasis on the Jewish component. As a result, he perceived a curricular emphasis in social work schools on a population that was not served by the centers. Thus there were dichotomous socialization processes at work. In conclusion he made note of the then emerging schools communal service and added, "undoubtedly these new programs will

---

<sup>15</sup> Bertram Gold and Arnulf Pins. "Effective Preparation for Jewish Community Center Work," Journal of Jewish Communal Service, 39, 1962, pp. 121-141.

<sup>16</sup> Beser, Elasar, Lewy, Rosen, Pins in Journal (full citations will be used).

<sup>17</sup> Bernard Reisman, "Social Work Education and Jewish Communal Service Centers: Time for a Change," Journal of Jewish Communal Service, XLVIII, 4, 1972, p. 384.

build upon much of the valuable knowledge and methodology developed and refined in the schools of social work. Where they will differ will be in terms of Jewish content--both as it is reflected in formal educational content and in the informal atmosphere of the program. It is too early to assess the effectiveness of these new programs, but in terms of their objectives and ideology, they appear to offer more promise than the traditional social work school, for producing Jewish communal workers capable of responding to the needs of the American-Jewish community of the 1970's."<sup>18</sup> The criteria, then, for successful preparation and professionals lay in motivating and socializing the Jewish civil servant in ways that were more useful to the community.

In a later paper, Reisman stated "Professionals who work in Jewish communal agencies need to achieve a blend of two areas, in which there are appropriate bodies of knowledge, skill, and values: one is social work which includes the technical competences of working with individuals, groups, organizations, and communities; and the second is the Jewish area which involves achieving sufficient mastery of the Jewish heritage to transmit

---

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., p. 395.



information and values about that heritage."<sup>19</sup> He further states that the expectation for integration of the two primary components is rarely achieved in professional education and therefore compartmentalization is dysfunctional. For Reisman, education and curricular needs must reflect this integration. His thinking is reflected in a later chapter.

Particularly Bubis has referred to the importance of infusing social work practice with Jewish values in 1981 articles.<sup>20</sup> It is with this concern that curricular issues can be viewed. In 1975, Levy concentrated on this issue specifically. The question of the Jewish component itself has been discussed in nearly all issues of the Journal of Jewish Communal Service.<sup>21</sup> The implications for curricular planning have not been under as close direct scrutiny. There has been an implied impact in many articles dealing with the kind of knowledge Jewish communal workers need but rarely the direct impact on curricular concerns. Levy's

---

<sup>19</sup>Bernard Reisman. "The Jewish Component in the Training Programs of Jewish Communal Workers," Journal of Jewish Communal Service, LVIII, 1981-82, N.2, p. 98.

<sup>20</sup>Gerald Bubis, op. cit.

<sup>21</sup>For one perspective on this we refer the reader to the Journal of Jewish Communal Service, in particular an article by Charles Zibbell, "The Jewish Component in Jewish Communal Service," LV, 1978, 2, pp. 141-148.

article directly addresses this within the context of the Jewish school of social work (Wurzweiler School of Social Work of Yeshiva University). For him, "a rationale is needed for professional education which takes into account the nature of Jewish communal service as well as the nature of social work, and which takes into account the requisites of academic as well as professional education."<sup>22</sup> This rationale must be reflected by the curriculum. While Levy speaks from the perspective of involvement in a single school which combines social work education and preparation for Jewish communal service for all students regardless of whether they enter (or intend to enter) Jewish communal service, many of the conclusions apply to the multiple programs developed at Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion School of Communal Service. In both instances, and for others preparing Jewish civil servants, "courses are required of all students [...] which are designed to afford such understanding of Jews--their organizational and welfare structure, and their beliefs, values, and traditions--as would facilitate students' performance of the social work helping function with them, at whatever level and in whatever form they may perform it--counseling, group services, administration, community planning,

---

<sup>22</sup>Charles S. Levy. "Education for Social Work Practice in Jewish Communal Service," Journal of Jewish Communal Service, LII, 1975, N.1, p. 35.

fund raising, etc."<sup>23</sup>

There are many approaches to the training of Jewish communal professionals. The philosophies behind the curricular offerings are different but the aims of all the schools are the same: the preparation of highly skilled and competent Jewish professionals. It is with this in mind that the current evaluative study of one program has been undertaken.

---

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., p. 41.

## CHAPTER TWO

### HISTORY OF TRAINING PROGRAMS IN JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICE

#### Overview

The field of Jewish communal service, although unique, is not new. In 1915, the New York Kehilla sponsored the first school of Jewish Communal Work as one of its several bureaus. The stated purpose of the graduate school was to strengthen and speak for the Jewish community. Prior to this, all that existed were in-service training programs and individual extension courses.

In 1925, The Graduate School for Jewish Social Work<sup>1</sup> was established to equip future Jewish leaders with Jewish and professional education. After the school closed in 1940, The Training Bureau for Jewish Communal Service (1947-1950) was created in New York with a mandate to conduct a study of the status of the field, and more specifically, to make recommendations towards the re-creation of a school.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Michael Freund. Training for Jewish Social Welfare with Special Reference to The Training Bureau for Jewish Communal Service, New York, March, 1956.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. VI.

The Bureau findings included a series of recommendations, namely: (1) the fact that the school must be supplementary in nature and not a discipline unto itself, (2) curricular emphasis should be on community organization, community relations, and overseas services, not casework, and (3) the faculty must have a genuine interest in the program.<sup>3</sup> The school itself was to be connected with the American Association for Jewish Education, the American Joint Distribution Committee, the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, the National Community Relations Advisory Council and the National Jewish Welfare Board. These national agencies agreed to take responsibility for the launching of the program.

The Bureau was conceived as an extension of already existing institutions. Columbia University in New York, Dropsie College in Philadelphia, Brandeis University in Waltham, Massachusetts, and the New York School of Social Work were all approached with the idea of adding a Jewish communal "division" to their schools of social work, but after negotiations, none accepted the proposal.<sup>4</sup> With the establishment of the Continuing Committee on Training for Jewish Communal Service, the Bureau closed in 1951. An agreement was worked out between Yeshiva University, the

---

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. VIII.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. IX.

Training Bureau, and the National Jewish Welfare Board after prolonged debate on the issue. At that time Yeshiva Dean Hartstein decided to open a Graduate School of Education and Community Administration aimed at service to the Jewish community. Representatives from the Training Bureau and N.J.W.B. saw this as an opportunity to exploit valuable academic resources for the field of Jewish communal service. Because of Yeshiva University's affiliation with the Orthodox movement, it was seen as being an important avenue for cooperation between Rabbis and other Orthodox professional and social workers. In addition, supplementary instruction for Jewish professionals could be offered through the school. Finally, the school was seen as an institution for the training of Jewish social workers. What eventually emerged from this was an independent School of Social Work at Yeshiva University, the Wurzweiler School, which began in 1951 building upon the recommended methods and objectives of Jewish communal service as stated by the Training Bureau.<sup>5</sup>

#### The School of Jewish Communal Work

What precipitated these vigorous efforts to develop an academic field of Jewish communal service? In 1918, the Jewish Communal Registry of New York was published. In it, some of the most influential thinkers in the

---

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 341.



Kehilla espoused their views and considerations regarding the Jewish community. The religious problem of the community was perceived as centering on a number of factors.

Dr. Judah L. Magnes saw it aggravated by

differing religious views and practices, multiplicity of religious organizations representing replicas of the religious conditions of the old homes, and lack of coordinated effort.<sup>6</sup>

In addition, it was reported that less than half of the adult population was affiliated with synagogues. "Wandering" youth was a problem as was a low degree of Jewish culture. The Kehilla targeted these as well as other phenomena as areas for Jewish concern. Part of the organized Jewish community's response to these was the formation of the School of Jewish Communal Work. The aim of the school was to provide training "of expert workers in the various phases of life of Jews in America."<sup>7</sup> Fields of concentration were to include philanthropy, correctional work, cultural-recreational activities, industry, Jewish education and religious affairs. A second thrust of the school was to conduct research. The sociological implications of the transplanted Jewish community was a central concern. Similarly, the adjustment from "old" to "new" communities needed to be examined.

---

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., 19.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 25.

The school was to be comprised of the six departments with three phases of the educational process: (1) preliminary course - a lecture course dealing with the history and "theory" of Jewish communal work. Upon completion of this first course students were awarded certificates, (2) institutes - re-orientation evening courses designed for those already in the field, (3) graduate work - divided into two units; Basic Courses and Group Studies. The former dealt with fundamentals and methods of generic communal work while the latter were designed to supply in-depth content pertaining to chosen specialty areas. (For listing of specific courses, see Appendix B.) The school closed in 1918 and following a hiatus a new school was born.

#### The Graduate School for Jewish Social Work

The Graduate School for Jewish Social Work was opened in 1925. By this time, immigration restrictions had stopped the influx of newcomers. The nature of Jewish social work had changed drastically. A 1920 study conducted by the Bureau of Jewish Social Research (the forerunner of the Council of Jewish Federations) concluded that workers were leaving the field at a swift pace due to dissatisfaction with conditions, insecurity of tenure, absence of pension, poor relations with Board members and non-professional work status.<sup>8</sup> Prior to the School's opening these

---

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 43.



issues were subjects for consideration in 1922 when a special meeting was convened in Cleveland, Ohio by the executive committee of the Conference of Jewish Charities to discuss the continuing issue of educating professionals.

The committee consisted of Julius Drachsler, H.L. Glucksman, Dorothy C. Kahn, M.J. Karpf, Solomon Lowenstein, Frances Taussig, Bessie B. Wessel, Samuel A. Goldsmith ex-officio, Dr. Ludwig Bernstein, and Dr. Maurice Hexter, all pre-eminent leaders in the field of Jewish communal service.<sup>9</sup> A dispute arose during the conference regarding the special nature of Jewish social work and its validity. The majority of the participants maintained that the Jewish component should be separate and supplemental to the non-sectarian while the minority opinion held that the curriculum be 100% Jewish. An indispensable element of the curriculum was thought to be "continuity of contact" with contemporary Jewish leaders and thinkers. The group was split on another issue. Some felt the aim of the school should be to train composite Jewish leaders, others believed energies should be directed toward specific administrative skills. All agreed, however, that the school should be independent, national and supported by various communities interested in Jewish philanthropy. Social work theory was to be taught, but was to remain generic since the assembled Committee on Training for Jewish Social Work

---

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 46.

felt it was premature to move into specific specialties.

Eventually, the rationale for the new Graduate School of Jewish Social Work was explained formally as encompassing several perspectives. The agencies of the American Jewish community required trained employees if they were to have the desired long-range effects. The education of personnel needed to be designed to meet certain prerequisites, namely, an informed understanding of Jewish culture and ethnicity. Therefore, a facility was required to provide this education. Secondly, the school was to concern itself with leadership, and a third objective was to elevate and ameliorate the level of satisfaction with the profession by improving selection standards in the field.<sup>10</sup>

Following the rationale for the school, a new set of guidelines was adopted for the purpose of creating a new curriculum which would achieve these goals. The guidelines centered on four points:

1. Classes would be devised to impart specific Jewish cultural and historic knowledge.
2. General methods and theories of social work would be taught in a general school of social work in recognition of the fact that Jewish clients and Jewish issues are but a part of a larger society.

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., pp. 51-52.

Contemporaneous with these developments were similar steps being taken in Philadelphia by I.M. Rabinow at the Pennsylvania School of Social and Health Work.

3. Classes would be devised to modify and re-apply general social work principles to the Jewish community.
4. Classes would be devised to analyze and critique contemporary social issues in recognition of the fact that change is constant and the field of social work must continually adapt to changes.<sup>11</sup>

Specifically the courses were again divided into three units. The first period was three months long and was devoted to an introduction to Jewish culture and history as well as a practicum which consisted of field visits to various Jewish organizations and agencies.

Part II was a nine-month block of courses taught at the New York School of Social Work. The courses started with methods and theory and after three months, the students chose classes pertaining to their particular field of concentration. During this time, the student was responsible for 15 hours per week of field work. The first three months of field work were to be taken in a Jewish family service agency followed by three months in an agency congruent to the student's chosen specialty (preferably

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., pp. 52-53.

non-Jewish) and finally, three months in their chosen specialty in a Jewish agency. The field work component was directed by the Training Bureau which was also responsible for running seminars, the purpose of which was to connect the field experience with that which they were learning at the New York school.

The third and final segment of the program was an intensive examination of Jewish social service and its application to the contemporary issues (for list of courses see Appendix C). During this period there were to be weekly meetings as well which would serve as opportunities for the students to meet with outstanding Jewish leaders and thinkers. Faculty members included Dr. Maurice J. Karpf, Dr. Salo W. Baron, Rabbi Mordecai M. Kaplan, Dr. Mordecai Soltes, and Mr. George Wolfe among others, all pre-eminent in their respective fields. The weekly meetings were intended to augment this distinguished faculty which, although selected with care, represented a split between the academic and professional communities. Academicians taught the Jewish History and Social and Religious Institutions courses while the bulk of the remaining courseload was taught by professional social workers. This absolute separation created an increasing rift between the faculty of the Graduate School and that of the New York School.

Funding of the school was also a major problem. In 1925 the budget was approximately \$36,000, but almost

immediately expenditures began to supercede income and by 1936, the school faced a critical funding shortage in part responsible for the school's closing that same year.

The reasons for the funding crisis were manifold. In the first 11 years of operation, the school relied on various foundations for close to half of its income. This funding source was never intended to be permanent and ultimately, at the end of the 11 year period, after two renewal terms, funding was discontinued.

In addition to the foundation support, approximately one quarter of the school's income was in the form of private donations. The bulk of them came from Mr. Felix Warburg and ended with his death. Another 15% came from the Jewish Federation and the remaining 10% was comprised of tuition fees and other scattered forms of support.<sup>12</sup> The cessation of much needed financial support from the above-mentioned sources created a dilemma of re-financing. Under the authority of the director, Dr. M.J. Karpf, negotiations were initiated with a number of potential funding sources. The possibility of a combined partnership with another school was also discussed. None of these came to fruition, however, and the school was forced to liquidate its assets.

The closing of the school in 1940 was the culmination of a series of contributing factors, the most pressing of which was the financial aspect. This was

---

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 90.



aggravated by a critical inadequacy in the field of public relations. There was never enough visibility in the local communities and as a result, relations between the school and professionals in the field were insufficient. Finally, questions of validity of the field, lack of conviction regarding a need for the school, and a lack of understanding regarding need forced final closure. Support from those in the field was lacking. Many Jewish social workers did not subscribe to the philosophies and ideologies of the school and offered only minimal support. In addition, there was little consensus surrounding the emphases and objectives of the school. Should casework be stressed? Was there a salient difference between Jewish and non-Jewish social work?<sup>13</sup>

#### The Training Bureau for Jewish Communal Service

Faced again with the dilemma of how to provide education for Jewish social workers, concerned experts were not content to let the matter die. It was felt that education was necessary for those in casework agencies as well as the broad array of other community services and there was very little consensus as to how to approach the problem. It was necessary to take a fresh look at the scope of content being offered in schools of social work in an effort to ascertain which of the professional needs were

---

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., pp. 103-104.

already being met.

In 1941, Dr. Solomon Lowenstein, a major force in the now defunct Graduate School, convened a meeting of concerned professionals to discuss the possibilities of re-establishing a school. A committee was appointed headed by Kurt Peiser, then Executive Director of the Philadelphia Federation. The committee had among its constituents several members of the faculty of the Graduate School including Dr. Karpf, Francis Taussig, Morris Waldman and Maurice Hexter. They agreed to conduct a study which would examine the present status of Jewish social work.

The findings of the commission uncovered a number of trends. Unparalleled growth had taken place in the field in the twenty years prior. This resulted in the emergence of new community organization agencies which dealt with new fields of service. The people staffing these agencies were largely uneducated in Judaica, but acknowledged the fact that their work dealt in large part with Jewish content. There was also a clearly perceived paucity of training facilities for workers in newly emerging fields such as community relations or care for the aged.<sup>14</sup> In-service training and individual post-graduate courses taken at general schools of social work were evolving into common supplementary education practices for many Jewish social

---

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., p. 110.

social workers. On the whole, caseworkers did not feel the need for a separate school of social work, stating that a universal approach was much more relevant to their line of work. Those more inclined to support the idea pointed to faculty, selection process, and specific course content as areas deserving of a more highly specialized Jewish setting.

Recommendations were made based on the findings and a steering committee was created to conduct further research and planning based upon the committee recommendations. The steering committee was comprised of representatives from each of the fine sponsoring agencies: the American Association for Jewish Education, the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (now the Council of Jewish Federations), the National Community Relations Advisory Council (now the National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council), and the National Jewish Welfare Board (now the Jewish Welfare Board).

In 1947, the committee issued a Plan and Prospectus which outlined the objectives of a new training facility as follows:

1. There is universal acceptance of the need for a professional training in community organization. There is equal agreement that this objective requires an intensive training program - flexible in character and subject to modification as experience develops and new needs arise.



2. The initial scope will be limited to training for executive and administrative leadership in the specialized fields of Jewish community service. The Bureau recognizes that short-term refresher opportunities are needed for persons not otherwise available for the full course, and will lend its staff and materials to the national agencies now conducting such programs. After the curriculum has been stabilized, the Bureau may assume greater responsibility for diversified refresher activities.
3. Furthermore, the educational resources developed by the Training Bureau will be useful to the schools of social work, to the Jewish Theological Seminaries, and to other training programs peripheral to Jewish community service.<sup>15</sup>

Proposals were designed to meet these objectives in terms of specific courses.

A decision was made by the Course and Scope committee to direct its energies towards the "training of beginning social workers"<sup>16</sup> and to postpone the actual conception of a school until a later date. It was deemed more feasible to combine a Jewish component into already existing curriculae of schools of social work. When schools were approached with the idea, they viewed with favor the incorporation of perhaps one course concerning cultural values but they were unwilling to develop anything more extensive.

It was not until 1950 that a decision was made by the Board of Trustees that "A school for communal services

---

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 120.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 135.

under Jewish auspices is needed and should be established<sup>17</sup> in order to train and sensitize Jewish professionals to Jewish values, history and culture, thereby preparing them more fully to staff the growing network of Jewish agencies. The first school to respond to this charge was Yeshiva University with the establishment of the Wurzweiler School of Social Work in 1951. In that same year, the Bureau closed and the Continuing Committee on Training for Jewish Communal Service was established.

The topics under discussion in the preceding pages are still being hotly debated. What is the Jewish component in the training of Jewish communal workers and how are the tenets of this concept to be transmitted? How does one resolve and indeed, use the tension which exists between the social work and Jewish components to work to our advantage?

Bernard Reisman outlines very clearly the elements to be taken into account when attempting to define the "Jewish component." He points out that the task of definition is a difficult one because the essence of the "Jewish component" changes as societal needs change and as the composition of the student body changes. He reminds the reader that the nature of the field changed drastically after World War II when the influx of immigrants slowed to

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., pp. 143-144.

a trickle and then again in 1967 after the Six Day War when all of world Jewry experienced a heightened consciousness and affirmed identity.

Given all of the above, Reisman continues to explore the distinct elements that make up the "Jewish component" for Jewish professionals. Accordingly, he includes all of the following:

1. Jewish knowledge: Specific Jewish knowledge encompasses both the historical and contemporary contexts. Familiarity with traditional texts, the Hebrew language, religious culture and historic developments of the Jewish people are mandatory if one is to have sufficient understanding of general Judaica. In addition, the contemporary context requires a certain expertise in the workings of the organized Jewish community, a working awareness of the issues facing the Jewish community and a conscious sensitivity to Jews as a people.
2. Skill: Certain skills and techniques are important if one is to translate knowledge into tangible issues for the workplace. Among these are "relevance of the tradition" (embracing the heart of the Jewish heritage and applying the ideas, motifs and personalities of that heritage to current situations), development of a physical

Jewish environment, acceptance of other Jewish outlooks while maintaining a personally positive identity, and willingness to undertake seemingly commonplace tasks that are all a part of Jewish professional life.

3. Values: The importance of a value base in creating guidelines for the profession cannot be over-emphasized. While personal values and ethics cannot be dictated, Reisman offers some initial suggestions as fundamental bases for the development of a value stance for the field. A belief in Jewish continuity, an all-encompassing devotion to the Jewish people, and visible Jewish attachment and affiliation are integral here.

