Chapter 7. Educational Offerings & Related Educational Activities
(Standards 11 and 13)

Overview of Charge

Cross-campus integration is the theme of the College-Institute's first self-study after its merger of accreditation from three regional agencies to one. The group's choices of research questions underscore this dual commitment to evidence and integration. Toward this goal of improving integration, related educational activities were discussed as the issue arose rather than separated as primary and secondary activities. Therefore, the fundamental elements from Standard 13 are inserted where the activity is discussed. As in earlier chapters, if none of the research questions addressed an element, that element is discussed in separate sections on *Additional Findings.*

Standards 11 & 13. Educational Offerings & Related Educational Activities

Discussion of Research Questions and Compliance

Research Question 11-13.1

> *To what extent do the statements of expected student learning outcomes reflect the academic content, rigor, and coherence appropriate to the mission of the College-Institute? And how well are they communicated?*

The group divided this crucial issue into the three areas of content, rigor, and coherence, since each of these elements is measured in different ways.

Content

One key source of information regarding this question is the course descriptions mentioned in a 2012 study that analyzed course descriptions from syllabi in relation to the mission of the College-Institute. Expected student learning outcomes are incorporated into the syllabi (fulfilling S11_12). Analysis of them makes it evident that faculty frame the student learning outcomes using different terminology. Some of these statements are couched in traditional academic terms, while others are focused on what students will be able to do with what is being taught. The working group's analysis suggests that the great majority of syllabi and course descriptions include explicit reference to learning outcomes which are consistent with the content, rigor, and coherence embodied in the College-Institute's various curricular documents.

The level of integration among students in different programs and on different campuses is growing as more students enroll for more than one program (Rabbi-Educators is a prime example), and with a steady rise in the number of courses being offered simultaneously on more than one campus using distance-learning technology. This change is accentuating the need for a common language of learning outcomes, to help communicate to the College-Institute's students what various courses are intended to achieve. The overwhelming sense is that the courses on offer are serious, challenging, and relevant. Rather, the issue to be addressed is the broad variance in the manner in which the learning outcomes of the courses are expressed. The first suggestion at the end of the chapter follows from these considerations.

Perusal of the course descriptions indicates beyond any serious doubt that the educational offerings of the school are fully consistent with the academic standards appropriate to the College-Institute's mission. It is clear that what is perhaps the largest faculty of Jewish studies to be found outside the State of Israel is providing a range and depth of teaching which bears favorable comparison with any Jewish Studies program in the world.

Rigor

Rigor is perhaps harder to gauge. Typically the syllabi include a section on expectations, but it may be worthwhile launching a research project to see how much time and effort these requirements do in fact demand of students. The College-Institute's manageable program assessments have the basic data to do such a study. The number of courses in which a particular *Practical* level outcome is addressed, the length of time to move from the *Easy* to the *Practical* level, and the endurance of the *Practical* level (e.g., lack of regression back to *Easy* in later courses) are indications of rigor. A course in which many students move to a higher level is a "high-impact" course if faculty teaching subsequent courses also indicate the higher level of performance. Rigor can also be assessed by comparing the preparation of students. A "rigorous" change might be one that needs extensive preparation before it becomes sustained.

The issue of rigor might also be gauged from three perspectives: whether the College-Institute's faculty believes the courses are structured and studied in a way they consider to be rigorous, whether the congregations and institutions out in the field feel that HUC-JIR students have received an appropriately rigorous education, and whether the students perceive that the program has led to sufficient growth. Faculty address this issue through the program assessment detailed in Chapter 8. Alumni perceptions were gathered through the recent survey reported in Chapter 2 (Alumni Survey Graphs, Alumni Survey Summary 2011). Responses from the Year-in-Israel Survey Results (2009-11) showed that the students reported more growth in *Israel studies* and *Hebrew knowledge* compared to *personal and spiritual growth, facility with texts,* and *professional growth.* That students routinely report major growth in the area of Hebrew is noteworthy, since the area of Hebrew skills continues to be the source of significant debate within the faculty of the College-Institute. Indeed, a faculty consultation in Hebrew occurred in June 2012 in Jerusalem to discuss possible improvements in Hebrew instruction at the College-Institute. The relative importance of modern Israeli Hebrew and classic textual Hebrew for the remaining years of the stateside curriculum was a key issue.

