



## **BEST PRACTICES IN HOLOCAUST EDUCATION**

### **REPORT TO THE SAN FRANCISCO JEWISH COMMUNITY ENDOWMENT FUND**

**Submitted by**

**The Berman Center for Research & Evaluation in Jewish Education**

JESNA: Jewish Education Service of North America

Leora W. Isaacs, Ph.D., Director

Wendy J. Rosov, Ph.D., Associate Director

Lauren Raff, Shira Rosenblatt, Shirah Hecht, Senior Research & Evaluation  
Associates

Miri Rozenek, Research Associate

Zohar Rotem, Research Assistant

**October 2006**

JESNA: 111 Eighth Avenue • New York, NY 10011-5201

Tel 212.284.6950 • Fax 212.284.6951

[www.jesna.org](http://www.jesna.org)

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |    |
|---|----|
| I. Introduction.....  | 1  |
| A. Project Description.....   | 1  |
| B. Methodology.....   | 2  |
| C. Report Summary by Project Research Question.....                     | 4  |
| II. Guidelines and Standards for Effective Holocaust Education.....     | 8  |
| A. Introduction.....  | 8  |
| B. Curriculum Guidelines: “Best Practices” For Holocaust Education..... | 8  |
| III. Presentations by Survivors and Alternative Strategies.....         | 12 |
| A. The Benefit Of Using Survivor-presenters.....                        | 12 |
| B. Necessary Conditions for Effective Survivor Presentations.....       | 12 |
| C. Alternatives to Live Presentations by Survivors.....                 | 13 |
| IV. Guidelines for Effective Teacher Professional Development.....      | 15 |
| A. Introduction.....  | 15 |
| B. General Principles, Standards and Guidelines.....                    | 15 |
| C. Costs and Benefits of Training Provided Locally vs. Nationally.....  | 17 |
| V. Effective Outreach and Educational Delivery Systems.....             | 20 |
| A. Overview.....  | 20 |
| B. Reaching Teachers Within the Educational System.....                 | 21 |
| C. The Pivotal Role of Teachers.....                                    | 22 |
| D. Reaching Students.....   | 22 |
| VI. Assessment and Evaluation in the Field.....                         | 24 |
| A. Introduction/Overview.....   | 24 |
| B. Two Examples of Current Research and Findings.....                   | 25 |
| VII. Particular Situation in California.....                            | 27 |
| A. Impact of State Requirements and Legislation.....                    | 27 |
| B. California Programming and Population.....                           | 28 |
| VIII. Summary of Findings and Final Recommendations.....                | 30 |
| A. Summary of Report Findings.....                                      | 30 |
| B. Experts’ Recommendations to Increase Funding Impact.....             | 31 |
| C. Final Note on Community Organization and Synergy.....                | 33 |



# LIST OF APPENDICES

The following appendices are provided in a separate document.

- Appendix I: Annotated Bibliography: Programs, Sources, Assessment
- Appendix II: Selected Bibliography of Academic Books and Articles
- Appendix III: Selected List of Holocaust Organizations
- Appendix IV: Holocaust Museum Houston – Teaching Guidelines
- Appendix V: California Resources and Legislation
- Appendix VI: FHAO Document on Assessment
- Appendix VII: Specific Programming Costs



# REPORT

## I. INTRODUCTION

### A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This research was commissioned to inform decision-making by the board of the Holocaust Memorial/Education Fund about its future directions and funding priorities and to inform funders and agencies providing Holocaust education more broadly. In addition to providing general information about “best practices” in Holocaust education, Holocaust education delivery systems, and the training of Holocaust educators, this report also responds to an interest in considering alternative educational models to address the diminishing access to survivors (who are aging and passing away), whose first-hand presentations have been a centerpiece of many of the educational programs to date.

The goal of the proposed research was to inform recommendations about programs and initiatives that will ensure:

- The deepest and most sustained impact on the broadest number of students;
- The most effective professional development for educators;
- The most efficient delivery systems for Holocaust education in the general community.

Specific questions to be addressed by the research include:

- What are the most effective Holocaust education programs, educator professional development programs and delivery systems, according to field leaders in Holocaust education?
  - What are characteristics of these programs that make them effective?
  - What is the role and importance of first-hand testimony by survivors?
  - How are field leaders thinking about Holocaust education in coming years, in light of the diminishing access to survivors and first-hand testimony?
- How might the community achieve “better penetration into the marketplace” regarding:
  - Involving educators beyond those who are already committed to Holocaust education;
  - Enhancing the effectiveness of teachers who are aware and doing a reasonably good job but are not exceptionally skilled or knowledgeable in the area of Holocaust education;
  - Reaching a broader range of students.
- How is the impact of Holocaust education programs currently being assessed?
  - What measurement techniques and instruments are available that might be adapted for use in the San Francisco Bay Area community?
  - What are the results of available relevant impact evaluations?
- How have other communities with well-developed Holocaust education programs addressed cost/benefit issues including the relative merits of:
  - Educating more teachers locally vs. supporting participation of a few at more intensive national seminars.
  - Professional development for teachers vs. programs and presentations for students.



