



THE CONSORTIUM FOR APPLIED STUDIES IN JEWISH EDUCATION

The Israel Educator: An Inquiry into the Preparation and Capacities of Effective Israel Educators

A Research Brief for the Consortium for Applied Studies in Jewish Education

Alex Sinclair, Bradley Solmsen, and Clair Goldwater

Over-arching research question

What are the capacities required to be an effective “Israel educator,” and how can emerging and current educators be best prepared to acquire those capacities?

Rationale

The need for research on Israel educators

“Effective teaching is both complex and counter-intuitive – but it can be taught.” (Ball and Forzani, 2010b).

This claim is the starting point for our discussion of the necessary capacities and training opportunities required for educators in the burgeoning field of Israel education. We start with the assumption that effective educational experiences do not just happen: they require thought, vision, planning, and careful execution, and they need educators who are equipped to think, plan and execute effectively. Indeed, many of the most renowned thinkers in public education have built convincing arguments over the past two decades that effective education requires a specific set of skills and knowledge, which particular types of training can help emerging educators learn (McDonald, 1992; Feiman-Nemser, 2008). One of the greatest obstacles to improving education is the notion that “good teaching is either innate or learned through hard knocks” (Ball and Forzani, 2010a), and what we know to be the case in formal educational contexts is also true in experiential education (Chazan, 2003; Reimer, 2009).

This is certainly the case as well in Israel education. A small number of thinkers and researchers have written about and investigated Israel education over the past few decades (one can go back, for example, to Chazan, 1971, or Ruskay and Szonyi (edd.), 1990, or Eisen and Rosenak, 1997); but Israel education remains relatively undeveloped as a “field”: its educators, for the most part, have been, and continue to be, Jewish educators first and Israel educators second; its goals and measures of success are elusive and sometimes controversial; and the subject matter itself is complex and fraught with ideological and political issues. As a result of these and other factors, very little research has been done to date that investigates the required capacities for an Israel educator. Although we know that a lot of educators are engaged with Israel in their classrooms and other settings, we are still lacking some key definitions and parameters for analysis and evaluation. In this paper we argue that a serious research agenda is needed in order to define what we mean by the term “Israel educator”; to understand who our Israel educators are; to define the effectiveness and success of those educators; to consider how educators can be recruited and prepared in order to achieve success; to map the existing opportunities for educator preparation; and finally, to make recommendations for steps to be taken to advance the field for Israel educators.

These questions are all the more important because significant investments have already been made, and continue to be made, in the training of Israel educators. In the past two years alone, new training programs

for Israel educators have been initiated, at the Davidson School of Education of the Jewish Theological Seminary, and at other institutes of higher learning through The iCenter; there are older existing programs like the Center for Israel Education at Emory University; and a variety of other organizations (for example: Encounter, the David Project, and Makom) also see themselves as having a role in the preparation of Israel educators. Each of these stakeholders has different approaches, emphases, and training structures, and, for the most part, operates based on hunches and anecdotal evidence, rather than a shared body of empirical research. A comprehensive research agenda like the one proposed here would help these diverse organizations and institutions clarify and enrich their work.

Is there such thing as an “Israel educator”?

Some might question whether the profession “Israel educator” even exists and that Israel educators do not deserve a designation separate from Jewish educators. We would argue strongly against this claim. Since Shulman’s seminal work on Pedagogical Content Knowledge (1986), we have known that it is not enough for an emerging educator to understand general principles of pedagogy on the one hand, and the particular subject matter that she will be teaching on the other; rather, educators need immersion in and exploration of “subject-specific pedagogy”. *Israel educators will not succeed by being good Jewish educators who also happen to know about, or have visited Israel.* Rather, approaches must be developed that synthesize specific pedagogical approaches with Israel-related content. Thus, our assumption going forward in this paper is that “Israel Educator” is a distinction separate from “Jewish Educator”, even though we know that educators are capable of fulfilling both roles simultaneously.