All of the above goals of Jewish professional standards must be met within the realm of the educational context. Reisman's methodology consists of four parts. The first is the actual academic courseload which, in addition to formal Judaica classes, includes guest lecturers, field trips and the Israel seminar. Second in the paradigm is the field work aspect. Next, he looks to the professional socialization which is achieved through the physical environment and field work setting, exposure to the professional journal and to the various professional associations and conferences. Finally, the role models set by the faculty are essential in terms of helping to develop

the character of the Jewish professional.

This section reviewed the general concepts of the field of Jewish communal service as well as the specific precedents, the birth and development of one other response to the question of training Jewish professionals. The School of Jewish Communal Service of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Los Angeles was the first school of Jewish communal service to re-appear since the demise of the Training Bureau.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Bernard Reisman. "The Jewish Component in the Training Programs of Jewish Communal Workers," Journal of Jewish Communal Service, Vol. LVIII, No. 2.

CHAPTER THREE  
HISTORY OF THE SCHOOL OF JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICE  
HEBREW UNION COLLEGE-JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION,  
LOS ANGELES

In 1922 Stephen S. Wise founded the Jewish Institute of Religion (JIR) in New York to provide training "for the Jewish ministry, research and community service."<sup>1</sup> Toward this end, Wise accepted a proposal to merge JIR with Hebrew Union College and in 1950 the merger became official. The Los Angeles campus was established in 1954.

In an attempt to offer an appropriate educational experience for Jewish communal workers, Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion explored the possibility of establishing a school of Jewish Communal Service. Bertram Gold, then director of the Los Angeles Jewish Centers Association, conducted a feasibility study commissioned by President Alfred Gottschalk, then Dean of the California school. This study was intended to ascertain the needs of the Jewish community and the feasibility of creating such a program. On May 24, 1967 Gold presented the

---

<sup>1</sup>Dr. Stanley Chyet. Encyclopedia Judaica, Hebrew Union College, Vol. 8, pub. Keter Jerusalem, Israel, 1971.



results of his study. He concluded that:

Jewish communal service agencies in the United States employ an increasingly large number of professional workers, and require approximately 275 new workers each year; and although most of these professionals receive their training from graduate schools of social work, they do not gain knowledge of Jewish history, culture, traditions, beliefs, and values.<sup>2</sup>

Therefore, in order to address the issues confronting the growing needs of the American Jewish community, alternative approaches in education were needed. Alfred Gottschalk, then Dean of the California School of H.U.C.-JIR, together with Nelson Glueck, then President of H.U.C.-JIR encouraged the Board of Governors to assume the sponsorship of the proposed new school as a service to the total American Jewish community.

Out of the feasibility study came the following proposal to create a department of Jewish Communal Service organized to serve as a supplement to undergraduate and graduate schools of social welfare by offering the following:

1. A B.A. degree in Jewish communal service related to an undergraduate major in social welfare.
2. An M.A. degree in Jewish communal service related to a graduate school of social work.

---

<sup>2</sup>Bertram H. Gold. "Feasibility Study for a Department of Jewish Communal Service for the Los Angeles School of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion," submitted May 24, 1967.

3. A program of continuing education for those presently employed as professionals by Jewish communal agencies.
4. A research program in selected aspects of Jewish communal life.
5. An opportunity for H.U.C. Rabbinic and Education students to take relevant courses in Jewish Communal Studies.
6. The development of adequate teaching materials in areas of Jewish religious and cultural history.<sup>3</sup>

The intended functions of the school were as follows:

1. The B.A. and M.A. programs were intended to offer classes in Jewish history, sociology, institutions, social philosophy, beliefs, practices, culture, and social welfare. In addition, the master's program was to address issues of professional social work practice in conjunction with the University of Southern California School of Social Work.
2. The School of Jewish Communal Service was to provide continuing education for the professional staffs of Jewish agencies in the field of Jewish studies and their application to social work practice. This was to be done through in-service

---

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 2.

training and extension courses that would be given on agency time and at agency expense. The concept of developing appropriate courses for the staff of individual agencies and offering one or two-week summer institutes with the option of gaining credit, was also referred to as an option.

3. The school was to conduct research in a field with little prior exposure. The school was to encourage research in the field of Jewish sociology, ecology, and Jewish Communal Service.
4. Supplementary education for Rabbinic and Education students was to teach students in those programs how to translate the ideals of Judaism into concrete and effective programs. It was also to help establish essential linkages with other Jewish professionals.
5. The final goals of the school were to be the development of adequate teaching materials, basic resources, and skills in areas of Jewish knowledge to be imparted to workers in the field.<sup>4</sup> Simultaneously, Gold recommended the formation of an Advisory Council consisting of 15 to 20 leading

---

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., pp. 5-8.

professional Jewish communal workers in the country. This Council was intended to legitimize and give professional sanction to the school, aid in the recruitment of students, secure stipend support, assist in the selection of a director, and help in the development of curriculum.<sup>5</sup>

Great importance was placed on the appointment of a competent full-time director. The functions delineated were:

1. organizing and finalizing the curriculum
2. coordinating and supervising the courses taught
3. teaching a number of courses
4. being a part of an intertwining network of schools of social work and Jewish Communal Service agencies
5. actively supervising a recruitment program for the school
6. providing staff services to the National Advisory Council
7. developing a working relationship with the Research Service Bureau of the Los Angeles Jewish Federation Council for the purpose of developing appropriate research projects
8. developing a basic resource book of teaching materials.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 10.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 10.

On July 1, 1968, Gerald B. Bubis was appointed Director of the school. Feeling the need for consultation, guidance, and ideas from the field which the school was designed to service, he traveled extensively. He discussed with young people, professionals, and lay leaders the goals, aspirations, programs and priorities for the proposed School of Jewish Communal Service.<sup>7</sup>

Overall, Bubis was received warmly and supportively by professional and lay leaders alike. There were differences in opinion as to whom the school should serve, i.e., executive leadership, professional staff, lay leaders, or interested students. The focus of the program degree, seminars, or the creation of video and correspondence programs of education, as well as the length of time of the program were all in question. There was a decided interest in the school and a unanimous feeling that no matter what direction and focus it adopted, it would be fulfilling an important need in the community. Questions abounded. Was the school to be a laboratory of thought or a conventional degree-granting educational system?<sup>8</sup>

Others expressed interest in the creation of a model program that could then be transported to other cities and used at a local level. This idea arose in

---

<sup>7</sup>Gerald B. Bubis. Memoranda of Meetings, July 31, 1968 to October 15, 1968.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., Bubis notes.

response to the financial and logistical concerns of having the school based on the West coast when the concentration of Jews were in the East. Being in the West, it was feared there would be higher costs of transportation, minimal utility of the school, lack of available consultation, and that local seminars would be handicapped if a national impact was desired. Some were concerned that H.U.C.'s auspices would be inappropriate. This was alleviated by explaining that although the school would be based at H.U.C. it would be seen as a school geared to all of Jewish communal life.<sup>9</sup>

Philosophic discussions took place in many of the meetings. Which Jewish values would the school transmit? What are Jewish ethics and how are they put into practice? Can values be modified over a two-summer period? Many felt that the dilemma facing the Jew today is the tension between universalistic and particularistic identity - the pull to be like everyone else and the counterpull to retain one's own identity. It was time that the Jewish community begin thinking in terms of long-range goals and the raison d'etre of the Jewish community. A new commitment to the future rather than a focus on the past was needed. All felt strongly that the H.U.C. educational experience should be more than classroom learning. Jewish values and ethics as a way of life were to be imparted both formally and

---

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.



informally.<sup>10</sup>

Some felt strongly that it was the right and responsibility of people working in Jewish Communal Service to take stands that were Jewish and to expose these to people rather than impose them.

With these suggestions in mind and the realization that the program needed to be flexible and open to change if needed, classes began in the summer of 1969.

The following statements and goals were recommended for acceptance by the Advisory Committee and subsequently accepted by H.U.C.-JIR.

The School of Jewish Communal Service at H.U.C.-JIR was created to help meet the personnel needs of the American Jewish community agencies. The school seeks to awaken its students to their Jewish heritage and values. The school will concentrate on the values, knowledge, and skills most likely to develop a commitment to careers in Jewish community service.

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

The School of Jewish Communal Service hopes to develop and transmit: knowledge and understanding of the internal and external forces contributing to the survival of the Jew through history; knowledge and understanding of American Jews, their growth and development, social institutions, and their historical antecedents; awareness of and familiarity with contemporary Jewish communal

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

services in the United States and Canada and their developmental history; understanding of issues, conflicts, and ideologies within Jewish life here and abroad; knowledge and appreciation of Jewish values, culture, practices, and beliefs; proficiency in synthesizing the application of these objectives with the values, knowledge, and skills acquired in schools of social work or related fields, and in bringing them to bear in practice; a positive attitude towards the goal of Jewish communal life.<sup>11</sup>

These goals were the primary focus for the School of Jewish Communal Service. Learning was to take place over two summers and upon completion of 20 credits, a Certificate was to be granted.

In addition to the summer program, other services were developed in Los Angeles for agencies and students, including seminars, institutes, lectureships, staff training programs for agencies, and leadership training for lay people.

In choosing a curriculum a:

Balance was sought between the pragmatic and the idealistic; the cognitive and the emotive, the ideals of the Jewish community and the realities of the community. There was an attempt to begin with the contemporary and move back through time in trying to understand (a) the Jewish individual and his family; (b) the intellectual and ideological issues confronting him as a Jew and as an American, and (c) the community instruments which the Jew has created to encapsulate his values, meet his needs, and discharge his communal obligations.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup>Gerald B. Bubis. "The Birth of a School," Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal, October, 1971, p. 4.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 5.

Since its inception in 1969, the School of Jewish Communal Service has expanded greatly. Within the last 13 years the school has grown from an original four classes (The Individual and the Jewish Family; Contemporary Jewish Thought and Issues; The Modern Jew, His Community and His Institutions; The Bridge Between Content and Practice) to an institution offering several degree programs in response to the changing concerns of the Jewish communal field.

Second in age to Yeshiva University, H.U.C. School of Jewish Communal Service preceded the programs developed in Baltimore, Boston and New York. The Los Angeles campus strives for a certain uniqueness in composition, program diversity, and degree of cooperation with the organized Jewish community. Put in the words of Gerald Bubis:

Students study with colleagues from many settings ranging from Rabbinic to almost every agency that exists in the Jewish community.

The school allows for people already working to continue their studies.

We offer Jewish communal service components to people in the Rabbinate.<sup>13</sup>

Over the years, many who are affiliated and/or familiar with the school feel that there are great areas of thought which while somewhat intangible in nature, represent a total learning experience. Much of what the school

---

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., p. 5.

wishes to impart cannot be taught through texts or lectures but must be lived in order to be fully appreciated. This is partly achieved through the provision of a genuine Jewish setting in which many fields of Jewish professional life are nurtured. In a previous alumni survey conducted by Rosa Kaplan, one former student addressed this issue succinctly when she said, "For me the school was not just classes; it was a way of life. Learning took place formally and informally. I felt we were enacting Jewish community in microcosm."<sup>14</sup> To speak only about curriculum would do the quality of the school a great disservice. There are seminars, co-curricular days, shared Shabbatot, camp weekends with faculty and students, special holiday programming, bi-weekly synagogue services, as well as a full agenda of working meetings and planning sessions for school events. Again, a quote from a former student poignantly encapsulates this: "Much of what the school is, is difficult to write on paper. It is an embodiment of interactions, questions, friendships and growth."<sup>15</sup>

The school has developed a number of degree and double-degree programs. They are:

1. A two summer Certificate program
2. A Single Masters in Jewish Communal Service

---

<sup>14</sup>Rosa Kaplan. "Summary of Responses to Alumni Survey Conducted January to March, 1978," p. 1.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 1

3. A Double Masters in Social Work and Jewish Communal Service (together with University of Southern California School of Social Work and George Warren Brown School of Social Work at Washington University)
4. A Double Masters in Gerontology and Jewish Communal Service (together with University of Southern California)
5. A Double Masters in Public Administration and Jewish Communal Service (together with University of Southern California)
6. A Joint Masters in Education and Jewish Communal Service.
7. A Joint Masters in Rabbinics and Jewish Communal Service
8. A Masters in Jewish Communal Service with a Major in Judaica.

An additional option to be made available in 1984 is a Double Masters in Social Work and Jewish Communal Service with the University of Pittsburg School of Social Work.

Inquiries and applications have grown in number and diversity. In the first year, the class was comprised of 13 men and 2 women from the United States, and one from Canada, with ages ranging from 22 years to 48 years. Classes have now reached up to 30 in size and have included people from Israel, France, Canada and Latin America.



Students have come from varying ideological backgrounds including Lubavitch, Orthodox, Reservodox, Conservative, Reform, Reconstructionist, Secular, Zionist, Cultural and just Jewish.<sup>16</sup> Concomitant with the rise in the number of applicants, a new dilemma now plagues the school. How large should the classes become without risking the essential community feeling?

Another aspect of the Los Angeles school is the bi-annual Israel seminar which operates in conjunction with the Institute for Contemporary Jewry of Hebrew University and the Institute for Leadership Development of the Jewish Agency. Although the three-week seminar is offered on an optional basis, those who are able to attend are enriched with a knowledge and insight into Israel, unavailable to the average tourist. Its emphasis is on the role of the Jewish professional in Israel/Diaspora relations and offers comprehensive, sensitive Israel experiences useful in professional settings.

The mandatory field placement is yet another area of concern to the school. Fieldwork's goals are as follows:

1. To offer an opportunity for professional growth while putting class-learned theory into practice.

---

<sup>16</sup>Bubis. Op. cit., "The Birth of a School," p. 8.



2. To introduce students to people in the field and to involve them in the organized Jewish community, thereby establishing important linkages and avenues of communication with their future colleagues.

Sources of financial support have grown as well. Students now receive stipends for their field placements as a result of a grant from the Jewish Community Foundation of Los Angeles Jewish Federation Council. While more scholarships are now available through local Federations, Jewish Community Centers, and the Jewish Welfare Board, primary scholarship and loan support continues to come from Hebrew Union College.

The school has a set of long-range goals. Included in the list of possible new programs are the establishment of three more Double Masters tracks: Business Administration and Jewish Communal Service, Law and Jewish Communal Service, and Communications and Jewish Communal Service. These new double degrees are being explored in response to the emerging needs of Jewish life.<sup>17</sup>

After the completion of the first summer, Bubis wrote the following:

The School of Jewish Communal Service at H.U.C.-JIR has come upon the American scene at a propitious moment. We hope to defy

---

<sup>17</sup>Personal interviews with Gerald B. Bubis and Rita Lowenthal, March, 1983.

convention, mix diciplines and settings, ages and backgrounds. We hope to remain responsive to every dynamic need of the American Jewish community.<sup>18</sup>

The following chapters attempt to analyze the embodiment of the original ideology and principles of H.U.C.-JIR School of Jewish Communal Service as reflected in the assessment of the alumni.

---

<sup>18</sup>Gerald B. Bubis. Report, "After two Summers," 1970.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### METHODOLOGY AND DEMOGRAPHICS

The authors investigated alumni perceptions of the role of Hebrew Union College Jewish Institute of Religion School of Jewish Communal Service in the Jewish community. This was done by investigating three areas: the role as reflected by reasons for attending the school; curricular response to professional needs; recognition of attendance in the work place.

To determine the above, a questionnaire was devised (reproduced in Appendix A). The three different variables involved: dependent, independent, and intervening, were previously identified.<sup>1</sup> The questionnaire was devised accordingly.

The researchers developed a precoded survey which was sent to all people who had attended the School of Jewish Communal Service. It consisted of thirty two primarily closed questions, with the exception of those requiring specificity (e.g., job title, previous degrees). The final question was open to allow respondents to share comments.

---

<sup>1</sup>Fred N. Kerlinger. Foundations of Behavioral Research, 2nd ed., New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973, p. 35.

Each person was sent a questionnaire with an explanatory letter from the researchers and Dr. Bruce Phillips in which alumni were asked to evaluate aspects of the curriculum as part of a review of the entire curriculum to be undertaken by a special H.U.C. task force. A stamped envelope was included, addressed to Hebrew Union College, for return mail purposes.

The questionnaire was pre-tested for purposes of clarity with subjects not connected with the College.

Due to technical problems the questionnaire was constructed prior to the researchers having examined the questionnaire used in the University of Michigan Study of social work graduates.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, a comparison of the two instruments reveal many similarities.

There was a conscious bias toward social work to the exclusion of other fields such as gerontology, education, etc., which can be combined with Jewish Communal Service because it was deemed too difficult to incorporate all of H.U.C.'s options in one questionnaire.

Two areas were not covered by the questionnaire: reasons for having left the school prior to completion of studies, and reasons for having left the field of Jewish Communal Service. While these are both important questions, they are beyond the scope of the current study.

---

<sup>2</sup>For a full discussion of this study, see Chapter I.

Slightly over 51% of the 227 questionnaires were returned.

In order to determine possible bias in respondents, the completed sample's demographic attributes were compared to the demographic attributes of all HUC-JIR School of Jewish Communal Service alumni. These latter were made available by the school. The results obtained (Table 4-1 through 4-3) by these comparisons show that the completed sample and the entire population shared similar demographic attributes with regard to sex, last year of attendance and program attended.

TABLE 4-1 through 4-3  
COMPARISONS OF DEMOGRAPHIC ATTRIBUTES

TABLE 4-1 SEX				
	Total # Enrolled		Total returning questionnaire	
Male	118	52%	55	48%
Female	<u>109</u>	<u>48%</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>52%</u>
Total	227	100%	116	100%
	—	—	—	—

TABLE 4-2 LAST YEAR OF ATTENDANCE

(This category was grouped to facilitate handling of results.)

	Total # Enrolled		Total returning questionnaire	
1969-1973	46	24%	23	20%
1974-1978	100	46%	51	44%
1979-1983	<u>91</u>	<u>40%</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>40%</u>
Total	207	100%	116	100%
	—	—	—	—

Three people reported their last year of attendance as 1969; two reported 1983 as their last year. For purposes of statistical analyses these were collapsed into years 1970 and 1982 respectively. The rise in the number of students between the categories 1969-1973 and 1974-1978 is accounted for by the introduction of the Double Masters programs.



TABLE 4-3 PROGRAM ENROLLED IN

	Total # Enrolled		Total returning questionnaire	
Certificate	100	44%	47	40%
*MAJCS	30	13%	20	17%
*DM HUC/GWB	18	8%	11	9%
*DM HUC/USC	47	21%	30	26%
*MAJCS/MAJE	12	5%	4	4%
Other	<u>20</u>	<u>9%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4%</u>
Total	227	100%	116	100%
	—	—	—	—

The category "other" includes some people from the Rabbinic program and others who attended the school but who did not complete the program.

*MAJCS	Masters in Jewish Communal Service
*DM HUC/GWB	Double Masters Jewish Communal Service and Social Work at H.U.C. and George Warren Brown School of Social Work
*DM HUC/USC	Double Masters Jewish Communal Service and Social Work at H.U.C. and University of Southern California
*MAJCS/MAJE	Joint Masters in Jewish Communal Service and Jewish Education at H.U.C.

Once it was determined that the completed sample was representative, the general demographic attributes of the respondents was analyzed. Respondents were grouped by

marital status, residence, and age when enrolled. People were asked to respond to "Now for clarification purposes we would like to ask you a few questions." Table 4-4 shows the responses to this question in terms of "What is your marital status?" The vast majority of alumni are married now, though 12% are divorced. Very few are co-habiting which seems to reflect the commitment of Communal Service workers to conventional lifestyles. A much higher percentage of women remain single.

TABLE 4-4 MARITAL STATUS

Sex	Single	Divorced/ Separated	Widowed	Married	Living together
Male	2 10.0	7 50.0	0 0.0	45 58.4	1 25.0
Female	18 90.0	7 50.0	1 100.0	32 41.6	3 75.0
Total	100 N=20	100 N=14	100 N=1	100 N=77	100 N=4

In response to the request "Please check region of country you live in now" the largest number of alumni checked the West coast. The reasons are surmised to be:

- 1) graduates tend to remain in the area where they last attended school;
- 2) there are a great number of jobs available in this area because of the density of Jewish population;

- 3) the school may be better known on the West coast.