Compliance with the rigor aspects of this Research Question and with S11_01 and S11_02 is assured in numerous ways, including especially the manageable program assessment that was based on the creation of Learning Outcomes Networks (LONs, described in Chapter 8) for every program, matching these to mission statements and courses, matching course descriptions across campuses for courses leading to rabbinical ordination (the only all-campuses program), alumni employment analysis, monitoring Federal Financial Aid Loan Repayment, and studying alumni careers. In addition, the current mission statement for the Rabbinical School (all campuses) was drafted from the *Practical* level of the LON for the program. Using rubrics based on interviews of all full-time faculty that match to the elements of the program mission statement approved by the entire faculty should facilitate faculty connecting course objectives to the program mission. Mission statements of the School of Graduate Studies, School of Jewish Nonprofit Management and the DeLeT certification program in education have been matched to their rubrics. The mission-drafting process now needs to be extended to the other programs. Thus, at this point the College-Institute is in partial fulfillment of S11_03 and needs to make the improvements identified in the first suggestion at the end of the chapter.

As indicated in Chapter 8, the assessment process in the Rabbinical School was expanded in spring 2012 to capture the fifth-year capstone projects. At this time[16] the College-Institute can already show that, a year before graduation, Cincinnati rabbinical students are performing at the *Practical* level (the target program level) nearly 75% of the time for eight of eleven dimensions. Ratings of two of the remaining dimensions (*Critique, Research & Write* and *Scholarship & Use of Sources*) will likely change substantially when more capstone projects are rated, and as the impact of the newly-introduced (fall 2012) Writing Center begins to figure into assessment results. The dimension with the third lowest ratings at the *Practical* level was teaching. This may reflect the lack of a School of Education on the Cincinnati campus and is likely to change substantially as the Service Learning Grant is implemented. Further documentation of HUC-JIR's fulfillment S11_04 is found in Chapter 8.

Another sign of adequate rigor is the College-Institute's federal loan default rate, which has hovered between 0 and 1% for recent years. A significant factor in keeping these rates low involves monitoring the careers of graduates, as was done in a recent career-path study of types of organizations served by men and women alumni over the decades after ordination.

Data gleaned in 2005 during a strategic planning process gives a sense of how alumni and lay leaders polled at that time gauged the impact of HUC-JIR on the preparation of its graduates in a wide array of areas. This survey addressed in a quite thorough way the issue of emphasis, which is related to, but not equivalent to, rigor. The survey found for example that alumni considered "people skills" to be the most valuable of 15 areas for effectiveness and success "on the job" but the second lowest area of contribution of the College-Institute, while the programs emphasized *Jewish learning and text skills* and *Hebrew language skills*, which alumni claimed were of lesser usefulness, in direct contradiction to the College-Institute's enduring purpose and aspirations for its alumni. *Teaching skills* was an area that was high on both lists. Since that survey, there has been an increase in emphasis on *clinical pastoral education* and on *leadership skills*. These findings bring up two considerations for the future that added to the suggestions listed at the end of the chapter.

Coherence

The term "coherence" needs some explanation. Assuming that what is meant by this term is a combination of relevance and integration, the new study of course descriptions does indicate that, at least at the declaratory level, expected student learning outcomes are characterized by a high degree of coherence (S11_02). Again the manageable program assessments provide a significant opportunity to enrich "coherence." Thus, they enable the possibility of a transcript of all the assessment ratings supplemented by narrative assessments by previous instructors. This transcript could be provided to each faculty member at the beginning of the student's next term and used by the faculty to help the student focus on areas found to be problematic in previous courses.