Definition of “the Israel educator”

Who, then, is an Israel educator? As noted above, many Jewish educational professionals find themselves dealing with Israel at one point or another. Every pulpit rabbi has surely at some point been asked a question about Israel by a congregant. Every camp counselor has sung an Israeli song with campers. Does that make every pulpit rabbi and every camp counselor an Israel educator? We would suggest that such an overly expansive definition would diminish the focus of this research agenda, in the same way that research on teaching Bible would lose focus if it included every Jewish educator who had at one point discussed the importance of honoring one’s parents.

On the other hand, there are relatively few *full-time* Israel educators at work in the field, and this is likely to remain the case for the foreseeable future. Too narrow a definition of the Israel educator, then, would also not serve our purposes.

For the purposes of this brief, then, we have adopted a working definition of the “Israel educator” as someone who defines his/her professional role as including Israel education in a significant way. By requiring an explicit self-definition, but also leaving the question of scope somewhat vague, we hope that this definition is broad enough to capture practitioners who are of interest to the research brief, without being so catch-all as to be meaningless.

Literature Review

In considering the two parts of this brief – the capacities required to be an effective Israel educator, and the training required in order to produce such professionals – we are enriched by several fields of research and literature.

Teacher Preparation

With regard to teacher preparation, the existing research is instructive and highly relevant to our discussion. We know that effective pre-service teacher preparation should initiate emerging teachers into a clear vision of teaching and learning; well-defined standards of practice; a core curriculum of child development, learning, and subject-specific pedagogy; strong partnerships with and clinical experience in schools or other educational settings; and extensive use of pedagogies that relate theory and practice (Feiman-Nemser, 2010; Carroll, Featherstone et al., 2007).

We also know that many Jewish teacher preparation programs do adhere to these standards (Feiman-Nemser, 2011). Indeed, research and practice in Jewish educator preparation in general has been greatly enriched by wider educational discourse.

Where the field is lacking is in the areas of Israel subject-specific pedagogy, and practicum, internship or clinical experiences specifically in Israel education (Grant, 2007). We will make recommendations below about research projects that could fill these gaps, to help us better understand teacher preparation and development that has Israel as its focus.

In-Service Professional Development

Research over the past two decades on both pre-service and in-service professional development in public education has taught us that effective in-service professional development is ongoing; collaborative; intellectually challenging; respectful of teachers' experiences and wisdom; focused on student learning outcomes; and resistant to demands for immediate gratification, but rooted in the real life of the educational context (Little, 1993; see also Feiman-Nemser, 2007, 2008; Dorph, 2011). Although focused on the preparation of classroom teachers, this research has broad resonance and relevance to educators operating in informal or non-formal settings.

When we consider the reality of professional development for Israel educators in the light of this research, we discover significant challenges. We know, for example, that successful professional development is "ongoing," but many Israel education interventions are "one-shot wonders" (a speaker from the Embassy, an event run by the local shaliach, a movie screening, a one-hour panel at a conference, etc.) This is also true when it comes to trips to Israel, which may affect teachers strongly in terms of *personal* transformation, but seldom in long-term *professional* thinking and growth (Pomson and Grant, 2004). We know that the best professional development is "collaborative;" but much Israel professional development is a one-way street in which educators are asked to listen to experts or spokespeople. The best professional development is "intellectually challenging;" but few Jewish educators have been asked to grapple thoughtfully with the real problems and challenges that Israel faces. The best professional development is "respectful of teachers' wisdom;" but teachers are seldom asked to investigate and analyze their own practice and institution in critical ways. The best professional development is focused on "student learning outcomes;" but few institutions can identify the outcomes they desire in Israel education.