TABLE 4-5 REGION OF COUNTRY WHERE NOW LIVING

	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Cumulative Frequency (%)
East Coast	16	14.2	14.2
Mid-Atlantic	3	2.7	16.8
South East	6	5.3	22.1
South	3	2.7	24.8
Mid West	23	20.4	45.1
North West	3	2.7	47.8
West Coast	45	39.8	87.6
South West	12	10.6	98.2
Other	2	1.8	100.0
Missing	<u>3</u>	<u>Missing</u>	
	116	100.0	
	<hr/>	<hr/>	

Table 4-6 shows the responses to the question "What is the size of the Jewish community in which you live?" Respondents were given four categories. The largest percentage live in communities of one hundred thousand and over. The communities demand more services and therefore create more job opportunities. There is also a large percentage of alumni living in small communities probably because of the job availability.

TABLE 4-6 SIZE OF JEWISH COMMUNITY WHERE RESIDE

	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Cumulative Frequency (%)
100,000,000	52	45.2	45.2
and over			
50-99,999,000	18	15.7	60.9
30-49,999,000	11	9.6	70.4
Under 30,000	34	29.6	100.0
Missing	<u>1</u>	<u>Missing</u>	100.0
	116	100.0	
	<hr/>	<hr/>	

The mean age of alumni when attending HUC-JIR School of Jewish Communal Service was 23 (see Table 4-7).

TABLE 4-7 AGE WHEN ATTENDED

	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Cumulative Frequency (%)
18 - 20	2	1.8	1.7
21 - 22	20	17.2	19.0
23 - 24	39	33.6	52.6
25 - 26	18	15.6	68.1
27 - 30	11	9.4	77.6
31 - 39	11	9.5	87.1
41 - 55	<u>15</u>	<u>12.9</u>	100.0
	116	100.0	

Researchers also investigated experience prior to enrollment at HUC-JIR School of Jewish Communal Service. Question 4 asked, "Did you ever work in Jewish Communal Service prior to attending HUC-JIR SJCS?" The Certificate program caters to professionals already in the field and finding the great majority of alumni had prior experience in Jewish Communal Service was not surprising. Alumni were asked in Question 5, "Did you ever work in Social Work prior to H.U.C.?" Results of this are difficult to analyze as the questions did not sufficiently clarify the difference between Jewish Communal Service and Social Work. It is assumed that respondents understood "social work" to mean non-sectarian settings but this is not certain.

TABLE 4-8 PRIOR WORK EXPERIENCE IN JCS AND SW

	Jewish Communal Service		Social Work	
	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)
Full Time	39	33.6	30	26.3
Part Time	36	31.0	13	11.4
Both Full and Part Time	8	6.9	5	4.4
Voluntary Only	16	13.8	25	21.9
No Previous Experience	17	14.7	41	36.0
Missing	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>Missing</u>
	<u>116</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>116</u>	<u>100.0</u>



CHAPTER FIVE

THE ROLE OF HEBREW UNION COLLEGE AS REFLECTED BY  
REASONS FOR ATTENDING THE SCHOOL

Why do people choose H.U.C.'s program?

An attempt was made to analyze the answers to this question in order to understand the alumni's motivations and determine how the school experience had fulfilled their expectations.

Motivations were approached from two directions: pragmatic and academic/educational concerns. The pragmatic concerns are those dealing with finances, future job potential, reputation of the school and of the director. The academic/educational concerns are those dealing with the quality of social work education, education about the Jewish community, and Jewish studies. These distinctions enabled the researchers to determine which of the above were the most important reasons for attendance.

Respondents were separated by sex, program, last year of attendance, and job title. Knowing the respondent's sex demonstrates the goals and expectations as well as other differentials in socialization to the field. The choice of program indicates how alumni view the school. The last year of attendance reveals trends in attitudes toward the school. Job title was used as a category to

demonstrate the impact of both pragmatic and academic factors on the work place.

In question seven, seven reasons were listed for coming to the school:

- A. Financial Aid
- B. Probability of job
- C. Reputation of school
- D. Opportunity to study with Jerry Bubis
- E. Quality of social work education
- F. Quality of education about the Jewish community
- G. Jewish Studies curriculum

Respondents were asked to check a column to indicate the importance of each reason. Responses A and B were associated with immediate and future financial concerns. The next two responses dealt with status while five through seven were concerned with academic questions.

It may be significant that responses five and six required a qualitative answer. Each area, however, was viewed subjectively. Question eight related to question seven by requiring the respondent to choose which was the most important reason.

All areas had four choices of answers to the question, "How important were the following reasons in your choice of H.U.C.?" These are "extremely," "very," "somewhat," "not important." For example, 7C states

"reputation of the school," 7F "quality of education about the Jewish community." If a respondent checked extremely important for 7C and chose 7F as the most important reason (Question 8), it would have to be assumed that the academic quality was more important than the status of the school.

Respondents did not view financial aid as a major consideration in choosing to attend the school. There was no significant difference in importance of financial aid as compared to sex. Financial aid compared to year of last attendance showed that in the early years of the school the majority of the students (57%) found financial aid to be extremely or very important. This is significant because full funding was offered up through 1973 and after that grants were supplemented by loans. In most recent years the number dropped to 29%. These results can be found in Table 5-1.

TABLE 5-1 FINANCIAL AID BY IMPORTANCE

	1969-73	1974-78	1979-83
Extremely	7 33.3	9 18.8	6 14.6
Very	5 23.8	12 25.0	6 14.6
Somewhat	4 19.0	8 16.7	9 22.0
Not important	5 <u>23.8</u>	19 <u>39.6</u>	20 <u>48.8</u>
Total	100 N=21	100 N=48	100 N=41

Table 5-2 shows some responses to probability of getting a job as a result of attending H.U.C. compared by sex. Job probability was significantly higher for women in their choice of H.U.C. (58%) than men (32%). Male cohorts said it was not at all important (50%) while women disagreed. Women tend to rely on their education and graduate degree for success in the field much more than do men.

TABLE 5-2 IMPORTANCE OF PROBABILITY OF A JOB BY SEX

	Male	Female
Extremely	9 18.0	16 27.6
Very	8 16.0	18 31.0
Somewhat	8 16.0	10 17.2
Not important	25 <u>50.0</u>	14 <u>24.1</u>
Total	100 N=50	100 N=50

Missing Observations 8    Significance 0.0353  
 $\chi^2$  8.58546                      3° Freedom

Table 5-3 shows responses to the statement "probability of a job" as a reason for choosing a particular program.

There was a high association between program enrolled in and importance of job probability. The statistical significance was 0.0000. This could be obtained at random only one in a million times. This factor held little weight

for Certificate students, all of whom came to the school employed. Those enrolled in the Double Masters/G.W.B.

track indicated this as extremely important (54.5%).

TABLE 5-3 PROBABILITY OF A JOB BY  
PROGRAM AND IMPORTANCE

	Certificate	MAJCS	HUC/GWB	HUC/USC	MAJE/MAJCS	Other
Extremely	5 11.9	4 23.5	6 54.5	8 26.7	1 25.0	1 25.0
Very	4 9.5	6 35.3	4 36.4	11 36.7	1 25.0	0 0.0
Somewhat	6 14.3	0 0.0	0 0.0	8 26.7	2 50.0	2 50.0
Not important	27 <u>64.3</u>	7 <u>41.2</u>	1 <u>9.1</u>	3 <u>10.0</u>	0 <u>0.0</u>	1 <u>25.0</u>
Total	100 N=42	100 N=17	100 N=11	100 N=30	100 N=3	100 N=4

Missing Observations 8

Table 5-4 shows responses to enrolling because of job probability by last year attended. Job probability as a factor rose sequentially through the years. In the formative years (1969-73) only 15% of those enrolled considered this to be extremely important; a large minority of more recent alumni saw this as extremely important (29.3%).

TABLE 5-4 IMPORTANCE OF PROBABILITY  
OF A JOB BY YEAR

	1969-73	1974-78	1979-83
Extremely	3 15.0	10 21.3	12 29.3
Very	2 10.0	13 27.7	11 26.8
Somewhat	4 20.0	6 12.8	8 19.5
Not important	11 <u>55.0</u>	18 <u>38.3</u>	10 <u>24.4</u>
Total	100 N=20	100 N=47	100 N=41

Missing Observations 8

Table 5-5 shows responses to job probability by first job title. Those whose entry level positions after graduation were middle management positions indicated probability of a job to be more important (34.6% said extremely important) than any other category of workers.



TABLE 5-5 PROBABILITY OF A JOB BY JOB TITLE

	Case Work	Group Work	Agency Exec.	Feder. Exec.	Feder. Staff	Middle Manag.	Not in JCS
Extremely	2 18.2	2 20.0	3 20.0	3 23.1	0 0.0	9 34.6	1 12.5
Very	4 36.4	2 20.0	3 20.0	2 15.4	5 50.0	7 26.9	1 12.5
Somewhat	3 27.3	3 30.0	1 6.7	1 7.7	0 0.0	5 19.2	2 25.0
Not important	2 <u>18.2</u>	3 <u>30.0</u>	8 <u>53.3</u>	7 <u>53.8</u>	5 <u>50.0</u>	5 <u>19.2</u>	4 <u>50.0</u>
Total	100 N=11	100 N=10	100 N=15	100 N=13	100 N=10	100 N=26	100 N=8

Table 5-6 shows responses by sex to a question related to the reputation of the school. Women indicated this to be extremely or very important (80%) while 60% of the men so indicated.

TABLE 5-6 REPUTATION OF SCHOOL BY SEX

	Male	Female
Extremely	13 25.5	20 33.3
Very	18 35.3	28 46.7
Somewhat	11 21.6	9 15.0
Not important	9 <u>17.6</u>	3 <u>5.0</u>
Total	100 N=51	100 N=60

The school's reputation was of significant import to students in all programs. When reputation was compared to the last year attended, a rise in importance is noted (Table 5-7). This rose as the school's reputation developed over the years.

TABLE 5-7 REPUATION BY YEAR

	1969-73	1974-78	1979-83
Extremely	1 5.0	14 28.6	18 42.9
Very	8 40.0	23 46.9	15 35.7
Somewhat	6 30.0	7 14.3	7 16.7
Not important	5 <u>25.0</u>	5 <u>10.2</u>	2 <u>4.8</u>
Total	100 N=20 <hr/>	100 N=49 <hr/>	100 N=42 <hr/>

Missing Observations 5

Comparison of the reputation of the school by job title showed no findings of any significance. However, the opportunity to study with the school's director showed that more men than women emphasized this area (Table 5-8). This may be an indication of male role model postulate: men have figures in the field with whom to identify.

TABLE 5-8 OPPORTUNITY TO STUDY WITH  
SCHOOL'S DIRECTOR BY SEX

	Male	Female
Extremely	16 30.8	12 20.0
Very	15 28.8	10 16.7
Somewhat	11 21.2	18 30.0
Not important	10 <u>19.2</u>	20 <u>33.3</u>
Total	100 N=62 <hr/>	100 N=60 <hr/>

Missing Observations 4

The opportunity to study with the school's director was a major concern only for Certificate students, 60% of whom indicated "very" or "extremely" important (see Table 5-9). In terms of last year attended compared to the above opportunity, no findings of any importance resulted. This was also the case for the comparison with job title (see Table 5-10). Newcomers to the field would have had little opportunity to know about staff or faculty through prior experience.

The quality of social work education within H.U.C. was not seen as significant. However, Single Masters students earmarked this element as being least important in their choice of H.U.C. (It was designated the least number

of times as being the most important reason.) None of the G.W.B. students marked it as being extremely important.

It was slightly more important for women, but not to a significant degree (15% said extremely important). When this reason was examined by job title, there was very little correlation (see Table 5-12).

TABLE 5-9 OPPORTUNITY TO STUDY WITH  
SCHOOL'S DIRECTOR BY SEX

	Male	Female
Extremely	2 4.1	9 15.0
Very	9 18.4	16 26.7
Somewhat	17 34.7	19 31.7
Not important	21 <u>42.9</u>	16 <u>26.7</u>
Total	100 N=49	100 N=60

Missing Observations 7

TABLE 5-10 IMPORTANCE OF STUDY WITH

## DIRECTOR BY PROGRAM

	CERTIFICATE	MAJCS	HUC/GWB	HUC/USC	MAJE/MAJCS	Other
Extremely	3 7.1	0 0.0	0 0.0	6 20.0	1 25.0	1 25.0
Very	8 19.0	6 33.3	3 27.3	8 26.7	0 0.0	0 0.0
Somewhat	11 26.2	4 22.2	6 54.5	11 36.7	2 50.0	2 50.0
Not important	20 47.6	8 44.4	2 18.2	5 16.7	1 25.0	1 25.0
Total	100 N=42	100 N=18	100 N=11	100 N=30	100 N=4	100 N=5

Missing Observations 7

TABLE 5-11 QUALITY OF SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION

## BY PROGRAM

	CERTIFICATE	MAJCS	HUC/GWB	HUC/USC	MAJE/MAJCS	Other
Extremely	3 7.1	0 0.0	0 0.0	6 20.0	1 25.0	1 25.0
Very	8 19.0	6 33.3	3 27.3	8 26.7	0 0.0	0 0.0
Somewhat	11 26.2	4 22.2	6 54.5	11 36.7	2 50.0	2 50.0
Not important	20 47.6	8 44.4	2 18.2	5 16.7	1 25.0	1 25.0
Total	100 N=42	100 N=18	100 N=11	100 N=30	100 N=4	100 N=4

Missing Observations 7

TABLE 5-12 QUALITY OF SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION

## BY JOB TITLE

	Case Work	Group Work	Agency Exec.	Feder. Exec.	Feder. Staff	Middle Mngmt.	Not in JCS
Extremely	3 27.3	3 27.3	1 6.7	0 0.0	1 10.0	2 7.7	0 0.0
Very	3 27.3	1 9.1	5 33.3	4 30.8	1 10.0	6 23.1	0 0.0
Somewhat	3 27.3	4 36.4	3 20.0	3 23.1	5 50.0	9 34.6	4 50.0
Not important	2 18.2	3 27.3	6 40.0	6 46.2	3 30.0	9 34.6	4 50.0
	100 N=11	100 N=11	100 N=15	100 N=13	100 N=10	100 N=26	100 N=8

Missing Observations 22

The quality of education about the Jewish community proved to be important to all students. There were virtually no differences between the sexes (see Table 5-13).

Responses about the quality of education about the Jewish community by program are found in Table 5-14. There are eight empty cells; only ten people noted this area as less than very important. Ninety-one percent of all alumni responded "extremely" or "very" important to this question. The same percentage rated the quality of education by last year attended as "extremely" or "very" important to this question. The same percentage rated the quality of education by last year attended as "extremely" or "very" important. The statistical association is



0.043 (see Table 5-15). When comparing this area with job title, the same percentages held, however, there was no statistical significance (see Table 5-16).

TABLE 5-13 QUALITY OF EDUCATION ABOUT  
JEWISH COMMUNITY BY SEX

	Male	Female
Extremely	26 49.1	32 52.5
Very	21 39.6	25 41.0
Somewhat	4 7.5	4 6.6
Not important	2 <u>3.8</u>	0 <u>0.0</u>
Total	100 N=53 <hr/>	100 N=61 <hr/>

Missing Observations 2

TABLE 5-14 QUALITY OF EDUCATION ABOUT

## JEWISH COMMUNITY BY PROGRAM

	CERTIFICATE	MAJCS	HUC/GWB	HUC/USC	MAJE/MAJCS	Other
Extremely	26 56.5	10 52.6	7 63.6	12 40.0	2 50.0	1 25.0
Very	18 39.1	6 31.6	4 36.4	15 50.0	2 50.0	1 25.0
Somewhat	0 0.0	3 15.8	0 0.0	3 10.0	0 0.0	2 50.0
Not important	2 4.3	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
Total	100 N=46	100 N=19	100 N=11	100 N=30	100 N=4	100 N=4

Missing Observations 2 Significance 0.0732

TABLE 5-15 QUALITY OF EDUCATION ABOUT

## JEWISH COMMUNITY BY YEAR

	1969-73	1974-78	1979-83
Extremely	12 57.1	25 49.0	21 50.0
Very	7 33.3	26 39.2	19 45.7
Somewhat	0 0.0	0 11.8	2 4.8
Not important	2 9.5	0 0.0	0 0.0
Total	100 N=21	100 N=51	100 N=42

Missing Observations 2 Significance 0.0431

TABLE 5-16 QUALITY OF EDUCATION ABOUT

## JEWISH COMMUNITY BY JOB TITLE

	Case Work	Group Work	Agency Exec.	Feder. Exec.	Feder. staff	Middle Manag.	Not in JCS
Extremely	3 27.3	7 58.3	9 56.3	9 69.2	7 58.3	14 51.9	3 37.5
Very	7 63.6	4 33.3	6 37.5	2 15.4	4 33.3	11 40.7	4 50.0
Somewhat	1 9.1	1 8.3	0 0.0	2 15.4	1 8.3	2 7.4	0 0.0
Not important	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 6.3	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 12.5
Total	100 N=11	100 N=12	100 N=16	100 N=13	100 N=12	100 N=27	100 N=6

Missing Observations 17

Gender made little difference in assessing the Jewish Studies curriculum. Only eight out of 116 responded that it was not important and in the comparison to last year enrolled, 76% responded that it was at least very important. Responses by job title assessing the Jewish Studies curriculum showed that everyone said it was extremely important. Ninety-nine percent of all caseworkers stated this to be extremely or very important. This is significant because it has often been assumed caseworkers would not view the curriculum content as directly applicable to their jobs (see Tables 5-17 through 5-20).

TABLE 5-17 JEWISH STUDIES CURRICULUM BY SEX

	Male	Female
Extremely	19 35.8	27 44.3
Very	21 39.6	20 32.8
Somewhat	7 13.2	12 19.7
Not important	6 <u>11.3</u>	2 <u>3.3</u>
Total	100 N=53	100 N=61

Missing Observations 2

TABLE 5-18 JEWISH STUDIES CURRICULUM BY PROGRAM

	CERTIFICATE	MAJCS	HUC/GWB	HUC/USC	MAJE/MAJCS	Other
Extremely	19 41.3	11 55.0	4 36.4	10 34.5	1 25.0	1 25.0
Very	18 39.1	5 25.0	4 36.4	11 37.9	3 75.0	0 0.0
Somewhat	5 10.9	2 10.0	3 27.3	7 26.1	0 0.0	2 50.0
Not important	4 <u>8.7</u>	2 <u>10.0</u>	0 <u>0.0</u>	1 <u>3.4</u>	0 <u>0.0</u>	1 <u>25.0</u>
Total	100 N=46	100 N=20	100 N=11	100 N=29	100 N=4	100 N=4

Missing Observations 2 Significance 0.3714  
 $\chi^2$  16.16202

TABLE 5-19 JEWISH STUDIES CURRICULUM

BY LAST YEAR ATTENDED

	1969-73	1974-78	1979-83
Extremely	10 45.5	22 44.0	14 33.3
Very	10 45.5	13 26.0	18 42.9
Somewhat	1 4.5	10 20.0	8 19.0
Not important	1 <u>4.5</u>	5 <u>10.0</u>	2 <u>4.8</u>
Total	100 N=22	100 N=50	100 N=42

Missing Observations 2 Significance 0.3348

 $\chi^2$  6.85116

TABLE 5-20 JEWISH STUDIES CURRICULUM BY JOB TITLE

	Case Work	Group Work	Agency Exec.	Feder. Exec.	Feder. Staff	Middle Manag.	Not in JCS
Extremely	4 36.4	6 50.0	7 43.8	5 35.5	6 50.0	12 46.2	1 12.5
Very	7 63.6	3 25.0	5 31.3	6 46.2	4 33.3	7 26.9	5 62.5
Somewhat	0 0.0	3 25.0	3 18.8	1 7.7	1 8.3	5 19.2	2 25.0
Not important	0 <u>0.0</u>	0 <u>0.0</u>	1 <u>6.3</u>	1 <u>7.7</u>	1 <u>8.3</u>	2 <u>7.7</u>	0 <u>0.0</u>
Total	100 N=11	100 N=12	100 N=16	100 N=13	100 N=12	100 N=26	100 N=8

Missing Observations 18 Significance 0.7367

 $\chi^2$  13.88260

TABLE 5-21 REASONS FOR COMING TO SCHOOL BY SEX

	Male	Female
Financial aid	4 7.8	3 5.2
Probability of a job	5 9.8	8 13.8
Reputation of school	5 9.8	9 15.5
Opportunity of working with Jerry Bubis	10 19.6	4 6.9
Quality of social work education	2 3.9	4 6.9
Quality of education about Jewish community	15 29.4	23 29.7
Jewish Studies curriculum	10 19.6	6 10.3
Other	0 <u>0.0</u>	1 <u>1.7</u>
Total	100 N=51	100 N=58

Missing Observations 7 Significance 0.2917



The most important reason (Question eight) was compared to the same four categories. Most felt the quality of education about the Jewish community was the most important reason for attending the school. There was one area where men and women differ significantly. This was in having an opportunity to study with the school's director. As previously noted, this may be because of the role model. Responses by program show that education about the Jewish community and Jewish Studies are the most important criteria. Social work education and financial aid were the least important reasons for attending H.U.C. Quality of education about the Jewish community was the majority response even when compared by last year enrolled (see Tables 5-21 through 5-23).