## B. METHODOLOGY

The method employed to obtain this information was two-fold:

- Speaking with a limited number of leading professionals in this area in order to identify the best practices in this field.
- Gathering documents and other resources that may be available related to best practices.

### 1. INTERVIEWS WITH LEADING PROFESSIONALS

JESNA researchers used a “snowball sampling” strategy to identify and gain access to leading professionals in the field of Holocaust education. Beginning with known professionals in the New York area, the researchers contacted individuals nationally and in Israel by email and phone to introduce the project, to arrange to speak with them on its substantive content and to ask them to recommend additional experts to be interviewed.

In accordance with the proposal for this study, the sample included noted professionals who are associated with a range of institutions including Holocaust museums, Holocaust education and resource centers and state commissions on Holocaust education. There was particular emphasis on including professionals from the California and San Francisco regions.

Through this sampling process, more than 50 experts were identified (some identified by multiple sources), and 22 professionals were interviewed. Of these, 16 individuals participated in extensive interviews that followed a structured protocol and six individuals responded to more focused questions about specific topics of interest.

All of the interviews were conducted by phone and transcribed in detail. The quotations included in this text are “verbatim” within the limits of: (a) a transcription process that did not include audio taping and (b) minor editing to make the quotes more readable in the written document.

The 22 individuals interviewed included:

- 5 educator-administrators in California (4 of whom appear in the following categories)
- 3 directors of Holocaust centers (1 is state-mandated, also listed as task force liaison)
- 3 heads of state Holocaust commissions or task force liaison/center director
- 6 heads of education at national or state-wide centers, museums or other repositories
- 5 other administrators/providers of program or museum-based professional development
- 1 director of the national Association of Holocaust Organizations (AHO)
- 4 individuals conducting academic or program-based research

The complete list of individuals interviewed is provided on the following page.



## Local and National Professionals Interviewed for Project

| <b>Name</b>          | <b>Position</b>   | <b>Institutional Affiliation</b>  |
|----------------------|---|---|
| Dennis Barr          | Director of Evaluation                                  | Facing History and Ourselves National Office  |
| Kim Birbrower        | Director of Education                                   | Shoah Foundation Institute  |
| Morgan Blum          | Educational Director                                    | Holocaust Center of Northern California   |
| Richelle Budd-Caplan | Director, Asper International Holocaust Studies Program | The International School for Holocaust Studies, Yad Vashem  |
| Sam Edelman          | Director, Taskforce Liaison                             | Center for Excellence on the Study of the Holocaust, Genocide, Human Rights, and Tolerance, California State University – Chico |
| Liz Edelstein        | Director of Education                                   | Museum of Jewish Heritage – A Living Memorial to the Holocaust  |
| Jeffrey Ellison      | Head of Social Studies                                  | Bernard Zell Anshe Emet Day School Chicago  |
| Stephen Feinberg     | Director, National Outreach, Education Division         | United States Holocaust Memorial Museum   |
| Paul Filben          | Chairman  | Alabama Holocaust Commission  |
| Marjorie Green       | Consultant  | Retired from Anti-Defamation League, California   |
| Mary Johnson         | Senior Historian  | Facing History and Ourselves  |
| Rosita Kenigsberg    | Director  | Holocaust Documentation and Education Center located at Florida International University  |
| Susan Llanes Myers   | Executive Director                                      | The Holocaust Museum Houston  |
| Dan Napolitano       | Director, Education Division                            | United States Holocaust Memorial Museum   |
| Simone Schweber      | Goodman Professor of Education and Jewish Studies       | Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Wisconsin – Madison   |
| William Shulman      | Director  | Association of Holocaust Organizations  |
| Alan Stoskopf        | Director of Professional Development                    | Facing History and Ourselves National Office  |
| Samuel Totten        | Professor of Secondary Education                        | College of Education and Health Professions, University of Arkansas   |
| Christina Vasquez    | Education Director                                      | The Holocaust Museum Houston  |
| Jack Weinstein       | Director  | Facing History and Ourselves West Coast Office  |
| Paul Winkler         | Executive Director                                      | New Jersey Commission on Holocaust Education  |
| Paul Weiser          | National Director for Holocaust Education               | Braun Holocaust Institute, Anti-Defamation League   |



## 2. DOCUMENT AND RESOURCE COLLECTION

The research effort also included creating an annotated listing of resources and studies related to the questions addressed in this research. The annotated listing appears in Appendix I. Entries in the list include suggestions provided by the interviewees as well as additional internet research by JESNA research staff. The search for documents and the interview process also yielded other lists of published studies and relevant resources nationally, on the internet and in California, which are included in additional appendices to this report.