Professional development in Israel education spans a spectrum from short, one-hour sessions, all the way through to intensive year-long programs at the other extreme. Our policy in this brief is to include those short, one-hour sessions as part of the material that needs to be researched, since to exclude such experiences would be ignoring a significant reality of the field. Nevertheless, in one of our research projects below, we suggest probing the efficacy of short one-off sessions compared to longer programs of professional development that are more in line with Little's characterization of good practice in this field (1993).

The Complexity Hypothesis

Many contemporary stakeholders in the field of Israel education have written about what we are here terming the “complexity hypothesis”. The discourse around this hypothesis claims that engagement with all of Israel’s complexities, including aspects that are uncomfortable, frustrating, or alienating, will ultimately lead to more robust connections between young people and Israel; therefore, Israel educators need to acquire and apply those kinds of complex understandings.

Statements about the complexity hypothesis over the past 10-15 years have come from a variety of thinkers, researchers, and commentators, and have taken a variety of forms. A partial survey would include the distinction between “mythic” and “real” Israel (Eisen and Rosenak 1997), the contrast between the “mobilization” and “personal meaning” narratives of American Zionism (Cohen and Liebman 2000), the demand for “meaning-making” in Israel education (Chazan 2000, 2005), the phrase “hugging and wrestling” (Gringras 2006), debates over losing one’s “love for Israel” (Michaelson 2009), “high-resolution, connected” conversations (Sinclair 2003, 2009), engagement with the questions of Israel’s Jewish/democratic character (Hartman 2010), and, of course, Peter Beinart’s widely read essay in the *New York Review of Books* on the failure of the American Jewish establishment (2010). In the past year, the approach has even made it to the podcasting medium with the bi-weekly *Promised Podcast*.

These statements all approach the issue somewhat differently, but they hold certain things in common. They all agree that Israel education should no longer deal only with idealistic and simplistic understandings of Israel, although there are differences in emphasis as to just how “gritty” Israel education should be; they all agree that Israel education must relate to questions of personal meaning and identity, although, again, with different nuances as to how this might be done; they offer various views on how complexity should be handled in children’s different developmental stages; and, crucially, none of these writers, thinkers, or commentators base their approaches on empirical research. Their statements are based on hunches, anecdotal evidence, and their own perceptions of the field. Hence our term “the complexity *hypothesis*.” It may well be that the hypothesis is correct; but to date no research has been done to test it. Our research agenda seeks to address this situation.

A Research Agenda

Our research agenda is broadly divided into two areas, looking at teacher capacities and training, following our overarching research question. We should note that we have tried to keep our research questions broad enough to relate to include a range of educational contexts in which Israel education happens, and a span of ages and developmental levels. Those funding and carrying out the research will decide whether to ask the questions in one particular context or many.

Firstly, we are concerned with identifying the capacities of effective Israel educators. To this end we suggest research to identify who our current Israel educators are, and to define and consider two categories: master educators and emerging educators. Our second broad area of research is concerned with training educators for the field, both in pre-service and in-service contexts. Our research agenda is concerned with mapping the current state of opportunities for training, as well as looking at the question of where the training does and should happen (in Israel or outside Israel), and questions related to the complexity hypothesis.

Each of the research categories contains a variety of questions and issues which would benefit from specific research cycles. Where possible, we have graphically indicated shorter research projects, suitable for 90-day cycles, with the graphic S➡; medium-range research projects with the graphic M➡, and long-term research cycles with the graphic L➡.

It is important to note that, while we see each of these sub-categories as discrete, there are also significant overlapping questions between the categories. In addition, we envision these research projects as an ongoing

process through which to build the field. The projects, whether short, medium or long term, will build on each other, and strengthen each other and the field as a whole as they are undertaken.

The Capacities of an Israel Educator

Mapping the Field - Who are the educators?

Who is actually “doing” Israel education in various contexts? Is it Judaic Studies teachers, Israelis who now live in the US, shlichim (short, medium and long-term), people who've been to Israel, people who have been explicitly trained in Israel education, etc.? This category is a field-mapping exercise in order to provide a baseline for further research about changes and effects down the line. In these research projects, we refer not to “master Israel educators” as identified by peers, as in section (2) below, but just to typical educators who self-identify as doing Israel education some of the time.