TABLE 5-22 REASONS FOR COMING TO SCHOOL BY PROGRAM

	CERTIFICATE	MAJCS	HUC/GWB	HUC/USC	MAJCS/MAJE	Other
Financial aid	4 9.1	1 5.3	0 0.0	2 7.1	0 0.0	0 0.0
Probability of job	3 6.8	4 21.1	3 30.0	3 10.7	0 0.0	0 0.0
Reputation of school	3 6.8	3 15.8	1 10.0	6 21.4	0 0.0	1 25.0
Opportunity to work with Jerry Bubis	9 20.5	3 15.8	0 0.0	1 3.6	0 0.0	1 25.0
Quality of social work education	0 0.0	1 5.3	0 0.0	4 14.3	0 0.0	1 25.0
Quality of education about Jewish community	17 38.6	4 21.1	3 30.0	10 65.7	3 75.0	1 25.0
Quality of Jewish Studies curriculum	8 18.2	3 15.8	3 30.0	2 7.1	0 0.0	0 0.0
Other	0 <u>0.0</u>	0 <u>0.0</u>	0 <u>0.0</u>	0 <u>0.0</u>	1 <u>25.1</u>	0 <u>0.0</u>
Total	100 N=44	100 N=19	100 N=10	100 N=28	100 N=4	100 N=4

Missing Observations 7 Significance 0.0036

 $\chi^2$  61.60616

TABLE 5-23 REASONS FOR COMING TO SCHOOL  
BY LAST YEAR ATTENDED

	1969-73	1974-78	1979-83
Financial aid	4 19.0	1 2.1	2 4.9
Probability of getting job	2 9.5	5 10.4	6 14.6
Reputation of school	0 0.0	9 19.1	5 12.2
Opportunity of working with Jerry Bubis	3 14.3	7 14.9	4 9.8
Quality of social work education	0 0.0	3 6.4	3 7.3
Quality of education about Jewish community	6 28.6	16 34.0	16 39.0
Jewish Studies curriculum	6 28.6	6 12.8	4 9.8
Other	0 <u>0.0</u>	0 <u>0.0</u>	1 <u>2.4</u>
Total	100 N=21 <hr/>	100 N=47 <hr/>	100 N=41 <hr/>

The most important reason for choosing H.U.C. was compared to job titles. In this area, there is less consistency in responses. Caseworkers did not designate financial aid, job probability, or reputation as important. Rather, caseworkers identified the academic factors as most important with Jewish Studies curriculum as outstanding. Group workers noted the school's reputation as having greatest importance in deciding to apply and job probability as least important. Executives, other Federation staff, and those not presently employed in Jewish communal service felt knowledge about the Jewish community was most important to them (see Table 5-24).

TABLE 5-24 REASONS FOR COMING TO SCHOOL

## BY JOB TITLE

	Case Work	Group Work	Agency Exec.	Feder. Exec.	Feder. Staff	Middle Manag.	Not in JCS
Financial aid	0 0.0	1 9.1	1 6.3	0 0.0	1 8.3	2 8.3	0 0.0
Probability of job	0 0.0	0 0.0	2 12.5	1 8.5	0 0.0	8 33.3	0 0.0
Reputation of school	0 0.0	3 27.3	2 12.5	1 8.3	3 25.0	4 16.7	0 0.0
Opportunity to work with Jerry Bubis	0 0.0	2 18.2	1 6.3	2 16.7	1 8.3	1 4.2	3 37.5
Quality of social work education	3 30.0	1 16.7	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 16.7	1 16.7	0 0.0
Quality of ed- ucation about Jewish community	3 30.0	2 18.2	7 43.8	7 58.3	4 33.3	5 20.8	4 50.0
Quality of Jewish Studies curriculum	4 40.0	2 18.2	3 18.8	2 8.3	2 16.7	2 16.7	1 12.6
Other	0 <u>0.0</u>	0 <u>0.0</u>	0 <u>0.0</u>	0 <u>0.0</u>	0 <u>0.0</u>	1 <u>4.2</u>	0 <u>0.0</u>
Total	100 N=10	100 N=11	100 N=16	100 N=12	100 N=12	100 N=24	100 N=8

The original hypothesis was that people would choose to attend H.U.C. for the quality of education about the Jewish community and the Jewish Studies curriculum. When asked, "How important were the following reasons in your choice of H.U.C.?", students chose the H.U.C. School of Jewish Communal Service because of academic/educational impetuses rather than considerations of pragmatics. The school professes to provide an arena for the study of Jewish issues and values and findings indicate that that is precisely what draws the students. The main emphasis of this school of Jewish Communal Service is the introduction and exploration of the Jewish component in social work practice. It is this element which attracts motivated applicants.



## CHAPTER SIX

### THE ROLE OF THE CURRICULUM

Levy noted that professional education needs to take into account the nature of Jewish communal service as well as the nature of social work. Respondents were therefore asked to rate those social work skills used in their jobs. A comparison was made of responses for first and current jobs in order to see in what areas changes in the field had occurred. The curriculum was then compared to these findings to see if there was a parallel change. The social work helping function within Jewish Communal Service demands an understanding of the organizational structure, sociology, values, traditions and practices of the Jewish community. Alumni perceptions of adequacy of preparation in these areas were compared with courses taken that relate to these topics. To further elucidate the degree of perceived proficiency, a comparison was made of frequency of use with degree of adequacy.

Respondents were asked to indicate on a scale of "frequently," "sometimes," "occasionally," and "never," use of areas of social work expertise (casework-counseling, advocacy, public relations, etc., see questionnaire, question 18, Appendix A). This was done for the respondents' first and current jobs. Table 6-1 shows the

TABLE 6-1  
FREQUENTLY USED SKILLS, TECHNIQUES OR METHODOLOGIES  
BY FIRST JOB/CURRENT JOB %

	First Job	Current Job
Casework - Counseling	28.8	24.4
Advocacy	29.4	28.2
Public Relations	49.0	57.0
Administration	49.0	74.4
Supervision	41.3	64.0
Fund Raising	27.9	41.9
Policy Formulation and Analysis	28.4	50.6
Community Organization	45.6	57.0
Group Work	52.0	34.1
Computers	6.8	22.1
Acting as a Client Advocate	17.5	17.6
Staff Development and Training	21.4	38.8
Consultation with Staff Members	56.3	68.2
Publicity	43.7	41.2
Writing Grants and Proposals	6.8	10.6
Leadership Development	34.3	51.8
Research	6.9	15.3
Writing Reports, Papers, Articles	29.1	41.2
New Program Development	49.0	56.0
Meeting with Representatives of Community Agencies	39.2	60.0

TABLE 6-1 (continued)

	First Job	Current Job
Meeting with Community Groups	28.4	48.2
Meeting with Public Officials	8.8	23.5
Lobbying	9.9	14.3
Jewish Family Education	15.7	10.6
Working with Boards and Lay People	53.9	76.5

There are many aspects of jobs listed above. Most respondents indicated several areas in which they were occupied.

Alumni were asked about nine areas of Jewish skills and information for their current job. They were asked to respond for each on three scales: "how often do you draw upon these knowledge areas, either directly or indirectly?"; "how much would you like to use these compared to now?"; "how adequate would you feel if you are to use these in your work?" Responses to the last rating were compared with courses to see if having taken a given class resulted in a concomitant feeling of adequacy. Courses were grouped according to the nine areas: knowledge of Jewish values, Jewish practice, Jewish ethnic groups, organization of Jewish community, Scripture, Jewish history, Jewish literature, contemporary Jewish issues and Hebrew. Only the salient comparisons of those who took the courses in the given areas with feelings of adequacy are

responses to "frequently" for this area. There are several areas of expertise respondents indicated increased in importance. These reflect changing demands of the field. For most of these, course work is available either at Hebrew Union College, or, within the context of the double master degree programs, at the associated universities. There are, however, three areas where little or no course work is available. Over one half of alumni work in areas of public relations. No course offerings are available in this area. Computer use is increasing, again an area where there is no specific course offering. The percentage of alumni stating frequent writing of reports, papers or articles has increased. Very little article writing occurs on the graduate level.

Areas that decreased in frequency of use are: casework, advocacy, group work, publicity and Jewish family education. Of these group work decreases most significantly. This seems to reflect the changing nature of Jewish Center work and upward mobility of positions. (Table 6-1 is on following page.)

reported. Table 6-2 shows responses to "how adequate would you feel you are to use these in your work" with indications of both those who took the course Jewish Thought and Practices and those who did not. People taking the course feel at least adequately prepared (81%). One hundred and seven of the 116 responded. Since this is not a course offered continuously since the school's origin, the numbers not taking the course yet answering the question is disproportionately large. Moreover, non-enrollees may well have decided not to do so because of previous preparation. Of those enrolled, 81.7% felt adequately to more than adequately prepared in this area. For the rest of the courses in this area, 87.5% of those who took the courses felt at least adequately prepared. (Table 6-2 is as follows.)

TABLE 6-2 ADEQUACY BY COURSE  
JEWISH THOUGHT AND PRACTICE

	Took Course	Non-Enrollee
More than adequately prepared	14 28.6	25 43.1
Adequately prepared	26 53.1	30 51.7
Not adequately prepared	9 <u>18.4</u>	3 <u>5.2</u>
Total	100 N=49	100 N=58

Missing Observations 9    Significance 0.0587

Taking courses focused on knowledge concerning Jewish practice seemed to have no impact on a sense of adequacy. This again reflects people opting out of courses because of prior knowledge. Ninety percent of non-enrollees felt at least adequately prepared.

Knowledge of Jewish literature reflected similar findings. In this area, however, only 50% of non-enrollees felt at least adequately prepared overall. As an example, the course on Holocaust Literature attracted seventy percent of all respondents. Of these, 31.2% of people taking the course did not feel adequately prepared as a result of taking the course. (Table 6-3 is as follows.)

TABLE 6-3 ADEQUACY BY  
HOLOCAUST LITERATURE

	Took Course	Non-Enrollee
More than adequately prepared	9 11.7	3 9.4
Adequately prepared	44 57.1	14 43.8
Not adequately prepared	24 <u>31.2</u>	15 <u>46.9</u>
Total	100 N=77	100 N=32

Missing Observations 7    Significance 0.2966

In knowledge of Jewish history only the course on Holocaust Literature shows any significance in the cross



tabulations (see Table 6-4). In the area of ethnic groups most reported feeling adequately, or more than adequately prepared. The course that attracted the most students also had the most impact, Jewish family. There are four incorrect replies since all students are required to enroll in this course. Of the 105 correct responses, only 15 did not feel adequately prepared (see Table 6-5). Alumni feel adequately prepared in knowledge about the Jewish community organization and Jewish issues, regardless of classes taken.

The only course compared to the area of Scripture was Bible and Rabbinic Literature. Since this course has not been offered for all the years of the school, significance may be interpreted as even higher. It should be noted that this course is an introductory one, preparing people to understand how to read the Bible within the context of rabbinic literature and not one that teaches Scripture per se. Table 6-6 shows the responses to this question. (Tables 6-4, 6-5, 6-6 are on the following pages.)

TABLE 6-4 ADEQUACY BY  
HOLOCAUST LITERATURE

	Took Course	Non-Enrollees
More than adequately prepared	14 18.4	5 16.1
Adequately prepared	44 57.9	11 35.5
Not adequately prepared	18 <u>23.7</u>	15 <u>48.4</u>
Total	100 N=76	100 N=31

Missing Observations 9      Significance 0.0374  
 $\chi^2$  6.57327

TABLE 6-5 ADEQUACY BY JEWISH FAMILY

	Took Course	Non-Enrollees
More than adequately prepared	26 24.8	0 0.0
Adequately prepared	64 61.0	3 75.0
Not adequately prepared	15 <u>14.3</u>	1 <u>25.0</u>
Total	100 N=105	100 N=4

TABLE 6-6 ADEQUACY BY  
BIBLE AND RABBINIC LITERATURE

	Took Course	Non-Enrollees
More than adequately prepared	1 2.6	12 17.4
Adequately prepared	17 43.6	23 33.3
Not adequately prepared	21 <u>53.8</u>	34 <u>49.3</u>
Total	100 N=39	100 N=69

Missing Observations 8      Significance 0.0685

The last area examined compared the question "How often do you draw upon these knowledge areas either directly or indirectly?" with the question "How adequate would you feel you are to use these in your work?" The knowledge areas are listed above. The researchers wanted to determine if people refrained from using knowledge areas because of feelings of inadequate preparation, and also if people felt adequately prepared in areas frequently drawn upon. The comparison of knowledge of Jewish values viewed in this way shows that of the 107 people responding to this question, 12 people feel inadequately prepared. The majority of people responding use this area frequently and 88% feel adequately prepared. This indicates that frequency of use is predicated on preparation and that Hebrew Union College seems to have prepared students well or alumni think this

is the case. Responses are shown in Table 6-7.

TABLE 6-7 KNOWLEDGE OF JEWISH VALUES BY  
FREQUENCY OF USE AND ADEQUACY

	More than Adequate	Adequate	Not Adequate
Frequency of use	26 66.7	32 57.1	4 33.3
Sometimes use	11 28.2	21 37.5	7 58.3
Never use	2 <u>5.1</u>	3 <u>5.4</u>	1 <u>8.3</u>
Total	100 N=39	100 N=56	100 N=12

Missing Observations 9      Significance 0.3701

One hundred and seven of the 116 responded to the question of knowledge of Jewish practice correlated with frequency and adequacy. Eighty five percent feel adequately prepared, however, 30.6% of those using this knowledge base "sometimes" feel inadequately prepared (see Table 6-8). Knowledge of Jewish ethnic groups viewed in this way shows that 14.7% feel that they are not adequately prepared. Nevertheless, of these, 75.1% draw upon this knowledge in their jobs. There is a sense that people have been adequately prepared in this area (see Table 6-9). Another area showing a high degree of preparation is knowledge of organization of the Jewish community. Two people reported that they felt that they did not have enough preparation.

Ninety eight people both use this knowledge and feel adequately prepared (see Table 6-10). It is clear that knowledge of Scripture is lacking for most respondents (see Table 6-11). One third of the respondents do not feel adequately prepared in knowledge of Jewish history and literature. Both are drawn upon frequently (see Tables 6-12 and 6-13). One hundred and nine of the 116 respondents answered question 19K, "knowledge of contemporary Jewish issues." Of these, 6 felt inadequately prepared. Ninety six feel at least adequately prepared and draw upon the knowledge (see Table 6-14). (Tables 6-8 through 6-14 are found on the following pages.)

TABLE 6-8 KNOWLEDGE OF JEWISH PRACTICE BY  
FREQUENCY AND ADEQUACY

	More than Adequate	Adequate	Not Adequate
Frequently use	22 66.7	24 41.4	1 6.3
Sometimes use	6 18.2	28 48.3	15 93.8
Never use	5 <u>15.2</u>	6 <u>10.3</u>	0 <u>0.0</u>
Total	100 N=33	100 N=58	100 N=16

Missing Observations 9    Significance 0.0000  
 $\chi^2$  25.15536

TABLE 6-9 KNOWLEDGE OF JEWISH ETHNIC GROUPS BY

## FREQUENCY AND ADEQUACY

	More than Adequate	Adequate	Not Adequate
Frequently use	13 50.0	25 37.3	1 6.3
Sometimes use	10 38.5	36 53.7	11 68.8
Never use	3 <u>11.5</u>	6 <u>9.0</u>	4 <u>25.0</u>
Total	100 N=26	100 N=67	100 N=16

Missing Observations 7 Significance 0.0402  
 $\chi^2$  10.01139

TABLE 6-10 KNOWLEDGE OF JEWISH ORGANIZATION BY

## FREQUENCY AND ADEQUACY

	More than Adequate	Adequate	Not Adequate
Frequently use	41 74.5	54 65.4	0 50.0
Sometimes use	10 18.2	13 25.0	1 50.0
Never use	4 <u>7.3</u>	5 <u>9.6</u>	0 <u>0.0</u>
Total	100 N=55	100 N=52	100 N=2

Missing Observations 7 Significance 0.7229



TABLE 6-11 KNOWLEDGE OF SCRIPTURE BY  
FREQUENCY AND ADEQUACY

	More than Adequate	Adequate	Not Adequate
Frequently use	5 38.5	6 15.0	0 0.0
Sometimes use	5 38.5	20 50.0	27 49.1
Never use	3 <u>23.1</u>	14 <u>35.0</u>	28 <u>50.9</u>
Total	100 N=13	100 N=40	100 N=55

Missing Observations 8    Significance 0.0006  
 $\chi^2$  19.64189

TABLE 6-12 KNOWLEDGE OF JEWISH HISTORY BY  
FREQUENCY AND ADEQUACY

	More than Adequate	Adequate	Not Adequate
Frequently use	7 36.8	8 14.5	5 15.2
Sometimes use	10 52.6	37 67.3	25 75.8
Never use	2 <u>10.5</u>	10 <u>18.2</u>	3 <u>9.1</u>
Total	100 N=19	100 N=55	100 N=33

Missing Observations 9    Significance 0.1679

TABLE 6-13 KNOWLEDGE OF JEWISH LITERATURE BY  
FREQUENCY AND ADEQUACY

	More than Adequate	Adequate	Not adequate
Frequently use	6 50.0	4 6.9	1 2.6
Sometimes use	4 33.3	39 67.2	22 56.4
Never use	2 <u>16.7</u>	15 <u>25.9</u>	16 <u>41.0</u>
Total	100 N=12	100 N=58	100 N=39

Missing Observations 7    Significance 0.0000  
x<sup>2</sup> 26.33354

TABLE 6-14 KNOWLEDGE OF CONTEMPORARY JEWISH ISSUES BY  
FREQUENCY AND ADEQUACY

	More than Adequate	Adequate	Not Adequate
Frequently use	27 75.1	45 67.2	5 83.3
Sometimes use	8 22.2	16 23.9	1 16.7
Never use	1 <u>2.8</u>	6 <u>9.0</u>	0 <u>0.0</u>
Total	100 N=36	100 N=67	100 N=6

Missing Observations 7    Significance 0.6836

The last knowledge area examined, Hebrew, is unique as there are no courses offered in this. Therefore, it was deemed incumbent on the researchers to explore this area one step further. Frequency of use is compared with adequacy as in the previous tables. In addition, a comparison was made of frequency of use with "How much would you like to use (this) as compared to now?" Many alumni use Hebrew in their work even though Hebrew is not offered and as a result many feel inadequately prepared. However, a large proportion felt it was not relevant to their work. Expected results were that those who feel inadequate do not use Hebrew in their work. Unexpected results were that 45 people wanted to use more Hebrew (see Table 6-15 and 6-16 below).

TABLE 6-15 KNOWLEDGE OF HEBREW BY  
FREQUENCY AND DESIRE TO USE

	Want to use more	Fine as is	Not relevant
Frequently use	4 8.9	7 28.0	0 0.0
Sometimes use	29 64.4	16 64.0	5 13.5
Never use	12 <u>26.7</u>	2 <u>8.0</u>	32 <u>86.5</u>
Total	100 N=45	100 N=25	100 N=37

Missing Observations 9    Significance 0.0000

$\chi^2$  51.06941

TABLE 6-16 KNOWLEDGE OF HEBREW BY  
FREQUENCY AND ADEQUACY

	More than Adequate	Adequate	Not Adequate
Frequently use	22 66.7	24 41.4	1 6.3
Sometimes use	6 18.2	28 48.3	15 93.8
Never use	5 <u>15.2</u>	6 <u>10.3</u>	0 <u>0.0</u>
Total	100 N=33	100 N=58	100 N=16

Missing Observations 9    Significance 0.0000  
 $\chi^2$  25.15536

Most areas of social work expertise are covered in the curricular offerings of either Hebrew Union College or by those universities that function in conjunction with the school. There are two areas of expertise that are not addressed by the curriculum: public relations and computer use. Usage of several areas of this expertise is diminishing, while the majority is increasing in usage. This reflects the changing trends of social work. As Reisman has stated, Jewish communal workers are called upon to perform a wide array of tasks, from the most menial to the most complex. It is not surprising that the majority of respondents indicate usage of a wide variety of social work tasks.