There is a major and inherent tension between the academic and professional aspects of teaching in most of College-Institute programs (much less in the School of Graduate Studies than in the other programs). The Learning Outcomes Network shows that the conceptual dimensions move together while the professional dimensions and Hebrew language skills develop independently of each other. This tension is recognized by students and faculty alike and, on occasion, it becomes understood as a competition for curricular priority and allocation of time. A number of attempts have been made to address this perceived clash of interests. A

---

[16]The Cincinnati program assessment process using MODEL rubrics was begun in Fall 2009, which was five terms before it was rolled out to all programs and campuses.

major grant recently announced will make it possible for the Rabbinical Program on the Cincinnati campus to engage for the next five years at least in the creation of models of service-learning, designed to integrate academic study with communal engagement wherever the faculty deems this appropriate. On each of the other campuses, attempts have also been made to integrate the so-called "academic" with the "professional" dimensions of the curriculum. In Los Angeles, for example, the School of Jewish Nonprofit Management and the DeLeT program have developed a strong mentoring program, while in New York the Jewish Spirituality Initiative has generated much excitement and interest.

All these initiatives are examples of attempts being made to enhance the coherence of the educational offerings. Coherence does not imply coalescence. There will continue to be distinct kinds of requirements in, for example, the academic and professional spheres. On the other hand, the range of learning outcomes may produce confusion in the minds of students. It is important to ensure that the aims of each program are clearly communicated, and that the way in which each course furthers these aims is stated concisely and explicitly.

Our conclusion is that the statements of learning outcomes reflect to a very significant extent the academic content, rigor, and coherence appropriate to the College-Institute's mission. To the extent that these expected learning outcomes are stated clearly in each course, and each program makes efforts to communicate the appropriate outcomes at the program level, the working group believes they are well communicated. There is, however, more work to be done, and the group's suggestions on the topic are listed at the end of the chapter.

Research Question 11-13.2

How pervasive and effective are opportunities for students to reflect on learning outcomes and synthesize what they have learned?

In a recent alumni survey students from each program and different eras were asked a direct question relating to opportunities for reflection. The question was framed thus:

Looking back on your time at HUC-JIR, do you feel you had opportunities to reflect on and synthesize the material you were learning?

The 476 replies closely approximated a normal distribution, as shown in Figure 7.1.

4.2% said they had no opportunity for reflection, while 1.7% complained of having too many opportunities for reflection. Everyone else was ranged between these two extreme positions, with 40% considering the number of opportunities for reflection to be just right, 29% slightly too much and 24% slightly too little.

Over the last few years a considerable amount of attention has been given to reflection and integration in most College-Institute programs. With the possible exception of the School of Graduate Studies, the academic programs all comprise a blend of academic, professional, and spiritual dimensions. Emphasis has always been placed on the academic dimension of this triad, but it is not considered axiomatic that one aspect has to come at the expense of the others.

The survey of alumni (Alumni Survey Summary) also showed that in the perception of many alumni there has been a shift over time both in the relative emphasis given to the three dimensions (academic, professional, and spiritual) at HUC-JIR, and indeed in the relative importance attached to them by the alumni themselves. While the evidence shows interesting variance of nuance among the three stateside campuses, the overall trend is clear: while the academic emphasis as perceived by alumni stays high, its relative dominance has been eroded,

and the professional dimension of the education offered at the College-Institute is gaining. This is true both of the way in which the College-Institute's alumni perceive the curricular emphasis of the school and also of the level of meaningfulness they themselves attribute to these aspects of the learning process. It is also striking that students of the College-Institute in recent years ascribe a much greater significance to the spiritual dimension of their education, although they are less convinced that their preference is reflected in the curricular priorities of the College-Institute.

Although this particular research separates out three distinct strands of the learning experience, the question at hand is: how does the College-Institute create opportunities for students to reflect and synthesize? When are students encouraged to step back from the particular requirements of one course or another in order to ponder the "big picture"?

The Rabbinical School Exit Interviews (LA , CN, NY) prominently address matters of academic-professional-spiritual integration. As the five-year program comes to its close, the Rabbinical School faculty is interested in the extent to which the program's various strands have come together.