S↻	<p>Research project 1.a:</p> <p>Goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To gain knowledge about what kinds of people understand their work to involve Israel education; • To understand where Israel educators of different types are located in the various educational settings and to identify where there are concentration, or gaps of people doing this work. <p>Methodology:</p> <p>Quantitative survey of staff in Jewish educational settings that seeks to locate those who self-identify as “doing Israel education”. This could be a smaller geographically-limited study, or potentially a national one (although that would be a large undertaking).</p>
M→	

M→ L↻	<p>Research project 1.b: A medium or potentially long-term longitudinal study that would follow a group of self-identified “Israel educators”.</p>
----------	---

M→	<p>Research Project 1.c</p> <p>Goal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To understand the actual content, scope, philosophy, depth, etc, of Israel education as it is currently being delivered in a variety of educational settings. <p>Methodology:</p> <p>The study would include the educators’ logs and reflective journals about what they were doing, and observations by outside researchers. The study’s purpose would be to gain more understanding of the day-in, day-out work that Israel educators do: What kinds of questions do students raise? What kinds of subjects are being taught? What kinds of approaches are being used? Where do these educators feel their weaknesses are?</p>
----	--

Defining “master” Israel educators

What are the capacities of master Israel educators? Where and how did they acquire those capacities? How do they understand their work and its preparation needs? How do their capacities enable them to teach Israel in different educational contexts and to various ages of learners?

S →	<p>Research project 2.a: Posit a category of “master Israel educator” and explore it.</p> <p>Goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To identify a cohort of the most ‘effective’ Israel educators in the field in North America (using recommendations of educators/peers) and understand the characteristics of these individuals; • To learn more about the training, experiences and capacities that these master Israel educators underwent/achieved; • To create a measure (based on the excellence already in the field) by which to judge future educators; • To create a yardstick which Israel educator preparation programs can use as a vision of success. <p>Methodology:</p> <p>Qualitative study to identify shared experiences, formal qualifications, attitudes and educational methodologies (if any) that allow us to understand the most important and effective capacities of an Israel educator.</p> <p>This could be a good 90-day research cycle.</p>
------------	--

M →	<p>Research project 2.b: One could also suggest a medium-term version of this project which includes observation and documentation of the educators in action.</p>
------------	---

Understanding the nature of emerging Israel educators

In this sub-category, we are again interested in Israel educators, but here we suggest a focus on those who are just entering the field, rather than those with experience in it. Our interest is in the journey of those educators as they choose to enter the field, their motivations, questions, experiences, etc. The assumption is that the more we understand about the individual growth and experiences of Israel educators, the more we can recruit them, serve them, and learn about how to train the next generation of effective Israel educators.

S →	<p>Research project 3.a:</p> <p>Goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To understand more clearly who the emerging Israel educators are and will be, in order to serve them better and maximize their skills and interests; • To understand better the experience of young people going through Israel educator preparation, in order to give us greater insight into how they receive and process the educational/academic experiences which existing institutions offer; • To identify the characteristics of emerging Israel educators, in order to identify and target the next generation thereof. <p>Methodology:</p> <p>Qualitative research on young people who are in Jewish education pre-service programs and have either chosen to specialize in Israel education or are considering it. In-depth interviews focusing on their journeys to Jewish/Israel education. Why did they choose this path and what lies behind these choices, what do they see themselves doing in the future, what do they see as their needs to be effective Israel educators, etc. For those who are already in programs, how have they perceived their training? What questions has it raised for them, either professional or personal? How has their</p>
------------	---

	training influenced the way they think about their future role, skills and knowledge needed? This could be a 90-day cycle.
--	--

M→	Research project 3.b: Methodology: A longer term version of 3.a would be to do a serious medium-term exploration of a program over the course of a semester or year. For example, a researcher could follow and interview students in one of the existing programs, analyze what's going on, talk to them, figure out what they're thinking, what their challenges are over the whole semester. The field would benefit from several of these kinds of studies, either in parallel or seriatim.
L⇨	Research project 3.c: Methodology:
M→	Practitioner-researcher reflection from those leading or teaching in these programs. [Full disclosure: Ofra Backenroth and Alex Sinclair are planning to do something like this for Keshet Hadash - but in general it would be good for the field to have a collection of such pieces from various programs.]