Overall, the School of Communal Service seems to do an excellent job preparing people with Jewish skills and information. Some skills and knowledge seem to be used more than they might considering that many do not feel adequately prepared in these. Based on these and the findings concerning social work expertise, recommendations for changes in the curriculum will be made in a later chapter.

There is much controversy over requiring Master's levels candidates to write theses. Several major universities have dropped this requirement in favor of research courses. For these reasons respondents were asked to evaluate the experience of writing a thesis, both in terms of applicability in the workplace, and personal growth. Further, they were given four options concerning the requirement: "keep the thesis," "replace it with a research course," "both are good ideas," "neither are good ideas." That feelings are strong concerning the thesis can be seen by the number of respondents who answered the question even though they had not written a thesis.

Specific application in the workplace was assessed by asking respondents to rate three statements by "very much applies to me," "somewhat applies to me," "does not apply to me." The statements are "Doing the thesis better enabled me to do research on the job," "Doing the thesis better enabled me to conduct research later on,"

"I referred to the thesis later." Most respondents stated that either enabling research on the job or conducting research later did not apply to their having done a thesis (see Tables 6-17 and 6-18). Many however, did refer to the thesis later (see Table 6-19). The assumption is that most graduates do not engage in quantitative research once they have left the school. They do refer to content of the thesis. This has vast implications for the process of choosing thesis topics since methodology does not appear to have application in the work setting. The two statements dealing with what the researchers felt was personal growth are "Doing the thesis helped me prove myself academically" and "Doing the thesis enabled me to develop an area of expertise." Most respondents felt that they did not prove themselves academically (see Table 20). The statement concerning expertise showed that while not quite 50% of respondents felt it did not apply, 35% felt that it very much applied to them (see Table 6-21). Viewing these results with those concerning later reference to the thesis reinforces the idea that content is more important than process. Despite the lack of application of the thesis, in reply to "how do you feel about doing the thesis" over 66% replied that it was a valuable experience (see Table 6-22). In contrast to this, less than 50% felt that the thesis requirement should be kept as is. They were divided as to whether it should be replaced by a research project or felt



that either were good ideas. This seems to imply that a choice of thesis or research project should be available (see Table 6-23). Specific recommendations regarding the thesis will be made in the concluding chapter.

TABLE 6-17 DOING THE THESIS BETTER ENABLED  
ME TO DO RESEARCH ON THE JOB

	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Cumulative Frequency (%)
Very much applies to me	13	13.5	13.5
Somewhat applies to me	22	22.9	36.5
Does not apply to me	61	63.5	100.0
Missing	<u>20</u>	—	—
Total	N=116	100.0	100.0
	—	—	—

TABLE 6-18 DOING THE THESIS ENABLED ME TO  
CONDUCT RESEARCH LATER ON

	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Cumulative Frequency (%)
Very much applies to me	8	8.3	8.3
Somewhat applies to me	14	14.6	22.9
Does not apply to me	74	77.1	100.0
Missing	<u>20</u>	—	—
Total	N=116	100.0	100.0
	—	—	—

TABLE 6-19 I REFERRED TO THE THESIS LATER ON

	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Cumulative Frequency (%)
Very much applies to me	31	32.3	32.3
Somewhat applies to me	20	20.8	53.1
Does not apply to me	45	46.9	100.0
Missing	<u>20</u>	_____	_____
Total	N=116	100.0	100.0
	—	_____	_____

TABLE 6-20 DOING THE THESIS ENABLED ME TO  
PROVE MYSELF ACADEMICALLY

	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Cumulative Frequency (%)
Very much applies to me	20	20.8	20.8
Somewhat applies to me	22	22.9	43.8
Does not apply to me	54	56.3	100.0
Missing	<u>20</u>	_____	_____
Total	N=116	100.0	100.0
	—	_____	_____

TABLE 6-21 DOING THE THESIS HELPED ME  
DEVELOP AND AREA OF EXPERTISE

	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Cumulative Frequency (%)
Very much applies to me	34	35.4	35.4
Somewhat applies to me	18	18.8	54.2
Does not apply to me	44	45.8	100.0
Missing	<u>20</u>	_____	_____
Total	N=116	100.0	100.0
	—	_____	_____

TABLE 6-22 HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT HAVING DONE A THESIS

	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Cumulative Frequency (%)
Valuable experience	43	66.2	66.2
Not particularly valuable experience	13	20.0	86.2
Not at all valuable experience	9	13.8	100.0
Missing	<u>20</u>	_____	_____
Total	N=116	100.0	100.0
	_____	_____	_____

TABLE 6-23 SHOULD THE THESIS REQUIREMENT  
BE KEPT OR DROPPED

	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Cumulative Frequency (%)
Keep thesis requirement	36	40.4	40.4
Drop the thesis and add a research course	19	21.3	61.8
Either are good ideas	27	30.3	92.1
Neither are good ideas	7	7.9	100.0
Missing	<u>27</u>	_____	_____
Total	N=116	100.0	100.0
	_____	_____	_____

One of the central concerns for people working in the Jewish community, indeed for Jews generally, is familiarity with Israel--politically and in terms of support. It is widely recognized that Jews in the Diaspora and those in Israel need to understand one another and the social

systems that govern each others' lives. For this reason the school biennially co-sponsors a seminar in Israel. Nearly 90% of all graduates of the school have been to Israel, 20% of whom participated in the Israel seminar. Only five such seminars have occurred; all held in the winter when Certificate students are not in school. It is probable that the seminar provides an opportunity for people who have not previously gone to Israel to do so since there are scholarships available for this. Most participating in the seminar (55%) found that it gave them personal inspiration as a Jew and 50% use knowledge gained there in their work. As the seminar is available for non-students as well, evaluation of this is beyond the scope of this study. What can be seen is that those students who have gone to Israel in conjunction with their studies have benefitted from the seminar.

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion with  
George Warren Brown University and University of Southern  
California

Many people attending the school do so in order to gain expertise in Jewish studies while concurrently receiving training in the fields of expertise offered at either George Warren Brown or the University of Southern California. They pursue parallel education with the scholastic institutions recognizing courses from one another, thus permitting students to emerge with two

graduate degrees. This study does not pretend to evaluate education offered by institutions other than Hebrew Union College. There is, however, the issue of complementary versus conflictual education. For these reasons alumni were asked to rate which institution, if either, had the greatest effect on their development of a professional sense of self and whether the material presented was complementary. Less than 15% of respondents felt that either USC or George Warren Brown were more important in their development than was H.U.C. Slightly more than one third felt H.U.C. to be more important. Since 49% of respondents felt that the institutions were equally important, it is clear that material presented was complementary as was the experience. Responses to the question of complementarity stated that there was neither repetition nor conflict for more than 90%. While it is difficult to maintain a balance when the needs of two institutions must be considered, an equitable relationship has been achieved. Students benefit from the experiences at both institutions almost equally (see Tables 6-24 and 6-25).

TABLE 6-24 WHICH INSTITUTION HAD THE GREATEST EFFECT  
ON DEVELOPMENT OF A PROFESSIONAL SENSE OF SELF

	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Cumulative Frequency (%)
Both equally important	21	48.8	48.8
H.U.C. more important	16	37.2	86.0
USC/GWB more important	6	14.0	100.0
Missing	<u>73</u>	—	—
Total	N=116	100.0	100.0
	—	—	—

TABLE 6-25 COMPLEMENTARITY OF COURSE MATERIAL

	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Cumulative Frequency (%)
Material was complementary	33	91.7	91.7
Material was in opposition	2	5.6	97.2
Material was repetitious	1	2.8	100.0
Missing	<u>80</u>	—	—
	N=116	100.0	100.0
	—	—	—

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### ALUMNI IN THE WORK PLACE

Do alumni work in the field of Jewish communal service once they have left H.U.C.? What kinds of jobs do they accept? What criteria are used to determine this acceptance? Question 11 asked about current employment status. Answers indicated whether alumni remained in Jewish communal service, social work or were unemployed. Their status was further broken down into categories of "full time," "part time," "not employed by personal choice," "not employed due to other circumstances," or "in school for an additional degree." To determine the kind of job alumni accepted, Question 13 asked for job title. Respondents noted their job title for both their first jobs and their current jobs. Question 16 offered a variety of criteria for accepting job offers. A subjective rating was used to determine the importance of these criteria. The responses enabled the researchers to analyze how these were valued by alumni.



Table 7-1 indicates current employment status responses. The overwhelming majority of alumni were employed full time in Jewish communal service. Those indicated being employed, but not in either social work or Jewish communal service included rabbis and Jewish educators who may have not seen themselves as working in Jewish communal service per se.

Only the category of first job was analyzed to determine the immediate effect of the experience at H.U.C. Given this, 90 respondents (85.5%) stated that their first job was in Jewish communal service. The emphasis on macro practice (working with groups rather than individuals) is a natural outgrowth of involvement in a voluntary community, one where emphasis is placed on volunteer and lay involvement. The highest category of jobs fell in the level of middle management including program directors. Of the eleven caseworkers, 7 were working in the Jewish community. These results were drawn from a comparison between Tables 7-2 and 7-3 following.

TABLE 7-1 CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS

	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Cumulative Frequency (%)
Full time JCS	80	69.6	69.6
Part time JCS	2	1.7	71.3
Employed but not in JCS or S.W.	10	6.1	87.8
Full time S.W. but not in a Jewish setting	7	6.1	77.4
Part time S.W. but not in a Jewish setting	2	1.7	79.4
Not employed by personal choice	8	7.0	94.8
Not employed due to other circumstances	3	2.6	97.4
In school for additional degree	3	2.6	100.0
	115	100.0	

Valid Case=116

Missing Case=1

Responses to Question 13-B, "job title" were collapsed into categories:

1. caseworker
2. group worker (Jewish community center, community organization)
3. executive directors of agencies
4. executive directors of Jewish federations
5. other federation staff (campaign, Community Relations Committee)
6. program director and other middle management
7. jobs not in communal service
8. rabbinic/not in labor force

TABLE 7-2 FIRST JOB TITLE

	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency (%)	Cumulative Frequency (%)
caseworker	11	11.0	11.0
group worker	12	12.0	23.0
executive directors of agencies	16	16.0	39.0
executive directors of Jewish federations	13	13.0	52.0
other federation staff	12	12.0	64.0
program director and other middle management	27	27.0	91.0
jobs not in communal service	9	9.0	100.0
rabbinic/not in labor force	<u>16</u>	<u>Missing</u>	100.0
	116	100.0	
	<hr/>	<hr/>	

Valid cases=100

Missing cases=16

An error in key punching resulted in  
rabbinic and not in labor force being  
reported as missing cases.

TABLE 7-3 JOBS IN AND OUTSIDE JEWISH COMMUNITY

	Jobs in Jewish community	Jobs in non Jewish community
caseworker	7 8.4	4 26.7
group worker	12 14.5	0 0.0
executive directors of agencies	14 16.9	1 6.7
executive directors of Jewish federations	12 14.5	1 6.7
other federation staff	10 12.0	1 6.7
program director and other middle management	24 28.9	3 20.0
jobs not in communal service	4 <u>4.8</u>	5 <u>33.3</u>
Total	100	100
	N=83	N=15

To further clarify how program choice had an impact on first jobs, job titles were compared with programs. Certificate respondents are already employed. Table 7-4 reflects the distribution.

TABLE 7-4 IMPACT OF PROGRAM CHOICE ON  
FIRST JOB TITLE

	CASEWORKER	GROUP WORKER	EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS OF AGENCIES	EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS OF JEWISH FEDERATIONS	OTHER FEDERATION STAFF	PROGRAM DIRECTOR AND OTHER MIDDLE MANAGEMENT	JOBS NOT IN COMMUNAL SERVICE
Certificate	2 18.2	4 33.3	11 68.8	4 30.8	6 50.0	6 22.2	6 66.7
MAJCS	1 9.1	2 16.7	1 6.3	3 23.1	2 16.7	7 25.9	0 0.0
Double Masters HUC/GWB	2 18.2	1 8.3	1 6.3	2 15.4	1 8.3	4 14.8	0 0.0
Double Masters HUC/USC	6 54.5	5 41.7	3 18.8	3 23.1	3 25.0	7 25.9	2 22.2
MAJCS MAJE	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 7.7	0 0.0	2 7.4	1 11.1
Other	0 <u>0.0</u>	0 <u>0.0</u>	0 <u>0.0</u>	0 <u>0.0</u>	0 <u>0.0</u>	1 <u>3.7</u>	0 <u>0.0</u>
Total	100 N=11	100 N=12	100 N=16	100 N=13	100 N=12	100 N=27	100 N=9

Question 13 also asked for salary range (first job and current job). These two salaries were compared. Salary increases caused by monetary inflation since 1969 are not taken into account (see Table 7-5).

TABLE 7-5 SALARIES ON FIRST JOB AND  
ON CURRENT JOB

ANNUAL SALARY	First Job			Current Job		
	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (%)	CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY (%)	ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY	ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (%)	CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY (%)
15,000 and under	56	50.5	50.5	5	5.7	5.7
16-20,000	33	29.7	80.2	12	13.8	19.5
21-25,000	17	15.3	95.5	10	11.5	31.0
26,30,000	2	1.8	97.3	18	20.7	51.7
31-40,000	2	1.8	99.1	18	20.7	72.4
40,000 and over	1	0.9	100	24	27.6	100
Missing	<u>5</u>	<u>Missing</u>		<u>29</u>	<u>Missing</u>	
	116	100.0		116	100.0	

Gender was also used as a variable in salary range. A comparison of Table 7-6 (first salary by gender) with Table 7-7 (current salary by gender) showed that more

men increased their salaries to over 40,000 than did women. Indeed only one woman respondent reported over 40,000 annually. While it appears that men and women enter the field at comparable salary ranges, the differential increases over time.

TABLE 7-6 FIRST JOB SALARIES FOR MEN AND WOMEN

	15,000 and under	16- 20,000	21- 25,000	26- 30,000	31- 40,000	Over 40,000
Men	31 55.4	10 30.3	7 41.2	2 100	2 100	1 100
Women	25 <u>44.6</u>	23 <u>69.7</u>	10 <u>58.8</u>	0 <u>0.0</u>	0 <u>0.0</u>	0 <u>0.0</u>
Total	100 N=56	100 N=33	100 N=17	100 N=2	100 N=2	100 N=1

TABLE 7-7 CURRENT JOB SALARIES FOR MEN AND WOMEN

	15,000 and under	16- 20,000	21- 25,000	26- 30,000	31- 40,000	Over 40,000
Men	0 0.0	3 25.0	3 30.0	7 38.9	11 61.1	23 95.8
Women	5 <u>100.0</u>	9 <u>75.0</u>	7 <u>70.0</u>	11 <u>61.1</u>	7 <u>38.9</u>	1 <u>4.2</u>
Total	100 N=5	100 N=12	100 N=10	100 N=18	100 N=18	100 N=24



Tables 7-8A and 7-8B show responses to Question 16, "In accepting a job offer, how important were the following considerations?" Respondents had the option of indicating as many reasons as was deemed appropriate. People accepted jobs for a variety of reasons. Important criteria were professional growth, variety of responsibilities, interest in day-to-day activities of the job, and mission of the work. Highest salary offered was a factor for 50% of the respondents. Most school graduates receive more than one job offer.

TABLE 7-8A REASONS FOR ACCEPTING JOBS BY  
FIRST AND CURRENT JOBS

	First Job					
	Very Much Applies		Somewhat Applies		Does Not Apply	
	Abs. Freq	Rel. Freq %	Abs. Freq	Rel. Freq %	Abs. Freq	Rel. Freq %
Highest salary	8	8.2	41	41.8	49	50.0
Only job offer	16	16.0	12	12.0	72	72.0
Opportunity professional growth	78	77.2	19	18.8	4	3.5
Mission of work	68	68.7	28	28.3	3	3.0
Opportunity professional advancement	48	48.5	39	39.4	12	12.1
Activities of job	74	73.3	24	23.8	3	3.0
Variety responsibility	76	76.0	18	18.0	6	6.0
Prestige of job	20	20.4	51	52.0	27	27.6
Prestige agency	20	20.2	48	48.5	31	31.3
Philosophy agency	55	55.0	35	35.0	10	10.0
Nice place to work	33	33.3	37	37.4	29	29.3
Job perquisites	13	13.3	46	46.9	39	39.8
Ease commute	15	15.3	21	21.4	62	63.3
Stay with family	16	16.3	10	10.2	72	73.5
Stay with spouse	20	21.1	10	10.5	65	68.4

Respondents indicated more than one answer therefore only absolute frequencies and relative frequencies are given. 114

TABLE 7-8B REASONS FOR ACCEPTING JOBS BY  
FIRST AND CURRENT JOBS

	CURRENT JOB					
	Very Much Applies		Somewhat Applies		Does Not Apply	
	Abs. Freq	Rel. Freq %	Abs. Freq	Rel. Freq %	Abs. Freq	Rel. Freq %
Highest salary	16	19.0	31	36.9	37	44.0
Only job offer	10	12.3	3	3.7	68	84.0
Opportunity professional growth	73	84.9	10	11.6	3	3.0
Mission of work	64	78.0	16	19.5	2	2.4
Opportunity professional advancement	51	61.4	20	24.1	12	14.5
Activities of job	68	80.0	16	18.8	1	1.2
Variety responsibility	69	82.1	12	14.3	3	3.6
Prestige of job	38	46.3	35	42.7	9	11.0
Prestige of agency	30	36.1	39	47.0	14	16.9
Philosophy agency	53	64.6	21	25.6	8	9.8
Nice place to work	28	34.1	32	39.0	22	26.8
Job perquisites	16	19.8	35	43.2	30	37.0
Ease commute	17	20.7	21	25.6	44	53.7
Stay with family	16	19.3	9	19.3	58	69.9
Stay with spouse	19	23.7	6	7.5	55	68.8

Respondents indicated more than one answer therefore only absolute frequencies and relative frequencies are given.

The final area of investigation dealt with alumni perceptions of how the experience at H.U.C.-JIR School of Jewish Communal Service was recognized in the work place. These perceptions were separated into two areas: external recognition as evidenced by being offered a job, salary and level of responsibility; personal feelings of competency as seen through ability to work with lay people, increased understanding of issues, and increased understanding of the Jewish community.

Alumni were asked to respond with statements of "definitely," "I think so," "definitely not" for both first and current jobs. Respondents to the questionnaire were separated into four categories: gender, program, last year attended and job title. The researchers assumed men and women would have different perceptions of the impact of H.U.C. since men tend to rise higher in the field of Jewish communal service. The various programs available at the school lead to different positions. A cross tabulation of program with the question "Did your attendance at H.U.C. make a difference for you?" was pertinent. The school's response to changing trends is indicated by the last year of attendance since programs continue to be added and modified. Level and field of entry had a bearing on how people view themselves in the field.

The area "being selected or promoted over others" was controlled for those working in the Jewish community.

The responses to this question compared with gender shows that attendance at H.U.C. was perceived as influencing women's selection and promotions more than men's. This seemed due to women relying on the degree for acceptance, while men are accepted more readily.

TABLE 7-9 IMPORTANCE OF BEING H.U.C. GRADUATE IN  
BEING SELECTED OR PROMOTED: PERCEPTIONS OF MEN AND WOMEN

	Male	Female
Definitely	13 34.2	18 40.9
I think so	7 18.4	14 31.8
Probably not	18 <u>47.4</u>	12 <u>27.3</u>
Total	100 N=38	100 N=44

The importance of being an H.U.C. graduate in being selected or promoted proved not to be significant. With last year of attendance, however, responses show a sequential increase in "definitely" which reflects the school maturation and subsequent increase in reputation. The correlary to this was a decrease in "definitely not."