One major forward step in this area is known as the Mandel Initiative. In January 2011 representatives from all four campuses met to discuss ways in which the aspect of visionary leadership might be accentuated. The program of that gathering combined with the follow-up plans for the inquiry groups illustrate the extent to which integration remains high on the agenda.

Our Schools of Education have consistently demonstrated a marked emphasis on both reflection and integration. Many aspects of the education curriculum explicitly privilege this dimension of the learning process. One example of this emphasis is the Day School Internship program for rabbinical, cantorial, and education students, co-sponsored by HUC- JIR, the URJ, and the Progressive Association of Reform Jewish Day Schools (PARDES). The goal of the program is to encourage participants to become advocates for day school education within the Reform movement and, in particular, in their congregations and their professional organizations. The program is open to all students from all campuses and all programs by application, which includes two reflective essays.

The core of the program is a week-long visit to a Reform day school (a different school each year). Most days begin with reflection with faculty and then move to observation and practice, then back to reflection. In the fall following the school visit, students plan and present a program on their respective campuses to introduce their colleagues to day school education as a viable option for children from Reform Jewish families.

There is an unprecedented level of co-curricular offerings in most of the College-Institute's various programs today. Students are invited to participate in a range of seminars, retreats, lectures, weekend experiences, conferences, and the like. Many of them encourage taking a broad view and considering the meta-implications of the program of study. Among the activities which can be included in this category are the Schusterman retreat for issues of outreach to interfaith couples and families in the congregational setting as well as to special groups including singles, couples, gays and lesbians; the Gerecht Institute for issues of conversion and outreach; a range of activities sponsored by the Davidson fund for social action and community involvement; as well as programs offered by organizations such as The National Center for Jewish Learning and Leadership (CLAL) in New York and the Shalom Hartman Institute in Israel.

It is worth noting that, beyond the small number of alumni who complain of far too much reflection, some concern has been expressed by faculty members and some current students about the risk of moving too extremely in the direction of hyper-reflection. Some faculty members believe that the centrality of academic study should be championed at all costs. They argue that the business of reflecting and constructing overarching meaning should not be "spoon-fed". Rather, it should emerge more organically.

Similarly, significant concerns have been expressed about the plethora of co-curricular offerings, sometimes described as a "shadow curriculum" (cf. also Chapters 3 and 6). These issues have been raised by the Faculty Council, and in 2011 the National Assessment Committee began to consider how the relative benefits and costs of such an emphasis on co-curricular offerings might be assessed.

At present, these voices are audible, but they do not overwhelm the calls for a greater emphasis on reflection and integration. More and more of the capstone projects being required in courses call for a significant degree of integration. Plans currently being developed for a service-learning model in Cincinnati, while still in the early stages, also suggest that significant efforts will be made to emphasize the integration of academic with other dimensions of the learning experience.

Rather than come down on one side or other of this debate, the working group notes that the number of opportunities for reflection and integration is greater than ever before and that the College-Institute certainly fulfills S11_02.

Research Question 11-13.3

What is the level of coherence among the activities and offerings in the rabbinical programs on the College-Institute's different sites?

In 2011 the Director of the LA Rabbinical School completed a major study of Rabbinical School Coherence among Campuses (focusing on the three stateside campuses, which all deliver the second through fifth years of the program). This study provides clear evidence that the three stateside campuses deliver the same rabbinic core curriculum, each playing to its particular strengths and traditions. This finding also has been supported by keyword studies of the relation of assessment rubrics to mission to courses, conducted in 2009 and 2012. The 2012 study of course descriptions in 107 syllabi used in the 2011-12 academic year calculated the similarity of keywords in course descriptions to those in the MODEL rubrics. A course was considered to "emphasize" the two dimensions that had the most similar keywords. Interestingly, the number of courses emphasizing each dimension was nearly identical from campus to campus. Thus, both kinds of studies show that HUC-JIR fulfills the location aspect of S11_08 and, for that program, satisfies S13_17 and S13_18. S13_19 is addressed in Chapter 5, while S13_20 informs major portions of Chapters 3 and 6.