Training and Professional Development

Research on current institutional training realities

In this category we are interested in the preparation of emerging Israel educators from an institutional or organizational perspective. What programs currently exist which explicitly state the training of Israel educators as a goal? What approaches do these programs have? What are their Hebrew requirements, their Israel subject matter and educational course requirements, and what demands do they make about spending time in Israel?

S⇨	Research project 4.a: Goals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To map the field of training programs from an institutional perspective; • To identify common programs of in-service training, both prolonged and “one-off”; • To identify where there is a concentration of ideology, style, or philosophy, and where there are gaps (e.g. geographical, philosophical, or otherwise); • To offer institutions and philanthropists a detailed image of the training realities in the field, so that relevant policy decisions can be made for the future. Methodologies: Data gathering about existing training programs, including numbers, student profile, course structure, and the level of current demand for specific institutions. Curriculum analysis of required courses in existing pre-service professional training programs. This would be a serious discourse analysis of the syllabus, requirements, activities, and philosophies, of the different courses that people take as part of the various programs, to uncover their guiding assumptions about skills and experiences that emerging Israel educators need. [To the extent that the mapping would also look at the location of the training (i.e. in Israel or outside), there is some overlap here with section 5.] The project would also have to include qualitative interviews with the leadership of the various programs in order to probe their guiding assumptions and rationales. This could be a 90-day cycle, but may require slightly more time.
----	--

M→	Research project 4.b:
----	------------------------------

L⇨	<p>Goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To provide an action research framework for teacher educators in the field of Israel education; • To empower those teacher educators to create and share new knowledge for the field that emerges from their own practice-based research. <p>Methodology:</p> <p>We would suggest an action research project involving the educational leadership of various institutions and organizations who are explicitly invested in Israel education. This could involve a Critical Friends Group where group members self-document and analyze shared problems of practice or theory; peer observations across programs which would be written up and shared; and short conceptual or empirical studies led by small teams of two or three leaders. This is clearly a medium- or perhaps even long-term research agenda, with significant logistical and political hurdles to overcome, but it could be immensely useful to the development of the field.</p>
----	--

The “location” question

The question of where a person is trained to be an Israel educator is one that raises many issues, both educational and philosophical-ideological. There are philosophical-ideological approaches to Jewish life that deem it crucial for an Israel educator (and indeed, any Jewish educator) to have spent some extended period in Israel. But even putting aside questions of philosophy and ideology, from a purely educational perspective, if we take seriously the notion of pedagogical content knowledge, then it seems hard to imagine an Israel educator who has not spent time in the very context about which she is supposed to be teaching.

The more complicated questions concern the content of the Israel educator’s Israel experience itself, and we believe that these questions are worth serious consideration from a research perspective. Is *any* extended time spent in Israel valuable for an Israel educator, or are specific types of experiences and exposures necessary for Israel educator preparation? If so, what *are* the particular content, structures, and areas of engagement that an Israel experience for Israel educators should consist of? Following these questions, how do emerging educators who go through profound and meaningful experiences in Israel deal with the “reality check” on their return to the US? How might Israelis based in the US (either as emigrants or on a temporary basis) be useful in Israel educator preparation? What kinds of Israel educator preparation (e.g. content, skills, or other elements) *can* take place outside of Israel?