TABLE 7-10 IMPORTANCE OF BEING H.U.C. GRADUATE IN  
BEING SELECTED OR PROMOTED: BY YEAR OF ATTENDANCE

	1969-73	1974-78	1979-83
Definitely	5 31.3	14 35.9	12 44.4
I think so	1 6.3	12 30.8	8 29.6
Probably not	10 <u>62.5</u>	13 <u>33.3</u>	7 <u>25.9</u>
Total	100 N=16	100 N=39	100 N=27

Significance 0.1190

4° Freedom

$\chi^2$  7.33985

Table 7-11 shows the responses to the cross tabulation of "being selected or promoted" with job title. Caseworkers overwhelmingly responded that "being selected or promoted over other candidates" had some effect (71% "I think so"). This indicates that social work degrees probably are of greater importance than degrees in Jewish communal service. The latter degree speaks to an increased knowledge and sensitivity to Jewish concerns. The responses of alumni in middle management indicate the greatest number opting for "definitely." Since most people attending H.U.C. in programs of communal service enter the field at the middle management level, this finding was not surprising. It can also be deduced that attendance at H.U.C.-JIR School of Jewish Communal Service is

advantageous in this category.

TABLE 7-11 IMPORTANCE OF BEING SELECTED OR PROMOTED  
OVER OTHER CANDIDATES: BY JOB TITLE

	CASEWORKER	GROUP WORKER	EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS OF AGENCIES	EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS OF JEWISH FEDERATIONS	OTHER FEDERATION STAFF	PROGRAM DIRECTOR AND OTHER MIDDLE MANAGEMENT	JOBS NOT IN COMMUNAL SERVICE
Definitely	1 14.3	5 41.7	2 20.0	4 44.4	4 40.0	12 54.5	1 33.3
I think so	5 71.4	2 16.7	2 20.0	2 22.2	2 20.0	6 27.3	0 0.0
Probably not	1 14.3	5 41.7	6 60.0	3 33.3	4 40.0	4 18.2	2 66.7
Total	100 N=7	100 N=12	100 N=10	100 N=9	100 N=10	100 N=22	100 N=3

Missing Observations 43    Significance 0.1857

$\chi^2$  16.12131

Results of cross tabulation of "receiving a higher salary" with gender, program, last year of attendance, and job title, were not salient. Generally, respondents did not feel that they received higher salaries. Table 7-12 shows responses to this area for all answering to "first job." Table 7-13 shows responses to "receiving greater responsibility than colleagues not have been to



H.U.C." As in Table 7-12, respondents did not feel they received greater responsibility than colleagues.

TABLE 7-12 IMPORTANCE OF BEING AN H.U.C. GRADUATE IN RECEIVING A HIGHER SALARY: BY FIRST AND CURRENT JOB

	FIRST JOB			CURRENT JOB		
	Abs. Freq	Adj. Freq %	Cum. Freq %	Abs. Freq	Adj. Freq %	Cum. Freq %
Definitely	15	15.5	15.5	9	10.6	10.6
I think so	21	21.6	37.1	15	17.6	28.2
Probably not	61	62.9	100	61	71.8	100
Missing	<u>19</u>	—	—	<u>31</u>	—	—
Total	N=116	100	100	N=116	100	100
	—	—	—	—	—	—

TABLE 7-13 IMPORTANCE OF BEING AN H.U.C. GRADUATE IN RECEIVING GREATER RESPONSIBILITY: BY FIRST AND CURRENT JOB

	FIRST JOB			CURRENT JOB		
	Abs. Freq	Adj. Freq %	Cum. Freq %	Abs. Freq	Adj. Freq %	Cum. Freq %
Definitely	14	14.6	14.6	11	13.4	13.4
I think so	16	16.7	31.3	6	7.3	20.7
Probably not	66	68.8	100	65	79.3	100
Missing	<u>20</u>	—	—	<u>34</u>	—	—
Total	N=116	100	100	N=116	100	100
	—	—	—	—	—	—

The next measurements concerned personal feelings of competency as seen through ability to work with lay

people, increased understanding of issues, and increased understanding of the Jewish community. These were divided into "being better able to work with lay people," "being better able to understand issues," and "being better able to understand the Jewish community."

In working with lay people, job titles were used for cross tabulation in order to ascertain with greater clarity which positions are perceived to be affected by this knowledge. Table 7-14 shows the result of this cross tabulation. The category of Federation staff, registers the highest frequency of "definite" responses. Since the nature of Federation work usually entails a large degree of interface with lay boards, etc., this finding seems to be an accurate reflection of professional realities.

TABLE 7-14 IMPORTANCE OF BEING AN H.U.C. GRADUATE AS  
A RESULT OF BEING BETTER ABLE TO WORK WITH LAY PEOPLE:

BY JOB TITLE

	CASEWORKER	GROUP WORKER	EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS OF AGENCIES	EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS OF JEWISH FEDERATIONS	OTHER FEDERATION STAFF	PROGRAM DIRECTOR AND OTHER MIDDLE MANAGEMENT	JOBS NOT IN COMMUNAL SERVICE
Definitely	1 16.7	1 8.3	5 45.5	4 44.4	5 55.6	7 33.3	1 33.3
I think so	3 50.0	5 41.7	4 36.4	2 22.2	3 33.3	6 28.6	1 33.3
Probably not	2 33.3	6 50.0	2 18.2	3 33.3	1 11.1	8 38.1	1 33.3
Total	100 N=6	100 N=12	100 N=11	100 N=9	100 N=9	100 N=21	100 N=3

The final two areas investigated, "being able to understand issues" and being better able to understand the Jewish community," elicited a large number of "definite" responses. It is evident that respondents felt greater competence in these areas as a result of attendance at H.U.C.

TABLE 7-15 BEING BETTER ABLE TO UNDERSTAND ISSUES

	FIRST JOB			CURRENT JOB		
	Abs. Freq	Adj. Freq %	Cum. Freq %	Abs. Freq	Adj. Freq %	Cum. Freq %
Definitely	59	59.6	59.6	57	67.1	67.1
I think so	23	23.2	82.8	21	24.7	91.8
Probably not	17	17.2	100	7	8.2	100
Missing	<u>17</u>	—	—	<u>31</u>	—	—
Total	N=116	100	100	N=116	100	100
	—	—	—	—	—	—

TABLE 7-16 BEING BETTER ABLE TO UNDERSTAND  
THE JEWISH COMMUNITY

	FIRST JOB			CURRENT JOB		
	Abs. Freq	Adj. Freq %	Cum. Freq %	Abs. Freq	Adj. Freq %	Cum. Freq %
Definitely	68	68.7	68.7	65	76.5	76.5
I think so	19	19.2	87.9	10	11.8	88.2
Probably not	12	12.1	100	10	11.8	100
Missing	<u>17</u>	—	—	<u>31</u>	—	—
Total	N=116	100	100	N=116	100	100
	—	—	—	—	—	—

H.U.C. alumni responding to the questionnaire were a representative sample and they choose to remain in Jewish community work. Moreover, they are employed on a full time basis; the highest concentration of whom accept middle management positions for their first jobs. The highest

salaries are made by men, even at the beginning levels. Respondents were usually offered more than one job. Criteria for job choice indicates that while these are varied, professional philosophic concerns outweigh practical considerations.

The H.U.C. experience does make a difference in professional skills, sensitivities and specific knowledge. "Getting an edge" over colleagues in a competitive sense does not seem to apply as much as gaining a sense of confidence vis a vis the issues of Jewish communal work. There is a certain differential in competence and/or capabilities as perceived by the subjects, but the rewards remain self-gratification and confidence rather than those externally granted by the employer, at least as perceived by the alumni.

## CHAPTER EIGHT

### CONCLUSION

The attempt to discover alumni perceptions of the School of Jewish Communal Service was limited by the very nature of the methodology employed. There was no way other than use of a questionnaire. The number of people involved and the fact that they live and work throughout the United States, Canada and Israel precluded any other method of soliciting their perceptions. Moreover, there was a concern to preserve as much anonymity as possible, facilitating honesty in both appreciation and criticism of the school.

It was determined that the survey would only address alumni perceptions since the school's impact could most easily be assessed in this way. Supervisors of alumni probably perceive the impact of the school differently. While their perceptions are important, this aspect was deemed beyond the scope of the study. For similar reasons neither faculty nor currently enrolled students were included.

There are several limitations present in the study. The need to use closed questions to facilitate the handling of the volume of information precluded investigation of a number of areas. The questionnaire did not

attempt to differentiate between preparation acquired at the school, before enrollment, on-the-job training, or elsewhere. Education occurs in many different ways and it is very difficult to distinguish what setting imparted what knowledge. This is complicated further when viewing the experience in retrospect. The use of check-off lists does not allow room for differences of personal opinion. Above all, the quality of interaction between faculty and students and the quality of socialization cannot be easily assessed by this form of questionnaire.

Graduates have commented that the "H.U.C." experience is more than simply an intellectual process. It is composed of multi-faceted experiences which begin prior to admission and continue post graduation. The concern for the individual permeates the school. This ambiance governs the school's pre-admission attitude toward potential enrollees and is evidenced in the packet sent to all those admitted. This material is developed by a committee of faculty, administrators and students. The shared participation on the part of the entire college community is typical of the quality of interaction on the campus. Community-building begins with Shabbat dinners prior to the commencement of classes, and a Sunday brunch cum registration where attention is paid to personal needs. Shortly after the beginning of classes each summer, the entire school, faculty, students and their families spend a



communal weekend in a camp setting. The warmth generated by the relaxed nature of the setting allows people to get to know each other as individuals, and sets the tone for the entire collegial experience. In a professional sense, the first summer field practicum serves as a comprehensive introduction to the individual characters and agencies/institutions of the organized Jewish community of Los Angeles. Opportunities are also available for students to participate in professional associations and gatherings (e.g., General Assembly of the Council of Jewish Federations). The integration of the School of Jewish Communal Service with the Rabbinic School and the School of Jewish Education occurs constantly, in particular through evening seminars, special holiday programming, and bi-weekly synagogue services.

The regard and warmth with which the alumni continue to view the school is conveyed through the response to the request for evaluation. Alumni were asked to return their responses within ten days. Despite mail problems, the majority of questionnaires were returned by the end of the first week post mailing. Within this ten day period, over one half of alumni had returned the completed questionnaire. A cut-off date had to be imposed; despite this, questionnaires continued to arrive.

Many alumni took advantage of the opportunity to make personal comments. The full list of these can be

found in Appendix C. Many comments were made about the overall positive impact of the school experience. Moreover, alumni have been contacting the researchers' with requests for early results.

The sample returned was representative. Because of this it was possible to determine certain attitudes with regard to gender. Women feel that attendance at H.U.C. is more helpful in terms of job procurement than do men. They therefore rely on the degrees more than do their male counterparts. This is symptomatic of society at large where men have less need to rely on these externals since they have many successful role models and are accepted as professionals. That men are more readily recognized in the field is shown by the fact that less than 5% of alumnae earn over \$25,000 per year while almost 70% of men do so. Indeed, 28% of men earn more than \$40,000. This attitude is not, however, prevalent in the school itself.

Most of the graduates of the programs enter the work force on a middle management level. Their duties entail supervision. While H.U.C. has attempted to address this, a strong recommendation is made that a supervision course become a permanent part of the curriculum.

By definition, knowledge of Jewish values and contemporary issues permeates all activities within Jewish communal service. While this may not always be recognized by alumni, in truth it is the underlying philosophical

premise of all Jewish agencies and organizations. Individuals consciously or unconsciously use this knowledge, whether this be within the confines of the organized Jewish community or in less secular settings.

It is evident that the quality of presentation of the Jewish component, both formally and informally, is excellent. There are, however, some areas of Jewish knowledge that merit greater emphasis. Alumni feel less prepared in knowledge of Scripture, Jewish history and Jewish literature. They also perceive that these areas are used in their work. It is therefore recommended that more courses be offered in these areas. The school, to date, has not offered Hebrew Language instruction. Based on alumni needs, it is recommended that such courses be made available.

The social work preparation has not been seen as significant for motivation to enroll. It should, however, be noted that this is a large component for enrollees in MAJCS and Double Master-George Warren Brown programs and therefore deserves greater emphasis. There are areas of this expertise that need particular emphasis. These include methods and techniques of supervision, fund raising, policy formulation and analysis, familiarity and working knowledge of the lay structure, and coalition-building. Three areas that need to be addressed are computer use, public relations, and the writing of reports, articles and

research. These are not currently part of the curriculum.

Despite the fact that there are a limited number of casework-counseling positions available within the organized Jewish community, caseworkers are consistently attracted to the school and find that the Jewish studies curriculum is paramount in their education. It is therefore recommended that casework continue to be part of the curriculum and encouraged.

There are two areas that pose some unique curricular concerns: thesis requirement; participation in the Israel seminar. It is clear that the Israel Seminar offers unique experiences in religious, political and professional arenas. It is valuable for neophytes and for those who have previous Israel experience. The seminar itself mixes students with professionals and Diaspora Jews with their Israeli colleagues. Clearly the seminar is helpful both personally and professionally and therefore participation should be strongly encouraged.

The second unique area concerns requiring that all Masters candidates complete a thesis. One of the most important underlying factors is that graduate students have the opportunity and the time to conduct original research, a luxury not often available to full-time professionals. Because of this, the results of the research need to be disseminated to a wide audience. Alumni stressed that the content of the thesis was extremely important. They also

indicated that they rarely engage in research once in the field. Therefore it is the content of research rather than the process that is seen as significant. For these reasons the following recommendations are made:

1. That the thesis requirement be transformed into writing of articles of professional quality. The choice of topic needs to be carefully considered and should reflect personal interest, area of advocacy, or a field in which expertise is desired. The content of this exploration can be reflected in other coursework thereby assisting in the integration of material from the varied educational components.
2. That because the thesis is presently conducted under the auspices of H.U.C., technical information (e.g., research courses) should be supplied through H.U.C. Moreover, in this way research in the field could be assessed and evaluated.

The experience of doing original research has been valuable to alumni. One of the provisions for advancement and upward mobility has often been publication of articles.

There is little question that this transformation, from thesis to article, will be of more assistance to the individual and to the profession.

The school's reputation has increased through the years. This reputation carries even more weight with



Certificate students who are familiar with the field. In the current economic crisis, more people are seeking advanced degrees in order to successfully compete in a shrinking job market. The school's reputation enhances these degrees and may prove to be helpful in the future.

The recommendations proposed reflect the dynamic nature of both the environment of the school and the changing requirements of the field. The mandate of the school has been to prepare professionals for the field of Jewish communal service. Alumni have indicated that the school has done an extremely good job in the area of knowledge about the Jewish community. The needs of the field for competent, trained professionals, skilled in Jewish knowledge, imbued with the values and traditions of that heritage, sensitive to contemporary concerns and pluralities, are being met.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arkava, Morton L. and Brennen, Clifford. "Quality Control in Social Work Education," Competency-based Education for Social Work.
- Bubis, Gerald B. "Introduction: Professional Education," The Turbulent Decades. New York: Conference of Jewish Communal Service, 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Birth of a School," Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal, October, 1971.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Memoranda of meetings, July 31 to October 15, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Report: After Two Summers, 1971.
- Davis, Howard R.; Windle, Charles and Sharfstein, Steven S. "Developing Guidelines for Program Evaluation Capability in Community Mental Health Centers," Social Work, Journal of the National Association of Social Workers, July, 1982, Vol. 27, No. 4.
- Feldman, Leon A. "Jewish Training Orientation of Social Workers," Jewish Social Work Forum, Vol. 3, No. 2, Spring, 1965.
- Fink, Arlene and Kosecoff, Jacqueline. An Evaluation Primer. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1978.
- Freund, Michael. Training for Jewish Social Welfare with Special Reference to the Training Bureau for Jewish Communal Service. Prepared under the auspices of the Continuing Committee of the Board of Trustees of the Training Bureau for Jewish Communal Service, New York, March, 1956.
- Gold, Bertram and Pins, Arnulf. "Effective Preparation for Jewish Community Center Work," Journal of Jewish Communal Service, 39, 1962
- Gold, Bertram H. "Feasibility Study for a Department of Jewish Communal Service for the Los Angeles School of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion," submitted May 24, 1967.

- Golden, Deborah; Pins, Arnulf M. and Jones, Wyatt. Students in Schools of Social Work: A Study of Characteristics and Factors Affecting Career Choice and Practice Concentration, Council of Social Work Education, 1972.
- Goldman, Ralph I. "The Role of the Professional in Developing and Shaping Jewish Communal Policies and Strategies," International Conference of Jewish Communal Service, Jerusalem, August 23-28, 1981.
- Janowsky, Oscar. The JWB Survey. New York: Dial Press, 1948.
- Kaplan, Rosa. "Summary of Responses to Alumni Survey Conducted January to March, 1978."
- Karff, Samuel E. Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion at One Hundred Years, editor, Hebrew Union College Press, 1976.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research, 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston, 1973.
- Kraft, Louis. A Century of the Jewish Community Center Movement. New York: Jewish Community Center Centennial Committee, 1953.
- Lauffer, Armand. "The Future of Social Work in the Jewish Community Center: The Case of the Disinclined Student," Journal of Jewish Communal Service, vol. 46, No. 1, Fall, 1969.
- Levy, Charles S. "Education for Social Work Practice in Jewish Communal Service," Journal of Jewish Communal Service, Vol. LII, No. 1, 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Professional Role of the Social Worker in the Jewish Communal Service," Jewish Social Work Forum, Vol. 1, No. 2, Spring, 1961.
- Patton, Michael Quinn. Qualitative Evaluation Methods. London: Sage Publications, 1980.
- Pins, Arnulf M. "Who Chooses Social Work and Why? An Exploratory Study of Factors influencing Career Choices in Social Work," Council on Social Work Education. New York: New York, 1963.

Pins, Arnulf M. "The Jewish Social Work Student: Some Research data about him and their Implications for the shortage of Jewish Community Center Workers," Journal of Jewish Communal Service, Vol. II, No. 1, September, 1964.

Radin, Norma. "University of Michigan Study," 1973.

Reisman, Bernard. "An Alternative Perspective on Training Jewish Communal Workers," Journal of Jewish Communal Service, Vol. 52, 1976.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Social Work Education and Jewish Communal Service and Jewish Community Centers: Time for a Change," Journal of Jewish Communal Service, Vol. XLVIII, No. 4, 1972.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Jewish Component in the Training Programs of Jewish Communal Workers," Journal of Jewish Communal Service, Vol. LVIII, No. 2.

Runyon, Richard P. and Haber, Audrey. Fundamentals of Behavioral Statistics, 4th ed., Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1980.

Shapiro, Judith. "Jewish Services for a Native Born Community: Values, Changes and Perspectives," Journal of Jewish Communal Service, Vol. 37, No. 1, September, 1960.

Solender, Sanford; Barron, Henry and Toubin, Isaac. "National Programs for Jewish Commitment, Knowledge and Culture," The Turbulent Decades. New York: Conference of Jewish Communal Service, 1980.

Weiss, Carol H. Evaluation Research: Methods for Assessing Program Effectiveness. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1972.

Zibbell, Charles. "The Jewish Component in Jewish Communal Service," Journal of Jewish Communal Service, Vol. LV, No. 2, 1978.

"Announcements 1925-1930," Training School for Jewish Social Work, New York.

"Announcements 1931-1938," Students Register 1925-1940, Graduate School for Jewish Social Work, New York.

Encyclopedia Judaica, Vol. 8, "Hebrew Union College," columns 216-219. Jerusalem, Israel: Keter Publishing House Jerusalem, Ltd., 1972.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY OF ALUMNI FROM  
HEBREW UNION COLLEGE - SCHOOL OF JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICE  
AND ACCOMPANYING LETTER

FEBRUARY 1983



HEBREW UNION COLLEGE—JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION

*Cincinnati • New York • Los Angeles • Jerusalem*

3077 UNIVERSITY AVENUE • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90007

(213) 749-3424

February 11, 1983

Dear Alumnus:

In the bar mitzvah year of the school, a special task force has been appointed to review the entire curriculum of the school. This committee includes full time faculty, part time faculty, students and alumni. The first phase of the review is an evaluation of all aspects of the curriculum by the alumni of the school. The final report of the committee will be released along with recommendations, in June, 1984.

We are asking all alumni to complete and return the enclosed questionnaire by February 25, 1983. The data will be analyzed and a report completed by June, 1983. Because of the scope of the decisions to be made on the results, it is imperative we have the input of all alumni regardless of program even if you are not currently working in the field of Jewish communal service.

You will receive a copy of the findings if you wish. The number at the front of the questionnaire is for classification purposes only. Your name does not appear in any way. The questionnaire is totally anonymous.

Thank you for giving the questionnaire your time and consideration. Your comments are valuable and essential to the task.

Sincerely,

Bruce Phillips  
Faculty

Leslie Goldfarb  
Student

Marie-Jeanne Lambert  
Student

Debra Schlossberg  
Student

enc.

FIRST WE WOULD LIKE TO FIND OUT ABOUT HOW YOU CAME TO H.U.C.

1. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN YOU ENROLLED AT H.U.C.? \_\_\_\_\_
2. WHICH PROGRAM WERE YOU ENROLLED IN?
  - A. CERTIFICATE \_\_\_\_\_
  - B. SINGLE MASTERS (MAJCS) \_\_\_\_\_
  - C. DOUBLE MASTERS (HUC-GWB) \_\_\_\_\_
  - D. DOUBLE MASTERS (HUC-USC) \_\_\_\_\_
  - E. JOINT MASTERS (MAJCS-MAJE) \_\_\_\_\_
  - F. OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_
3. WHAT WAS THE LAST YEAR YOU ATTENDED H.U.C.? PLEASE  
FILL IN BELOW.  
19 \_\_\_\_\_
4. DID YOU EVER WORK IN JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICE PRIOR TO  
ATTENDING HUC-JIR SJCS? IF SO INDICATE HOW LONG.
  - A. YES - FULL TIME \_\_\_\_\_
  - B. YES - PART TIME \_\_\_\_\_
  - C. YES - BOTH FULL AND PART TIME \_\_\_\_\_
  - D. VOLUNTEER ONLY \_\_\_\_\_
  - E. NO PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE \_\_\_\_\_
5. DID YOU EVER WORK IN SOCIAL WORK PRIOR TO H.U.C.? IF  
SO PLEASE INDICATE FOR HOW LONG.
  - A. YES - FULL TIME \_\_\_\_\_
  - B. YES - PART TIME \_\_\_\_\_
  - C. YES - BOTH FULL AND PART TIME \_\_\_\_\_
  - D. VOLUNTEER ONLY \_\_\_\_\_
  - E. NO PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE \_\_\_\_\_



6. DO YOU HAVE ANY ADVANCED DEGREES FROM A SCHOOL OTHER THAN H.U.C.?

A. YES \_\_\_\_\_

B. NO \_\_\_\_\_

IF YES:

WHAT DEGREE(S) \_\_\_\_\_

WHAT FIELD(S) \_\_\_\_\_

WAS THE DEGREE GRANTED BEFORE OR AFTER YOU CAME TO H.U.C.?

A. BEFORE \_\_\_\_\_

B. AFTER \_\_\_\_\_

C. BOTH (TWO ADVANCED DEGREES) \_\_\_\_\_

7. HOW IMPORTANT WERE THE FOLLOWING REASONS IN YOUR CHOICE OF H.U.C.?

	EXTREMELY 1	VERY 2	SOMEWHAT 3	NOT IMPORTANT 4
A. FINANCIAL AID	_____	_____	_____	_____
B. PROBABILITY OF JOB	_____	_____	_____	_____
C. REPUTATION OF SCHOOL	_____	_____	_____	_____
D. OPPORTUNITY TO STUDY WITH JERRY BUBIS	_____	_____	_____	_____
E. QUALITY OF SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION	_____	_____	_____	_____
F. QUALITY OF EDUCATION ABOUT THE JEWISH COMMUNITY	_____	_____	_____	_____
G. JEWISH STUDIES CURRICULUM	_____	_____	_____	_____

8. WHICH WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT REASON?

FILL IN LETTER FROM ABOVE. \_\_\_\_\_



9. WHAT WAS YOUR TOTAL DEBT ON LEAVING H.U.C. (INCLUDE ALL INDEBTEDNESS)

\_\_\_\_\_

10. HOW DID YOU FINANCE YOUR ATTENDANCE AT H.U.C.? FILL IN A PERCENTAGE OF YOUR TOTAL COSTS COVERED.

A. LOANS FROM THE SCHOOL \_\_\_\_\_

B. LOANS FROM OTHERS \_\_\_\_\_

C. PARENTS \_\_\_\_\_

D. SAVINGS \_\_\_\_\_

E. WORK \_\_\_\_\_

F. SCHOLARSHIPS \_\_\_\_\_

G. GRANTS FROM H.U.C. \_\_\_\_\_

11. WHAT IS YOUR CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS? CHOOSE LETTER FROM BELOW \_\_\_\_\_

A. EMPLOYED FULL TIME IN JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICE

B. EMPLOYED PART TIME IN JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICE

C. EMPLOYED FULL TIME IN SOCIAL WORK BUT NOT IN A JEWISH SETTING

D. EMPLOYED PART TIME IN SOCIAL WORK BUT NOT IN A JEWISH SETTING

E. EMPLOYED BUT NOT IN SOCIAL WORK OR JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICE

F. NOT EMPLOYED BY PERSONAL CHOICE

G. NOT EMPLOYED DUE TO OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES

H. IN SCHOOL FOR AN ADDITIONAL DEGREE

12. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING COURSES DID YOU TAKE (EITHER FOR CREDIT OR AUDIT): PLEASE CHECK OFF BELOW. (NAMES OF INSTRUCTORS ARE INCLUDED TO HELP YOU REMEMBER)

\_\_\_\_\_ JEWISH THOUGHT AND PRACTICES (NORMAN MIRSKY,  
STEPHEN PASSAMENEK, MICHAEL MENITOFF, EARL JORDAN)

- \_\_\_ ISRAEL DIASPORA RELATIONS (GIDEON SHIMONI, REUVEN BRIN)
- \_\_\_ SUMMER PRACTICUM (GERALD BUBIS)
- \_\_\_ FUND RAISING (ARTHUR ROSICHAN, AL HUTLER, BRUCE PHILLIPS)
- \_\_\_ WORLD JEWISH COMMUNITIES (SAM RABINOVE)
- \_\_\_ ADMINISTRATION (ROSA KAPLAN)
- \_\_\_ FIELD COORDINATION (ROSA KAPLAN, RITA LOWENTHAL, DAVID FREEDMAN)
- \_\_\_ FIELD PRACTICE - SUMMER (ROSA KAPLAN, RITA LOWENTHAL, GENE BENDER)
- \_\_\_ INDIVIDUAL AND THE FAMILY (ROSA KAPLAN, RAMA WEIZMAN)
- \_\_\_ INDIVIDUAL, FAMILY AND GROUP (RAMA WEIZMAN, RITA LOWENTHAL)
- \_\_\_ COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION PRACTICE (RITA LOWENTHAL, BEN COHEN)
- \_\_\_ COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION/COMMUNITY RELATIONS (MURRAY WOOD/RITA LOWENTHAL)
- \_\_\_ HUMAN GROWTH AND BEHAVIOR (ROSA KAPLAN, BERT GOLDBERG, CHARLES ANSELL, ROZ BENITEZ)
- \_\_\_ JEWISH IDENTITY (GERALD BUBIS, BRUCE PHILLIPS)
- \_\_\_ BUDGETING AND PLANNING (LAZAR COHEN, MERV LEMMERMAN, BRUCE PHILLIPS/GERALD BUBIS, GERALD BUBIS)
- \_\_\_ JEWISH SOCIAL POLICY (TED KANNER, BRUCE PHILLIPS)
- \_\_\_ GROUP WORK (FERNE KATLEMAN, RITA LOWENTHAL)
- \_\_\_ JEWISH FAMILY (GERALD BUBIS)
- \_\_\_ AMERICAN JEWISH COMMUNITY (ISIDORE SOBELOFF, ARTHUR ROSICHAN, MAURICE BERNSTEIN, JERRY AUERBACH, AL HUTLER, BERNIE RESNIKOFF, BRUCE PHILLIPS, CHARLES LEVY, JUDAH PILCH)
- \_\_\_ ORGANIZATION BEHAVIOR AND DEVELOPMENT (JACK DAUBER)

- \_\_\_\_\_ HOLOCAUST LITERATURE (DR. ZYGIELBAUM)
- \_\_\_\_\_ JEWISH HISTORY (ELLIS RIVKIN)
- \_\_\_\_\_ CONTEMPORARY JEWISH THOUGHT (JUDAH SHAPIRO, NORMAN MIRSKY, MICHAEL MENITOFF)
- \_\_\_\_\_ CONTEMPORARY JEWISH ISSUES (JUDAH SHAPIRO, EUGENE DUBOW, BERNIE RESNIKOFF, SAM RIBINOVE, MURRAY FRIEDMAN, REUVEN BRIN)
- \_\_\_\_\_ AMERICAN JEWISH LITERATURE (BEVERLY BIENSTOCK, NORMAN MIRSKY)
- \_\_\_\_\_ AMERICAN JEWISH HISTORY (SANDY RAGINS, MARK RAPHAEL, DAVID ELLENSON, DEBORAH LIPSTADT)
- \_\_\_\_\_ MEDIEVAL JEWISH HISTORY (MICHAEL SIGNER)
- \_\_\_\_\_ BIBLE AND RABBINIC LITERATURE (MICHAEL SIGNER)
- \_\_\_\_\_ MODERN JEWISH HISTORY (SANDY RAGINS, DAVID ELLENSON, DEBORAH LIPSTADT)
- \_\_\_\_\_ ETHNIC IDENTITY (NEIL SANDBERG)
- \_\_\_\_\_ RESEARCH (ROSA KAPLAN, BRUCE PHILLIPS)
- \_\_\_\_\_ GRANT WRITING (LAZAR COHEN, LARRY SIEGEL)
- \_\_\_\_\_ ISRAEL SEMINAR (GERALD BUBIS ET AL.)
- \_\_\_\_\_ BOUNDARIES (NORMAN MIRSKY)
- \_\_\_\_\_ PROGRAMMING AND COUNSELING ON CAMPUS (RICHARD LEVY)
- \_\_\_\_\_ JEWS IN TRANSITION (NORMAN MIRSKY)

IN THE NEXT SECTION WE WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU ABOUT YOUR FIRST JOB AFTER GRADUATION AND YOUR CURRENT JOB NOW (OR YOUR MOST RECENT IF YOU ARE NOT CURRENTLY EMPLOYED). PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS FOR BOTH FIRST AND CURRENT (OR MOST RECENT) JOB.

13. FIRST WE WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU ABOUT THE KINDS OF JOBS YOU HAVE HAD

	FIRST JOB		CURRENT (MOST RECENT)	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
A. WAS/IS YOUR JOB IN JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICE	_____	_____	_____	_____
B. JOB TITLE	_____		_____	
C. SALARY RANGE				
i) UNDER \$15,000	_____	_____	_____	_____
ii) \$16-20,000	_____	_____	_____	_____
iii) \$21-25,000	_____	_____	_____	_____
iv) \$26-30,000	_____	_____	_____	_____
v) \$31-40,000	_____	_____	_____	_____
vi) \$40,000 and over	_____	_____	_____	_____
14. HOW MANY COLLEAGUES DO/DID YOU SUPERVISE?	_____	_____	_____	_____
15. HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN IN YOUR CURRENT JOB (YEARS)?	_____			
IF LESS THAN ONE YEAR, NUMBER OF MONTHS	_____			

16. IN ACCEPTING A JOB OFFER, HOW IMPORTANT WERE THE FOLLOWING CONSIDERATIONS? PUT A 1 FOR VERY MUCH APPLIES, 2 FOR SOMEWHAT APPLIES, 3 FOR DOES NOT APPLY. IF YOU HAVE HELD ONLY ONE JOB SINCE GRADUATING, PLEASE USE THE CURRENT CATEGORY FOR YOUR ANSWERS.

	FIRST JOB	CURRENT (MOST RECENT)
HIGHEST SALARY OFFERED	_____	_____
ONLY JOB OFFER RECEIVED	_____	_____
OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROFESSIONAL GROWTH	_____	_____
MISSION OF THE WORK	_____	_____
OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROFESSIONAL ADVANCEMENT	_____	_____
INTEREST IN DAY TO DAY ACTIVITIES OF THE JOB	_____	_____
VARIETY OF RESPONSIBILITIES	_____	_____
PRESTIGE OF THE JOB POSITION	_____	_____
PRESTIGE OF THE AGENCY, DEPARTMENT OR ORGANIZATION	_____	_____
IDENTIFICATION WITH THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE AGENCY, DEPARTMENT OR ORGANIZATION	_____	_____
REPUTATION FOR BEING A NICE PLACE TO WORK	_____	_____
JOB PERQUISITES (E.G., BENEFITS, VACATION, ETC.)	_____	_____
EASE OF COMMUNTING	_____	_____
TO STAY WITH FAMILY	_____	_____
TO STAY WITH SIGNIFICANT OTHER AND/OR SPOUSE	_____	_____
OTHER (PLEASE EXPLAIN)	_____	_____

17. DID YOUR ATTENDANCE AT H.U.C. MAKE A DIFFERENCE FOR YOU IN ANY OF THE FOLLOWING WAYS? USE 1 FOR DEFINITELY, 2 FOR I THINK SO, AND 3 FOR PROBABLY NOT. PLEASE ANSWER FOR EACH.

	FIRST JOB	CURRENT (MOST RECENT)
A. BEING SELECTED-PROMOTED OVER OTHER CANDIDATES	_____	_____
B. RECEIVING A HIGHER SALARY	_____	_____
C. RECEIVING GREATER RESPONSIBILITY THAN COLLEAGUES NOT HAVING BEEN TO H.U.C.	_____	_____
D. BEING BETTER ABLE TO WORK WITH LAY PEOPLE	_____	_____
E. BEING BETTER ABLE TO UNDERSTAND ISSUES	_____	_____
F. BEING BETTER ABLE TO UNDERSTAND THE JEWISH COMMUNITY	_____	_____

18. HOW OFTEN DO YOU USE THE FOLLOWING SKILLS, TECHNIQUES OR METHODOLOGIES? USE 1 FOR FREQUENTLY, 2 FOR SOMETIMES, 3 FOR OCCASIONALLY, 4 FOR NEVER.

	FIRST JOB	CURRENT (MOST RECENT)
A. CASEWORK-COUNSELING	_____	_____
B. ADVOCACY	_____	_____
C. PUBLIC RELATIONS	_____	_____
D. ADMINISTRATION	_____	_____
E. SUPERVISION	_____	_____
F. FUND RAISING	_____	_____
G. POLICY FORMULATION AND ANALYSIS	_____	_____

- |  |       |       |
|--|-------|-------|
| H. COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION                                | _____ | _____ |
| I. GROUP WORK  | _____ | _____ |
| J. COMPUTERS   | _____ | _____ |
| K. ACTING AS A CLIENT<br>ADVOCATE                        | _____ | _____ |
| L. STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND<br>TRAINING                     | _____ | _____ |
| M. CONSULTATION WITH STAFF<br>MEMBERS                    | _____ | _____ |
| N. PUBLICITY   | _____ | _____ |
| O. WRITING GRANTS AND<br>PROPOSALS                       | _____ | _____ |
| P. LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT                                | _____ | _____ |
| Q. RESEARCH  | _____ | _____ |
| R. WRITING REPORTS, PAPERS,<br>ARTICLES                  | _____ | _____ |
| S. NEW PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT                               | _____ | _____ |
| T. MEETING WITH REPRESENTATIVES<br>OF COMMUNITY AGENCIES | _____ | _____ |
| U. MEETING WITH COMMUNITY<br>GROUPS                      | _____ | _____ |
| V. MEETING WITH PUBLIC<br>OFFICIALS                      | _____ | _____ |
| W. LOBBYING  | _____ | _____ |
| X. JEWISH FAMILY EDUCATION                               | _____ | _____ |
| Y. WORKING WITH BOARDS AND<br>LAY PEOPLE                 | _____ | _____ |
| Z. OTHER (PLEASE EXPLAIN)                                | _____ | _____ |





20. NOW, ABOUT THE PEOPLE YOU WORK WITH ON YOUR CURRENT JOB.

A. HOW MANY OTHER PROFESSIONALS DO YOU WORK WITH DIRECTLY? \_\_\_\_\_

B. HOW MANY OF THESE ARE GRADUATES OF H.U.C.? \_\_\_\_\_

C. HOW MANY OF THESE ARE GRADUATES OF OTHER COMMUNAL PROGRAMS? \_\_\_\_\_

D. HOW MANY ARE SOCIAL WORKERS BUT NOT GRADUATES OF COMMUNAL SERVICE? \_\_\_\_\_

E. NOT SURE/OTHER \_\_\_\_\_

21. PEOPLE TURN TO COLLEAGUES FOR VARIOUS REASONS. IF YOU DO SO PLEASE INDICATE WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING YOU HAVE TURNED TO.

	H.U.C. ALUMNI	OTHER COLLEAGUES	BOTH	NEITHER	DOES NOT APPLY
A.FINDING OUT ABOUT JOBS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
B.DISCUSS PRACTICE ISSUES	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
C.REFERENCES	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
D.DISCUSS JEWISH ISSUES	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
E.DECISIONS ABOUT CHANGING JOBS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
F.DECISIONS ABOUT REMAINING IN FIELD OF COMMUNAL SERVICE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
F.PERSONAL MATTERS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
G.AS FRIENDS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

22. WE WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU ABOUT THE THESIS. PLEASE INDICATE HOW USEFUL THE THESIS HAS BEEN IN EACH WAY.

	VERY MUCH APPLIES TO ME	SOMEWHAT APPLIES TO ME	DOES NOT APPLY TO ME
A. DOING THE THESIS BETTER ENABLED ME TO EVALUATE RESEARCH ON THE JOB	_____	_____	_____
B. DOING THE THESIS LATER ENABLED ME TO CONDUCT RESEARCH ON THE JOB	_____	_____	_____
C. DOING THE THESIS HELPED ME TO EXPLORE AN AREA WHICH I HAVE REFERRED TO LATER	_____	_____	_____
D. DOING THE THESIS MADE ME FEEL I "PROVED" MYSELF ACADEMICALLY	_____	_____	_____
E. DOING THE THESIS HELPED ME DEVELOP SOME EXPERTISE GROWING OUT OF THE CONTENT	_____	_____	_____

23. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING BEST DESCRIBES YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT DOING THE THESIS?

- A. I PERSONALLY FOUND IT A VALUABLE EXPERIENCE \_\_\_\_\_
- B. IT WAS NOT PARTICULARLY VALUABLE \_\_\_\_\_
- C. IT WAS NOT AT ALL VALUABLE \_\_\_\_\_

24. SOME SCHOOLS HAVE DROPPED THESIS REQUIREMENTS AND REPLACED THEM WITH A SECOND SEMESTER OF RESEARCH. WHICH DO YOU THINK WE SHOULD DO AT H.U.C.? PLEASE ANSWER ONLY ONE.

- A. KEEP THE THESIS REQUIREMENT \_\_\_\_\_
- B. DROP THE REQUIREMENT AND ADD THE RESEARCH COURSE \_\_\_\_\_
- C. EITHER ARE GOOD IDEAS \_\_\_\_\_
- D. NEITHER ARE GOOD IDEAS \_\_\_\_\_

25. HAVE YOU EVER BEEN TO ISRAEL?

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

IF YES:

26. HOW MANY TIMES? \_\_\_\_\_

27. DID YOU GO ON THE ISRAEL SEMINAR? \_\_\_\_\_

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

IF YES:

28. HOW DID THE ISRAEL SEMINAR MAKE A DIFFERENCE FOR YOU?

	VERY MUCH APPLIES TO ME 1	SOMEWHAT APPLIES TO ME 2	DOES NOT APPLY TO ME 3
A. I HAVE USED IT IN MY WORK	_____	_____	_____
B. I MADE FRIENDS AND PROFESSIONAL CONTACTS	_____	_____	_____
C. I IDENTIFY MORE CLOSELY WITH ISRAELI COLLEAGUES	_____	_____	_____
D. IT GAVE ME PERSONAL INSPIRATION AS A JEW	_____	_____	_____
E. IT GAVE ME PERSONAL INSPIRATION FOR MY WORK	_____	_____	_____
F. IT HAS GIVEN ME INSPIRATION TO CONSIDER ALIYAH	_____	_____	_____

29. NOW FOR CLASSIFICATION PURPOSES WE WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU A FEW QUESTIONS

A. WHAT IS YOUR AGE NOW? \_\_\_\_\_

B. WHAT IS YOUR MARITAL STATUS

SINGLE - NEVER MARRIED \_\_\_\_\_

DIVORCED - SEPARATED \_\_\_\_\_

WIDOWED \_\_\_\_\_

MARRIED \_\_\_\_\_

LIVING TOGETHER \_\_\_\_\_

C. HOW MANY CHILDREN DO YOU HAVE? \_\_\_\_\_

D. IN WHAT CITY, STATE, COUNTRY, DID YOU GRADUATE HIGH SCHOOL?

CITY

STATE/COUNTRY

E. PLEASE CHECK REGION OF COUNTRY YOU LIVE IN NOW

EAST COAST \_\_\_\_\_

MID-ATLANTIC \_\_\_\_\_

SOUTH EAST \_\_\_\_\_

SOUTH \_\_\_\_\_

MID-WEST \_\_\_\_\_

NORTH WEST \_\_\_\_\_

WEST COAST \_\_\_\_\_

SOUTH WEST \_\_\_\_\_

OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

F. WHAT IS THE SIZE OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITY IN WHICH YOU LIVE?

100,000 + \_\_\_\_\_

50,000-99,999 \_\_\_\_\_

30,000-49,999 \_\_\_\_\_

UNDER 30,000 \_\_\_\_\_

G. MALE \_\_\_\_\_

FEMALE \_\_\_\_\_

NOW FOR SOME QUESTIONS FOR THE DOUBLE MASTERS PROGRAMS ONLY

30. IN CONSIDERING YOUR CAREERS AT THE TWO INSTITUTIONS YOU ATTENDED, WHICH WOULD YOU CONSIDER TO BE THE BEST ANSWER AS TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF A PROFESSIONAL SENSE OF SELF? CHOOSE ONE.