Research Question 11-13.4

What evidence exists that students in distance learning courses achieve learning goals comparable to the goals achieved by students in face-to-face courses? What criteria are used to assess the achievement of learning outcomes in the College-Institute's distance learning offerings?

The working group considered two kinds of evidence: the comments of students who have participated in distance courses, and the reflections of faculty members who have been engaged in this kind of teaching.

The eLearning Student Evaluations Analysis is based on a number of student assessments of eLearning classes. The answers to the surveys yield some interesting data. For example, the replies to the question: "Would you take a cross-campus course again?" were 9% "No way" (bottom of 5 choices); 5% "2" (of 5); 33% "Maybe" (the median score); 19% "4" (out of 5); and 35% "Absolutely!"

Clearly, these responses do not of themselves prove that students in these courses achieve learning goals comparable to those achieved by students in face-to-face courses. Indeed, the comments embedded in these assessment forms offer much to think about – the challenge of minimizing technical glitches, the skills required of teachers in giving appropriate attention to all students and in learning to feel comfortable with the technology.

Another important source of evidence has been the faculty reflections on eLearning by those engaged in this kind of teaching. So far, the evidence available relating to the relative quality and efficacy of this kind of instruction is largely anecdotal. Considering the reflections of teachers and students is clearly most helpful in identifying challenges and trends. Thus, the College-Institute fulfills at a basic level S13_21.

Additional Findings Related to Compliance with Standard 11

As described in Chapter 1, the College-Institute has world-renowned library and archival resources staffed by highly qualified professionals who support the College-Institute's educational program. The Cincinnati Klau Library has the second largest Judaica collection in the world and a half-million volumes, underscoring the depth of the College-Institute's learning resources supporting its doctoral and professional programs (and also supporting S11_05). Documentation of the high quality of library services at the College-Institute's main library in Cincinnati was obtained in a 2009 Survey, which should be followed up with a repeat to determine the extent to which the findings have been implemented. Besides the print collection (including another quarter million volumes on the other three campuses), the College-Institute provides and maintains the Jewish Studies Portal. This portal provides extensive electronic databases and other Jewish Studies resources and is licensed for password-protected use by students, faculty, and staff only. The technology survey revealed that some students supported more use of resources like SMARTBoard and SAKAI, and several of these found that faculty had not received adequate support or training. This suggests that there needs to be more software support available.

The 2009 library survey (pp. 67-77) and the existence of the resources in the Jewish Studies Portal showed clearly that extensive collaboration exists among faculty, staff, and administration in fostering information literacy and technological competency skills across the curriculum (supporting S11_06). The library survey showed that, compared to students in courses, students doing theses or dissertations use a greater variety of resources, including the rare book room, books printed before 1900, microforms, and special collections. Nevertheless, their frequency of use of this variety of holdings clearly fulfills S11_07.

Transfer and accelerated degree policies have recently been updated within the new National Student Academic Handbook and were written to conform to the requirements of S11_09 and S11_10. Adult learners are not a major focus of the College-Institute, but when there has been a call for such programs, the response has been to create certificates and executive degrees that serve their needs.

Examination of the *Practical* level (expected of new graduates) of the MODEL rubrics for each of the programs accessed from wiki.huc.edu demonstrates extensive compliance with S11_14. The credentials of the College-Institute's renowned faculty are addressed in Chapter 6 and fulfill

S11_15. Finally, fulfillment of S11_16 on the assessment of student learning and program outcomes is detailed in Chapter 8.

Additional Findings Related to Compliance with Standard 13

For *Basic skills,* the first and third fundamental elements do not apply to post-baccalaureate programs, so were not included or numbered in the listing on wiki.huc.edu under Standard 13. Related Educational Activities. This leaves the second element as number S13_01. Even that element only applies to the single area in which a student admitted to HUC-JIR might be under-prepared, namely, Hebrew language skills. Discussion of the remediation programs that fulfill S13_01 for such students is found under "Additional Findings Related to Compliance with Standard 8" in Chapter 5. As indicated by the mission statements described above, the certificate programs for DeLeT, Jewish Nonprofit Management, and the new Cantorial Certificate are designed, approved, and administered using the same rigorous standards as degree programs, as required by S13_02 and S13_03.