M→	<p>Research Project 5.a: What role does location play in training (pre- or in-service) for Israel educators?</p> <p>Goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To consider the role played by location of training programs and experiences for Israel educators; • To probe the different assumptions behind, and experience of, training that happens in Israel and outside Israel; • To measure the relative value of training experiences in and outside Israel, and provide a way to analyze and measure the value and efficacy of training programs held in and outside Israel. <p>Methodology:</p> <p>We would suggest a comparative study of various training programs, some of which include an Israel-based component and some of which do not. We would imagine a multi-faceted study, using qualitative and quantitative methods, focused on the experiences of both students and faculty, that would analyze the assumptions behind the choice of location, the differences between content/curriculum in the two locations, and the impact of the location in which the training takes place.</p>
----	---

	<p>Research project 5.b: What Israel experience content is particularly necessary for Israel educators? Goal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To establish what kinds of engagement, exposures, content, formats, structures, etc., are particularly important for the preparation of Israel educators while they are physically in Israel. <p>Methodology: Comparative study of various Israel experience programs for Israel educators, including curriculum analysis, interviews with program leaders, and observations. Qualitative and quantitative methods should both be used.</p>
--	---

Research on the “complexity hypothesis”

As can be seen from the literature review, many contemporary stakeholders in the field of Israel education have written about what we are here terming the “complexity hypothesis”. Much contemporary discourse in the field of Israel education, on the level of both individual thinkers and institutional agendas (e.g. Makom, The Hartman Institute, The Davidson School at JTS), make the claim that Israel education that engages with all of Israel’s complexities will ultimately lead to more robust connections between young people and Israel; therefore, Israel educators need to acquire and apply those kinds of complex understandings. Put simply, research is needed to evaluate this claim. Is it really true? How would we know? How can complexity be incorporated at children’s different developmental stages? What are the consequences of these assumptions in terms of what educators need to understand in order to do their work?

The complexity hypothesis has been rendered in diverse ways and has by now become one of those vague notions that many officially support, while holding what may be quite different understandings of its meaning and programmatic implications. If these assumptions are to ground Israel education and the preparation of Israel educators, then research is needed to establish how different stakeholders, especially those who prepare educators, understand the issue.

The following three projects build off each other. Each later project needs the results from the earlier one in order to push this agenda forward.

S↻	<p>Research project 6.a: What is the “complexity hypothesis”? Goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To describe and analyze the hypothesis from a conceptual standpoint; • To analyze how the hypothesis is rendered or understood by different stakeholders; • To summarize the core shared aspects of the hypothesis and those areas where there are significant differences in how it is understood by different stakeholders. <p>Methodologies: There are a variety of ways to tackle this question. One way would be to look in depth at a couple of examples of “complex” Israel education (as identified by educators, peers and other professionals engaged in Israel education) and do a serious discourse analysis of the educational content, explicit and implicit messages in order to describe what it is and how it looks in practice. (This would be a sub-category of 2.a).</p> <p>Another approach would be to carry out a conceptual analysis of writings on the complexity hypothesis, to tease out different nuances and emphases in order to create a “typology of complexity”, or an analytical philosophical analysis of how the notion of complexity is used by different</p>
----	--

	stakeholders in the field.
--	----------------------------

M→	<p>A third approach, which would be a medium-term project, which would follow and analyze an existing program that explicitly adopts the complexity hypothesis, and observe how this is manifested in curricular terms.</p> <p>Research project 6.b: What are the impacts of ‘complex’ education on the participants (i.e. the educators in training)?</p> <p>Goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To understand how emerging educators react to and relate to the complexity hypothesis, as they engage with the complexity of Israel, and integrate those understandings into their own relationship with Israel; • To understand how the resulting complexity informs their conceptions of their future work. <p>Methodology:</p> <p>Qualitative study of a cohort of students who have received a ‘complex’ Israel education experience. This might include before-and-after questionnaires focused on certain attitudes and behavioral indicators. It might include interviews that seek to identify how the students experience that complexity.</p> <p>It might also need to take a somewhat longitudinal approach, given that impacts might take time to emerge, and often the hypothesis is that students encounter challenge and complexity in college and therefore it is only there that the value of the complexity can be tested. A longitudinal study of this nature would be very complex, and would involve some tricky methodological issues: how do you know that whatever attitudes eventually emerge are the result of any one particular experience? How do you control for them? It could get very fuzzy. We are not saying that it should not be attempted, but we are suggesting sobriety about its trickiness and the possibility of resulting in definitive answers.</p>
L⇒	