## C. REPORT SUMMARY BY PROJECT RESEARCH QUESTION

The following section summarizes the major substantive conclusions in response to the specific questions posed by the research project.

### **1) What are most effective Holocaust education programs, educator professional development programs and delivery systems, according to field leaders in Holocaust education?**

#### **a. What are characteristics of these programs that make them effective?**

- In general, the most effective programs for students:
  - Include appropriate content that does justice to historical facts and perspectives.
  - Creates an atmosphere that is responsive to readiness and emotional sensitivities of the students.
  - Creates a framework both in history and in the personal connection to historical figures and their perspectives.
  - Works across the curriculum and integrates diverse disciplines.
  - Uses powerful personal artifacts and historical materials.
- With regard to professional development, the most effective programs:
  - Are intensive rather than “one-shot” and include extensive local follow-up.
  - Are presented and organized in ways that recognize and respect the constraints, demands and opportunities to learn under which the teachers operate.
  - Provide teachers with clear pedagogical tools, techniques and approaches.
  - Are presented in ways that enable teachers to integrate the material into their larger curricula.
  - Invest in ongoing relationships with committed teachers.
  - Balance local and national resources for teacher development.



**b. What is the role and importance of first-hand testimony by survivors?**

- First-hand testimony is invaluable, especially when it is well applied and will be greatly missed when it is no longer available.
- First-hand testimony creates connection as well as making meaning of the Holocaust and communicating information.
- In particular, first-hand testimony is a powerful way to convey the reality of the Holocaust and to forge personal connections between students and survivors.
- The effectiveness of survivor presentations relies on the ability of the educators to help students contextualize the experience through appropriate preparation and debriefing.

**c. How are field leaders thinking about Holocaust education in coming years, in light of the diminishing access to survivors and first-hand testimony?**

- Extensive video testimony collections are being mined and applied for educational purposes, to great effect.
- Combining video testimony with other personal artifacts and materials, along with literature and expressive media, hold great promise for creating a powerful educational experiences.
- Using second-generation speakers is an option that must be pursued with attention to what they can and cannot contribute.
- Use of DVDs, video, and web-based technology offers possibilities for creating powerful educational conditions. At the same time, experts agree that educators will need specific training and professional development to integrate technological modalities into their teaching.

**2) How might the community achieve “better penetration into the marketplace” regarding:**

**a. Involving educators beyond those who are already committed to Holocaust education?**

- The best value is to invest in teachers who are committed to Holocaust education.
- By casting a wide net, you increase your chances of finding those teachers with the experience and potential to become active members of the Holocaust education “team” in your area.
- Teachers can be reached best where they are: through their school administration and at meetings of their professional organizations.
- Reaching teachers at diverse types of schools present opportunities for widening the impact of Holocaust education.

**b. Enhancing the effectiveness of teachers who are aware and doing a reasonably good job but are not exceptionally skilled or knowledgeable in the area of Holocaust education?**

- It is essential to continue to invest on an ongoing basis in Holocaust educators.
- The best way to invest is:
  - to continue to provide them with ongoing professional development opportunities, mentoring and support,
  - to recognize their status (e.g., as Fellows), and
  - to provide them with high-level opportunities to learn and to remain connected with others who are involved in this work.
- With ongoing support and involvement, these committed teachers can become a “cadre” to advocate for Holocaust education, bring others into the field, and mentor colleagues.

**c. Reaching a broader range of students?**

- The primary means of reaching students is through teachers.
- Diverse students can be reached by creating programming that speaks to their particular ethnic or contemporary concerns.
- Once students are involved actively, they can be excellent resources for encouraging other students to connect to the Holocaust curriculum.

**3) How is the impact of Holocaust education programs currently being assessed?**

**a. Overall question on assessment.**

- In many ways, the state of assessment in this area is in its infancy.
- Much relies currently on anecdotal evidence.
- The amount of work to be done with more scientific approaches is still significant.

**b. What measurement techniques and instruments are available that might be adapted for use in the San Francisco community?**

- There are tools for immediate post-training assessment and observation that can be adapted or developed.
- There are also instruments for teachers that are designed to measure the amount and type of Holocaust education that is being done in a given geographical area.