A. BOTH WERE EQUALLY IMPORTANT \_\_\_\_\_

B. H.U.C. WAS MORE IMPORTANT \_\_\_\_\_

C. U.S.C./G.W.B. WAS MORE IMPORTANT \_\_\_\_\_

31. IN TERMS OF COURSE CONTENT DID YOU FIND THAT

A. MATERIAL WAS COMPLEMENTARY \_\_\_\_\_

B. MATERIAL WAS IN OPPOSITION \_\_\_\_\_

C. MATERIAL WAS REPETITIOUS \_\_\_\_\_

32. DO YOU HAVE ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS YOU FEEL WOULD BE HELPFUL TO THE COMMITTEE, OR ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS?

APPENDIX B

COURSE LISTINGS FOR THE  
SCHOOL OF JEWISH COMMUNAL WORK



COURSE LISTINGS FOR THE  
SCHOOL OF JEWISH COMMUNAL WORK\*

Introductory Course, 1916-17

- I. The Communal Problem of Modern Jewry in the Light of History.
- II. The Shifting of the Jewish Center in the Diaspora to America.
- III. The Economic Problem of the Jew in America.
- IV. The Philanthropic Problem of the Jew in America.
- V. The Moral and Religious Problem of the Jew in America.
- VI. Organization of Jewish Life in America

Institutes for Workers in:

- a) Immigrant aid facilities and agencies for the distribution of immigrants;
- b) Employment exchanges and vocational bureaus;
- c) Charitable relief agencies;
- d) Medical social service;
- e) Child caring institutions
- f) Big Brother and Big Sister societies and probation officers;
- g) YMHA and kindred Associations

Advanced Course, 1916-17

I. Basic Courses

- a) Immigration

- b) Modern Industry and its Problems
- c) The Problem of Dependency
- d) Child Caring
- e) Problems of Correctional Work
- f) The Jew in America
- g) Religious and Modern Life
- h) The Problem of Religious Education
- i) Work in YMHA's and Kindred Institutions
- j) Social Legislation
- k) Public Health
- l) Statistics and Social Research
- m) Management and Administration of Communal Agencies

## 2. Group Studies

- |                         |                            |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| Group 1 - Major subject | - Industry                 |
| First Minor             | - Relief Work              |
| Second Minor            | - Correctional Work        |
| Group 2 - Major subject | - Relief Work              |
| First Minor             | - Industry                 |
| Second Minor            | - YMHA and settlement work |
| Group 3 - Major subject | - Religious Affairs        |
| First Minor             | - Education                |
| Second Minor            | - YMHA and settlement work |
| Group 4 - Major subject | - Education                |
| First Minor             | - Religious Affairs        |
| Second Minor            | - YMHA and settlement work |

Group 5 - Major subject - YMHA and settlement work  
First minor - Education  
Second Minor - Correctional Work  
Group 6 - Major subject - Correctional Work  
First minor - YMHA and settlement work  
Second minor - Relief Work

\*Michael Freund. Training for Jewish Social Welfare with Special Reference to the Training Bureau for Jewish Communal Service. Prepared under the auspices of the Continuing Committee of the Board of Trustees of the Training Bureau for Jewish Communal Service, March, 1956, pp. 29, 31.

APPENDIX C

COURSE LISTINGS FOR THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

COURSE LISTINGS FOR THE GRADUATE SCHOOL\*

First Period (given at the Training School for Jewish  
Social Work)

- I. Social and Religious Institutions of the Jews
- II. History of Jewish Communal Life
- III. The Field of Jewish Social Service in the United  
States - Field trips; Informal meetings

Second Period (given at the New York School of Social Work)

The Method of Social Case Work  
The Content of Family Case Work  
Immigrant Problems  
Social Case Work  
Social Case Work  
Seminar in Family Case Work  
Dependent and Neglected Children  
Children with Special Handicaps  
Child Welfare in Different States  
Seminar in Child Welfare  
Health and Nutrition  
Health and Nutrition  
Public Health and Personal Hygiene  
Problems of Disease  
Seminar in Medical Social Problems  
Psychopathology

Case Discussion of Children's Guidance Bureau

Crime and Punishment

Seminar

Seminar

Individual Psychology and Problems of Administration

Social Research (1) Methods of Social Research

Social Research (2) Methods of Social Research

Community Problems and Organization

Community Problems and Organization

Rural Problems

Leisure Time Problems

Social Surveys and Community Studies

Publicity Methods in Social Work

Administration of Social Agencies

Community Organization

General Community Organization

GRADUATE SCHOOL FOR JEWISH SOCIAL WORK

Courses of Instruction offered During the  
First Year - Fall, 1935 to Spring, 1936 - and Second Year -  
Fall, 1936 to Spring 1937

Jewish Background Courses

- |            |  |
|------------|--|
| GSJSW - I  | Modern Jewish History                    |
| "          | Yiddish Language and Literature          |
| "          | Jewish Life in the Middle Ages           |
| "          | Yiddish Language and Literature (contd.) |
| "          | Early Jewish Community Life              |
| "          | Yiddish Language and Literature (contd.) |
| GSJSW - II | The Problem of Jewish Self-Adjustment    |
| "          | Yiddish Language and Literature          |
| "          | The Reorganization of Jewish Life        |
| "          | Yiddish Language and Literature          |
| "          | The Reinterpretation of Jewish Values    |
| "          | Contemporary Jewish Problems             |

Social Work Backgrounds

- |            |   |
|------------|---|
| NYSSW - I  | The Nature and Varieties of Human Behavior      |
| GSJSW -I   | The Field of Social Work                        |
| "          | The Field of Social Work (contd.)               |
| NYSSW - II | Education and Social Progress                   |
| "          | Philosophic Interpretations of American Culture |



GSJSW - II	Seminar in Aims and Methods of Contemporary
"	Social Work
NYSSW - II	Introduction to Social Philosophy
GSJSW - II	Contributions of the Sciences to Social Work
"	Traditional Attitudes Toward Charity
"	History of Social Work in the United States

#### Special Courses

NYSSW - I	Labor Problems: Introductory Course
"	Labor Problems and Social Work
NYSSW -II	Unemployment: An Examination of Proposed Remedied
"	Current Industrial Problems
"	Social Legislation

#### Social Treatment

##### Family and Child Welfare

NYSSW - I	Introduction to Social Case Work
"	Analysis of Social Case Method
"	Children in Substitute Parental Care
"	Delinquent Children
NYSSW - II	Handicapped Children
"	The Family
"	Family and Case Work
"	Recording

### Medical and Psychiatric

- NYSSW - I      Problems and Disease I  
"      Psychopathology  
"      Case Studies in Mental Hygiene: Problems  
         of Children  
NYSSW - II      Community Health Problems  
"      Psychiatric Social Work  
"      Medical Social Problems  
"      Problems of Disease II

### Group Work

- GSJSW - II      Administration of Jewish Centers  
"      Problems and Administration of Jewish  
         Centers  
NYSSW - II      Social Work and the New Leisure

### Community Organization and Administration of

#### Welfare Services

- NYSSW - I      Methods of Community Organization  
"      Problems of Unemployment Relief  
         Administration  
"      Government and Social Work  
NYSSW - II      Community  
"      Public Welfare Problems  
GSJSW - II      Social Work Writing  
"      Social Work Interpretation

### Social Research

- GSJSW - I      Social Research and Professional Social Work
- "            Development of Scientific Thought and  
                 Methods of Research
- "            Statistical Methods and Procedures
- GSJSW - II     Methods and Techniques of Social  
                 Investigation
- "            Seminar in Theses Projects and Related  
                 Research

### Field Work Courses

- GSJSW - I      Field Work in Case Work Agencies
- "            Field Work in Case Work Agencies (contd.)
- "            Field Work in Case Work Agencies (contd.)
- GSJSW - II     Field Work in Case Work Agencies (contd.)
- "            Field Work in Case Work Agencies - Research

\*Michael Freund. Training for Jewish Social Welfare with Special Reference to the Training Bureau for Jewish Communal Service. Prepared under the auspices of the Continuing Committee of the Board of Trustees of the Training Bureau for Jewish Communal Service, March, 1956, pp. 57-60.

## APPENDIX D

### COMMENTS

## COMMENTS

1. One of my objections to the program at H.U.C. was the notion that professors were privy to the psyches of the student body (by the end of my year at H.U.C. the entire class was in therapy - or needed it!).

I am glad that the school is undergoing the process of self-study. At the time (my year), I found that the administration maintained a defensive posture when a student(s) dared to disagree with or question policy, course content and choice of professors.

In retrospect, I must say that much of the material to which I objected as having been unnecessary and simplistic has since proven useful to me.

2. This survey doesn't seem so applicable to students in other programs at H.U.C. who did just the Certificate. Good luck!
3. Although it's too late, it would have been interesting to compare the differences in responses between men and women.

I'm very anxious to see the results. Good luck!

4. My participation in the Double Master's Program

---

was indeed the most significant educational (and consequently, professional) experience of my life. This questionnaire is fine, yet does not touch upon the essence of the H.U.C. experience.

5. In regard to thesis questions: There is a dearth of exploratory research done in agencies, Federations and academia on contemporary Jewish problems and issues. The thesis may be a painful process, however, the Jewish community needs the kind of information produced through these efforts. Regardless of topic, scope or size, research is important and theses continued.

Also, for those of us not employed professionally in communal service, I wouldn't want anyone to think that the education wasn't helpful or useful. As an active lay participant in the community, the knowledge is tremendously helpful. Maybe H.U.C. should train lay leadership more!!

6. I wish Hebrew/Yiddish could be part of the curriculum (or an optional part). It can only enhance our future work in the field of Jewish communal service. I feel the lack.

My reasons for "not enough preparation" on number 19 was due to the time limitations of the program (for me), i.e., summers. I could only begin to get a taste of the Judaica. But it has whet my

---

---

appetite for further education within Jewish studies. So, the problem lay in the lack of time as opposed to the classes or professors.

Good questionnaire!

7. This survey was inappropriate for me since the questions were all phrased as if I were a social worker. This is unfortunate. I do not now nor do I anticipate to call or identify myself as a social worker. Because of my qualifications when answering the questions, I feel that my answers will be coded will not reflect me. I feel that this issue needs to be addressed seriously by the School of Jewish Communal Service (especially Jewish Family Service of Los Angeles) and this task force. All Jewish Communal Service alumni are not by that fact alone Social Workers. We are educators, community organizers, and gerontologists, etc.

8. I do not recommend the Single Masters Program be open to someone with only a B.A. unless:

- a) the undergraduate degree is in social work/  
social welfare  
or
- b) they have several years field experience.

As a Single Master's graduate, I feel H.U.C.'s casework/behavior and social policy curriculum was very weak.

---



The school, in the past, didn't push Single Masters' candidates to complete thesis requirements as they did the multiple degree candidates. Many did not receive degrees or were delayed several years.

9. The material was only repetitious in the C.O.P.A. concentration at USC. Other USC information was complementary with H.U.C.'s.
10. The clinical training while at H.U.C. was very poor. If those interested in this track continue to be accepted, utilizing the wealth of clinical expertise in the broader community needs to be tapped, while allowing the student to gain knowledge of Jewish issues from H.U.C. directly. I felt I gained nearly nothing from any classes on Human Behavior, Groups, and Treatment. The only skills/knowledge I gained in this area was during my tenure at field placement. The Jewish component was valuable, but I feel I was at a clear disadvantage to my non-Jewish communal service colleagues going into second year of clinical training.
11. I would like to see H.U.C. develop some course work of a more practical nature:
  - negotiating salary
  - finding a career ladder
  - balancing family and personal versus job
  - time management

- how to use a secretary
- how to keep a calendar
- stress management/burn-out
- new technologies in the field (electronic media computers, etc.)
- "how to's" of being supervised and supervising

12. While the study lists the classes I took and the roles I now have and the functions which I perform, it doesn't give me an opportunity to evaluate which courses most directly related to what I now do or material I use. I utilize a great deal from some classes and virtually nothing from others, but the course titles would not give you a clue to this information.

13. This is an interesting study and I will look forward to reading about your findings.

Thank you - good luck in your study!

14. I have not really worked in the Jewish community for a significant amount of time. However, my friends who have, have had difficult experiences in clinical agencies. I guess I haven't yet figured out what role I will take as a professional in the Jewish community, but this is something I very much feel committed to do. Currently, H.U.C. was an incredibly important experience personally, one which was very gratifying and helped me to understand and

clarify my sense of myself. I try very hard to live by Jewish values in my life.

15. We might have a more aggressive recruitment and job placement aspect to our school.

16. While I feel good about the H.U.C. program, I feel that the combination with the M.S.W., USC was the best combination for contemporary practice today.

H.U.C. should include salary negotiation in classroom work.

More Hebrew!

More inter-community comparisons of data, more "birds eye view" data (demography), more budgetary work in the classroom.

P.S.: H.U.C. still stands out as a great period of training and preparation for me - the tops!

17. I do not feel that these questions fully took into account the student who, like me, attended the SJCS as a "supplement" to another program such as Rabbinics. For me, many of the questions were ambiguous because of that.

Although I use the word "supplement," I feel that every Rabbinic student should take the Certificate program. It was excellent!

18. Thank you.

19. I found the H.U.C. experience to be a very

important part of my professional development. Although I had a strong Jewish background and a solid professional social work education, I was searching for the opportunity to put the two experiences together. The summer program provided me with a special educational course of study and it enabled me to find the medium for linking the two parts of my professional commitment to the Jewish community. I have no doubt about the fact that the educational experience remains with me. Personally, I am a "halachically" observant Jewish person and I felt welcomed and part of the school.

20. Having been both a student and a teacher in the H.U.C. program (SJCS) and having been a long term Jewish professional before that, I found the whole experience one of the most important in my career.

21. The program I attended had great merit to me in that I had the opportunity to discover (and in some cases, rediscover) personal skills that had been hidden from me in my previous career. I emerged with a better sense of self, something worth the price of tuition alone!

In all honesty, I do not know if I will stay in this career track (Federation), but I have gained in experience and in broadened perspective that will help me achieve in whatever field I may eventually pursue.

22. Came to the school relatively late in life with little background Jewishly. The exercise, aside from an enjoyable experience, was one of rather considerable growth Jewishly. Literally opened new vistas of heretofore unknown areas of Jewish thought.

23. I would attempt to integrate more textual and/or traditional material that could be utilized in practice.

For the most part, the curriculum is sound and worthwhile.

24. Good luck.

25. Areas of concern that continue to be of interest to me are mobility and the dual career family. In particular, question number 16 also will the committee research why so many are leaving the field? A well done survey!

26. I feel the H.U.C. experience prepared me well in basic areas of knowledge and issues, but not in areas of skill. That I've had to develop more on my own. The field work experience, which you didn't ask about and probably should have, lacked consistency, control and clear objectives. There was also little (if any) discussion and analysis of the field work experience back at the school. In other words, I think I knew pretty much what I needed to know, but I didn't really know how to do what I was supposed to do.

Good luck in ironing that one out.

P.S.: Good survey. I enjoyed completing it.

27. This questionnaire did not explore the fact that I attended law school and practised law between H.U.C. and present experiences.

28. I chose H.U.C. because of the Double Masters Program and the two Masters degrees. I would have attended H.U.C. only or USC only. I felt (and still do) that the M.S.W. tends to be the entry degree into jobs in the profession.

I found a conflict between H.U.C. and USC in two ways: professional issues, i.e., clients' self-determination and individual choice versus Jewish sense of community and responsibilities thereof; a conflict which existed for me and not other students was that I came to H.U.C./USC for communal service. This I felt was the emphasis of H.U.C. versus USC's casework dogma.

I had a sense while in school and the few years after I left that there was a division amongst the students/graduates between those who will be going into Federations (especially elite F.E.P.E.P.'s) and those who were preparing for the other agencies (a separation that exists out there in the real world - prestige and salaries). I can say that personally I felt "looked down upon" when I initially went into centers.



The integration of the two schools in terms of administration of the program was excellent.

29. While I found both the H.U.C. and USC Double Masters program superb, there were four of us in my class and today none of us are in the Jewish communal field. Reasons vary, but to some extent, we all met hostility, mostly as being seen as "superjews." This resulted in two graduates trained in casework never getting a job in the Jewish community and the other two graduates, who ended up in the same Jewish community center in the East, being kept out of Jewish content programming for the most part. Also, we were not prepared for the "real world" of Jewish communal work, i.e., workers having little Jewish identity and us coming from a program that created very close family feelings - Jewishwise.

While my own desires are to return to the Jewish communal field (I am presently struggling with law school), my own fears are that the field has changed very little.

30. While the material was complementary, the availability of field placements was not adequate and created a situation of conflict, particularly in the first year. I have not resolved this conflict, even five years after graduation.

Even though I have obtained my L.C.S.W., I still



feel lacking in clinical preparation because I did not have a clinical placement at the time when the curriculum was focused upon clinical theory and techniques. A non-clinical placement would have been more appropriate for the second year.

31. Would like to see the results. Thanks.

32. The range in teaching abilities of the faculty was a bit greater at H.U.C. than at other academic institutions. Some were positively great, others were absolutely lacking - the percentage of those lacking was too high and I felt many classroom hours to be a waste.

Clinicians, in contrast to community organizers, were less valued at H.U.C. The purpose of the H.U.C. communal service program is to develop mature, knowledgeably skilled community leaders, yet the recruitment into the program did not clarify this emphasis. Having had a clearly defined focus in clinical matters, I would not have attended H.U.C. had I known its philosophy and directions.

H.U.C. provided a warm, defined identity for me which gave me strength in the professional world as I departed from its womb, even in the non-Jewish work world. I work with pediatric oncology patients and the values that were re-established and re-worked at H.U.C. help me now in my work, even though the setting has very few Jews.

APPENDIX E

JOB TITLES

## JOB TITLES

Acting Director

Administrative Assistant

Assistant Director, Areas Jewish Federation Council

Assistant Director, Planning and Budgeting

Assistant Director, American Jewish Committee

Assistant Executive Director

Associate Director

Associate Director, Planning and Budgeting

Associate Executive Director

Campaign Associate

Caseworker

Chief Executive Officer

Community Relations Associate

Coordinator

Coordinator, Employee Counseling

Coordinator, Peer Services

Corporate President

Department Head

Director

Director, Children's Activities

Director, Community Relations

Director, Family Life Education

Director, Family Programs

Director, Leadership Development

Regional Director  
Regional Staff Counselor  
Senior Adult Director  
Self-Employed  
Social Work Supervisor  
Staff Advisor  
Staff Associate  
Staff Consultant  
Staff Counselor  
Staff Executive, Jewish Federation Council  
Teacher, Public School  
Teen Director  
Youth Outreach  
Youth Services Director  
Washington Representative, American Jewish Congress

Director, Mental Health Center

Director of Operations

Director, Senior Adult Services

Director of Student Activities

Director, Women's Division

Education Director

Executive

Executive Director

Executive Director, Jewish Community Center

Executive Director, Jewish Federation Council

Executive Regional Director, B'nai B'rith Youth

#### Organization

Executive Vice-President

Group Worker

Hillel

Homemaker

Hypnotherapist

Jewish Community Center Worker, teens, women, singles

Medical Social Worker

Physical Education Coordinator

Planner/Analyst

Planning Associate

Producer

Program Director

Rabbi