M→	<p>Research project 6.c: Analyze current training programs from a perspective of how ‘complex’ they are, and how much they do and do not deliberately try to create challenging and potentially difficult experiences for the education students. What makes a training program ‘complex’? How do students respond to this ‘complexity’? Does it make a difference if the program is in Israel or not (Davidson, Pardes educators versus iCenter program)? What kind of students are attracted, or not attracted to programs, and is there any connection to the explicit level of complexity that the programs embody?</p> <p>This is clearly related to 2.a, 3.a, and 3.b above, but with a specific focus on the complexity hypothesis.</p>
----	---

Relationships and Connections:

The questions in this brief overlap with many of the other foci in the CASJE Israel Education Panel agenda. For example, the questions regarding the relationship between Hebrew language acquisition and Israel education have direct and obvious impact on questions of training and preparation. Put simply: to what extent should facility with the Hebrew language be part of the preparation requirements for Israel educators? Research from the Hebrew language brief will help us gain clarity regarding that question. Additionally, the questions of metrics and definitions of success link clearly to this brief, because one hopes that Israel educators will attain the capacities needed to lead their students towards successful outcomes. Clarity about

what those outcomes and metrics are for American Jewish organizations and their learners will directly impact the research questions about their educators' required capacities.

And perhaps the most significant link between our research brief and others is to the issue of the purposes and possible outcomes of Israel education. Firstly, these are questions that we want pre- and in-service Israel educators to grapple with themselves. In other words, the very engagement with questions around purpose and vision should itself be part of Israel educator preparation. Secondly, questions of purpose clearly overlap with many of the research projects we have suggested here. For example, the complexity hypothesis is a significant conceptual issue not just for the preparation of Israel educators, but for the purposes of Israel education itself.

Finally, while we argued above that the term "Israel educator" is deserving of stand-alone treatment, it is also clear that the term fits into a wider context of Jewish and general education. The ways in which an Israel educator's preparation is informed by travel education (Kelner 2010), heritage education, or research on identity through peoplehood, and other cognate sub-fields (Isaacs 2011) deserve further investigation and consideration beyond what has been discussed here.