**c. What are the results of available relevant impact evaluations?**

- The research results available depend on the context of the research.
- Individual programs (e.g. FHAO) have documented impact on students in their immediate responses to educational programs or on teachers in their feelings of readiness to teach this material as designed in the curriculum at hand.
- Further studies of student impact with control groups and longitudinal designs will add to our knowledge and will also still be program-limited.

**4) How have other communities with well-developed/respected Holocaust education programs addressed cost/benefit issues including the relative merits of:**

**a. Educating more teachers locally vs. supporting participation of a few at more intensive national seminars.**

- There are strengths and limitations associated with national seminars.
- All training, no matter where it takes place, must be followed up with ongoing connection and reinforcement and support for the teacher locally in order to make it effective.
- It is of value to search widely and then invest more intensively in a few teachers or a limited area.

**b. Professional development for teachers vs. programs and presentations for students.**

- Experts agree that within the constraints of limited funding, the best investment for a community is in professional development for teachers.
- If this investment includes close attention to the teacher, it can create a center of involved educators out of which further developments in this field will come.

## II. GUIDELINES AND STANDARDS FOR EFFECTIVE HOLOCAUST EDUCATION

### A. INTRODUCTION

According to Holocaust education experts consulted for this report, guidelines for excellence in Holocaust education apply across audiences, whether they are school students, teachers at professional training seminars or other adults. There are two commonly cited sources of guidelines for teaching Holocaust material, as indicated in the annotated bibliography appended to this report: the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM) and the International Task Force for Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Commemoration and Research (ITF). Others have adapted these general principles to specific contexts, and thus have not been required to “re-invent the wheel.” For example, the website of the Holocaust Museum in Houston, TX provides a useful adaptation and extract of the USHMM’s guidelines (reproduced in Appendix IV).

At the same time, at least one interviewee cautioned that published guidelines are limited in their function in that they do not prescribe how to convey the educational content. The following educational principles, derived from conversations with the experts interviewed for this study, further elucidate the official published guidelines, as these educational leaders point to hallmarks of appropriate and effective Holocaust educational programming.

### B. CURRICULUM GUIDELINES: “BEST PRACTICES” FOR HOLOCAUST EDUCATION

According to the experts consulted, the following are essential principles that should be reflected in the content and process of any Holocaust education program.

1. EDUCATORS MUST USE POWERFUL TEACHING VEHICLES AND MATERIALS TO ENGAGE STUDENTS.
  - Museum artifacts and other primary materials hold great power in creating authenticity and restoring the individual voice. Experts from a range of educational domains (including classroom teachers, museum educators, curriculum developers, etc.) emphasized the power of actual artifacts for engaging students and for enabling them to internalize the personal nature of the events.
  - An interdisciplinary approach is more likely to impact students. Several curricular experts advocated an interdisciplinary approach that focuses not only on historical fact but also poetry, art, music, theology, psychology, literature, and other disciplines, which they contended is markedly more impactful for students.
2. CURRICULA SHOULD CONNECT WITH LARGER CURRICULAR GOALS AND EXTEND THE LEARNING OVER A LONGER DURATION.
  - Learning should be contextualized in terms of larger curricular goals and broader ideas, not just historical narrative. Experts indicated that the most effective Holocaust education relates ideas and understandings to specific curricular goals, rather than focusing simply on a historical chronology. As Weinstein and others described, within the standard curriculum, Holocaust education is now connected to other key concepts students learn, such as empires, nationalism, human rights and genocide. It is also common to place Holocaust study explicitly alongside a study of other genocide events.



- One-time events are not sufficient; longer instructional time frames are preferable. There was a great deal of consensus that “one-shot events” are much less effective than well-structured units of longer duration. Respondents observed that history teachers in the schools are frequently under pressure to complete a textbook and/or cover a span of history in the course of the year, in order to meet state testing standards. They proposed that highly effective Holocaust curricula allows teachers to integrate the ideas into their curricula throughout the year, rather than only touching on the topic briefly at the point where they teach about World War II near the year’s end.