Certificate programs have the same type of rigorous MODEL rubrics, which use the *Practical* level as the program outcomes, fulfilling the evaluation component of S13_02 and S13_04. Student support services for the very small certificate cohorts of the Jewish Nonprofit Management program are identical to those described in Chapter 5. The support services for the DeLeT certificate are documented under Learning and Mentor Teachers at DeLeT Overview and those for the Cantorial Certificate at Cantorial Certificate Support. These fulfill S13_05.

Experiential learning policies including procedures for granting credit for experiences outside of accredited institutions are addressed in the National Student Academic Handbook in the section on "Advanced Standing." These procedures fulfill the rare circumstances that might relate to S13_07 and S13_12.

Non-credit offerings include several institutes and internships. The Mandel Initiative Documentation describes how the initiative aims to enhance the leadership capacity of HUC-JIR rabbinical students in order to enable them, once they are practicing rabbis, to shape vision-guided communities of Reform Jews. Creating Jewish professional leaders is the first element of the College-Institute mission statement. The Schusterman and Gerecht Institute Outreach programs relate to the mission/purpose line on the growth of the Reform movement. The Davidson initiative on social action and community involvement is clearly aimed at "repairing the world" (*Tikkun Ha-olam* in the mission/purpose statement). The New York Spirituality Initiative directly addresses the religious/spiritual dimension included in the HUC-JIR mission. During the year in Israel, students visit the former Soviet Union during Passover to facilitate educational programming and prayer experiences in Progressive communities. Some students also serve in activities involving social responsibility, including American Jewish World Service internships and a wide variety of other agencies. These connections show clearly that the noncredit offerings are consistent with the HUC-JIR mission, as required by S13_13. These program descriptions also identify the learning goals, objectives, and expectations, as prescribed by S13_14. Documentation of assessment is most complete in the Mandel Initiative materials and mentioned in the other program descriptions without an analysis of results, indicating a basic compliance with the evaluation aspect of S13_14 and with S13_16. The National Assessment Committee Minutes document a start on a project to assess the impact of all such short-term programs on other aspects of the relevant programs, but this effort got deferred by the successful effort to create an institution-wide Rabbinical Mission Statement. Regarding S13_15, none of the College-Institute's non-credit offerings are transferable to other programs.

The College-Institute's few eLearning courses are nearly always synchronous (combining face-to-face and video-supported) making S13_24 and S13_25 resolved in the preceding discussion of rigor under *Research Question 11-13.1*. The rationale for eLearning is carefully spelled out in the eLearning Strategic Plan and in the Strategic Report detailed in Chapter 3, fulfilling S13_22. The first legal issue to be dealt with was compliance with the requirement to assure that students taking courses online are clearly identified. The key policies that the working group has addressed to fulfill S13_23 related to student verification and state authorization. As documented in the National Student Academic Handbook and the Year-in-Israel Student Services Portal Documentation, all students are issued usernames and passwords for email and for access to SAKAI, satisfying the USDE policy regarding student identification. New regulations regarding the enforcement of state authorization for distance learning are too much in flux to address with firm policies at this time. The working group recommends that this be monitored by the National Director of eLearning for changes.

The College-Institute does not make use of consortial partners or contractors for distance learning. Thus, S13_26 and S13_27 have not been relevant to the present time. The Jewish Studies Portal shows extensive online support available to all students in all programs, satisfying S13_28. Facilities available are described on page 5 of the eLearning Strategic Plan and the staffing projections on page 21, showing compliance with S13_30. The plan, combined with the Information Technology Assessment Response to the Administrative Survey Results, demonstrates compliance with S13_31.