References

- Ball, D.L., & Forzani, F.M. 2010a. What does it take to make a teacher? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 92(2), 8-12.
- Ball, D.L., & Forzani, F.M. 2010b. Teaching skillful teaching. *Educational Leadership*, 68(4), 40-45.
- Beinart, P. 2010. [The Failure of the American Jewish Establishment](#). *New York Review of Books*, June.
- Carroll, D., Featherstone, H., Featherstone, J., Feiman-Nemser, S., & Roosevelt, D. 2007. *Transforming Teacher Education: Reflections from the Field*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Chazan, Barry. 1971. *Texts and Contexts: Israel in the Jewish Curriculum*. New York: JTS Press.
- Chazan, B. 2000. Through a Glass Darkly: Israel in the Mirror of American Jewish Education, in A. Gal and A. Gottschalk (Eds.), *Beyond Survival and Philanthropy*. Cincinnati: HUC Press.
- Chazan, B. 2003. The philosophy of informal Jewish education. *The Encyclopedia of Informal Education*. Retrieved January 21st 2013 from http://www.infed.org/informaljewisheducation/informal_jewish_education.htm
- Chazan, B. 2004. Schechter's Lament: Israel and Jewish Education Once Again. *Agenda: Jewish Education*. Jewish Education Service of North America (JESNA). Winter.
- Cohen, S. M., & Kelman, A. Y. 2007. *Beyond Distancing: Young Adult American Jews and their Alienation from Israel*. New York: Andrea and Charles Bronfman Philanthropies.
- Cohen, S. M., & Kelman, A. Y. 2010. Thinking about Distancing from Israel. *Contemporary Jewry* 30(2-3).
- Cohen, S.M. and Liebman, C.S. 2000. Israel and American Jewry in the Twenty-first century, in A. Gal and A. Gottschalk (Eds.), *Beyond Survival and Philanthropy*. Cincinnati: HUC Press.
- Dorph, G. 2011. Professional Development of Teachers in Jewish Education. *International Handbook of Jewish Education*. vol. 5 Ed. H. Miller, L. Grant, A. Pomson. London: Springer. 959-980.
- Eisen, A and Rosenak, M. 1997. *Israel in Our Lives*. Jerusalem, Joint Authority for Jewish Zionist Education.
- Feiman-Nemser, Sharon. 2008. Learning to teach. What we know now about Jewish education: Perspectives on research and practice. Ed. P. Flexner & R. Goodman (Eds.). Los Angeles: Tora Aura Publications. 213-222.
- Feiman-Nemser, Sharon. 2011. Preparing teachers for Jewish schools: Enduring issues in changing contexts. *International Handbook of Jewish Education*. vol. 5 Ed. H. Miller, L. Grant, A. Pomson. London: Springer. 937-958.
- Grant, Lisa D. 2007. Israel Education in Reform Congregational Schools. *CCAR Journal*. Summer.
- Gringras, R. 2006. Wrestling and Hugging: Alternative paradigms for the Diaspora-Israel relationship. Jewish Agency for Israel (JAFI), Makom: Renewing Israel Engagement.
- Hartman, D. 2010. The New Rules of Engagement. Retrieved January 21st 2013, from http://hartman.org.il/Blogs_View.asp?Article_Id=489&Cat_Id=273&Cat_Type=Blogs

- Isaacs, A. 2011. Israel Education: Practices and Purposes. *International Handbook of Jewish Education*. vol. 5 Ed. H. Miller, L. Grant, A. Pomson. London: Springer. 479-496.
- Kelner, S. 2010. *Tours that Bind: Diaspora, Pilgrimage, and Israeli Birthright Tourism*. New York: NYU Press.
- Little, J.W. 1993. Teachers' Professional Development in a Climate of Educational Reform. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 15/2.
- McDonald, J. P. 1992. *Teaching: Making Sense of an Uncertain Craft*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Michaelson, J. 2009. How I'm Losing My Love for Israel. *The Forward*, September 25.
- Pomson, A. and Grant, L. 2004. Getting Personal with Professional Development: The case of short term trips to Israel, in J. Bashi, M. B. Peretz and A. Bouganim (Eds.), *Education and Professional Training*. Jerusalem: Jewish Agency.
- Reimer, J.B. 2009. Experiential Jewish Education. What we now know about Jewish education: Perspectives on research for practice. Ed. RL Goodman, PA Flexner. LD Bloomberg. Los Angeles: Torah Aura. 343-352.
- Ruskay, J.S. and Szonyi, D. 1990. *Deepening the Commitment: Zionism and the Conservative/Masorti Movement*. New York: JTS Press.
- Shulman, S. 1986. Those Who Understand: Knowledge Growth in Teaching. *Educational Researcher*, Vol. 15, No. 2. 4-14.
- Sinclair, A. 2003. Beyond Black and White: Teaching Israel in Light of the Matzav. *Conservative Judaism* 55 (4), 69-80.
- Sinclair, A. 2009. A New Heuristic Device for the Analysis of Israel Education: Observations from a Jewish Summer Camp, *Journal of Jewish Education* 75 (1), 79-106.