Suggestions for Improvement

1. HUC-JIR should create an institution-wide convention for the composition of the College-Institute's syllabi and course descriptions. Each program needs to specify the relation of their mission to their program learning outcomes and these to their assessment rubrics. These specifications should also be made public. The MODEL rubrics provide clear and rigorous statements of outcomes. As noted in the National Assessment Committee Minutes, the *Practical* level provides a good starting point for program outcome statements. As illustrated by the process used to finalize the Rabbinical Mission Statement, these can be improved by the deep group process that the College-Institute habitually uses. A process of consultation among faculty colleagues across the institution should be initiated with the aim of furthering a common language in which the expected learning outcomes should be couched. By this the working group does not intend to limit the academic freedom of any of HUC-JIR instructors, but rather to frame the learning outcomes of each individual course in terms of the wider program, and indeed of the institution as a whole. The working group proposes that course descriptions and syllabi be compared each semester according to fixed parameters, so that this process of increased integration of the College-Institute's message can be gauged.
2. Survey questions of students in each of HUC-JIR's programs should contain at least some questions which are common to all programs. This should give the College-Institute a tool to assess how students perceive the extent to which learning outcomes are clearly communicated and furthered. This would be facilitated by actions to improve the language of the rubrics.
3. Various attempts currently underway to allow the various dimensions of the learning experience to cohere should be tracked and the experience of different campuses and programs should be shared across the institution.
4. A version of the alumni survey described in the 2006 strategic plan should be directed to those students who have graduated since that time to see if there is any significant change

in attitudes, especially as they relate to the valuation of Jewish learning and text skills. A faculty-alumni group should also be convened to consider the meaning of "people skills" and how the development of these skills could be more thoroughly and broadly infused throughout the program. Part of the charge to such a group would be to develop new ways to help alumni value their Jewish learning and textual skills.

5. The experiments being undertaken on each campus should be recorded and shared with campuses across the institution. Periodically, the faculty should review the impact of attempts being made to integrate the academic and professional dimensions of learning taking place in the College-Institute.

6. A faculty group should be organized to consider the advisability of, and methods for, creating Outcomes/Narratives Transcripts and selectively disseminating them to faculty at the beginning of courses.

7. While the number of opportunities for reflection and integration is greater than ever before, research should be undertaken to consider whether this new emphasis is having a positive impact on the students and standard of education of the College-Institute.

8. There is clear evidence that the three stateside campuses deliver the same rabbinic core curriculum, each playing to its particular strengths and traditions. While respecting the distinct culture of each campus, the College-Institute strives for an even higher degree of coherence among the campuses. The working group recommends an emphasis on an intelligible "vocabulary" that allows for local emphases within the framework of curricular coherence. The working group recommends that every three years the degree of curricular integration be the subject of an internal review process. Part of this process would involve having a committee look at the language in the rubrics over dozens of assessed projects to make sure that all members could agree on all levels at least 80% of the time.

9. The National Assessment Committee should work with program faculty (including representatives of Cincinnati's new Service-Learning Program) to formulate a way to evaluate student learning outcomes in non-course curricular requirements and relate them to evidence of expectations of congregations and other institutions served by HUC-JIR students. The OIRA should be charged with analyzing faculty ratings to trace student development over multiple years to see how they contribute to student learning overall and specifically to their learning in other courses. Faculty should define a rubric for evaluating such required activities.

10. Although the evidence available thus far relating to the relative quality and efficacy of distance learning is largely anecdotal, it suggests that those engaged in it are in the main satisfied that the benefits of this addition to HUC-JIR offerings are real, and that they outweigh the challenges associated with it. After the ratings of the manageable program assessments have been completed for a few years on all campuses, their evidence should be correlated with this anecdotal data to see if any discernible variance in the achievement of learning outcomes between students in face-to-face and distance settings can be identified.

11. An emphasis should be placed on the training of faculty in the use of distance-learning technology combined with timely support so that the quality of teaching using this technology is high.

12. The National Director of eLearning should monitor for changes the new regulations regarding enforcement of state authorization for distance learning and propose policies accordingly.