3. EDUCATORS MUST ATTEND TO BOTH COGNITIVE AND EMOTIONAL ASPECTS OF LEARNING THE HISTORICAL SUBJECT MATTER.

Curriculum experts emphasized that in presenting the Holocaust, teachers must attend to historical accuracy and complexity, and respect the historical figures under study – as well as make connections that personally reach students. Dan Napolitano, Director of the Education Division at the US Holocaust Memorial and Museum, articulated four principles in this regard, which were touched and elaborated on by other experts throughout the interviews. He stressed the importance of the following:

- Provide accurate historical data. Napolitano and others posited that providing accurate historical information is a necessary (but not sufficient) requisite for effective Holocaust education. Liz Edelstein, Director of Education at the Museum of Jewish Heritage: A Living Memorial to the Holocaust supported Napolitano’s view, and suggested that access to actual artifacts is one way to ensure historical accuracy.
- Present the larger historical context and complexity, including pre-post history. The experts concurred that the Holocaust cannot be understood as an isolated event, and must therefore be presented within a larger, more complex, historical context. Students must appreciate what came before (and was lost) as well as subsequent events. Several experts argued for the need to present a complex view of the perpetrators and their context as well.
- Foster empathy with those who experienced the events. Experts acknowledged the difficulties students face in fully appreciating the circumstances of the Holocaust. At the same time, they posted that effective Holocaust education should seek to foster students’ empathy with those who experienced the events. Several experts advocated focusing on the experiences of individuals as a powerful and effective means to foster empathy in students.
- Connect the historical events and experiences to students’ contemporary activities and lives. The majority of the educational experts who were interviewed stressed the importance of making connections to other historical, ethnic situations explicit, and of relating the learning to current events and situations. The experts also underscored their belief that Holocaust education could not be considered effective if students did not relate the lessons of the Holocaust to their own daily lives, such as in their experiences of prejudice or bullying.

#### 4. EFFECTIVE HOLOCAUST EDUCATION DEMANDS AN EMOTIONALLY SAFE ENVIRONMENT AND AN AGE-APPROPRIATE APPROACH.

The educational experts who were interviewed emphasized the importance of creating an open and “safe” educational environment. Many asserted that students (children as well as adults) can only learn when they are free to think and speak their honest thoughts. The following guidelines are derived from their responses on creating an atmosphere for effective Holocaust education.

- Educators must create a safe and respectful learning environment to encourage open dialogue and to avoid “shutting down” conversation. As many of those interviewed indicated, learning about the Holocaust involves a conversation that crosses boundaries, challenging learners to connect with individuals and experiences that may touch them deeply while also at first appearing foreign or uncomfortable. In this educational context, educators must remain open and ready to accept the variety of responses students will offer at different stages of their learning.
- Presentations must be content and age appropriate. In the course of their comments regarding creating an appropriate educational environment, these educational experts voiced cautions about making sure that content and presentations are developmentally appropriate. While these educators posited that issues related to bias and prejudice can be introduced at early ages, they cautioned about the temptation to introduce materials or concepts too early and that are not developmentally appropriate.

#### PROGRAM EXAMPLES

The following are a selection of curricula and student programs judged, from the interviewees’ experience, to be particularly effective.

Facing History and Ourselves (FHAO) Curriculum as (described by Johnson)

It’s like a circle.

We start with Identity – who are “you.”

Then we discuss “We vs. They – dynamics that turn “we” against “they” within a group.

And then we introduce the concept of the “Universe of Obligation.” The universe of obligation concerns who helps whom. The question is: How do we broaden out the universe, so as to have empathy for others.

Once we have building blocks of identity and group dynamics and we/they, then we look at a case study: the Holocaust or the eugenics movement or the civil rights movement. Now we are looking at South Africa, Rwanda – all with the same pattern. Look at the historical case study and ask: who was responsible.

To assess if there’s an impact of the material, you need to ask: do they think differently about their sense of responsibility for others.

The closing piece is about choosing to participate: what can happen if people are bystanders; how can you take part. The new lingo being used is “upstander.” That’s the work of Samantha Power, on the American response to genocide.



Museum of Jewish Heritage: Summary statement on their curriculum approach (Edelstein)

- \* Have a larger Jewish history context.  
*What's absent from textbooks is experience of the Jews. The texts teach the Nazi narrative, without the Jewish response and experience.*
- \* Help students come to empathy rather than judging.
- \* Teach in pedagogically sound ways that are age-appropriate.
- \* Not to use fear and shock.
- \* Not to shut down conversation.
- \* Use our precious resources while they are available to us by drawing on the power of artifacts and testimony.

Alabama Holocaust Commission program: Honoring the Communities (Filben)

We invite teachers to have their classes honor a community each year, from an Encyclopedia Judaica list of communities in Latvia, former Czechoslovakia and Poland before the Holocaust. This encourages teachers not to wait until May 1 when they are teaching WWII, to cover the Holocaust, but rather to do it all year, focusing on the community they've chosen to remember. The students email any Jews who are still left in the community and get all the details they can on that community. Then the students develop a fundraising project each year. For example, for the past five years, one prep school has worked with an organization that focuses on child abuse. At the end of the year, they invite the director of the Alabama Holocaust Commission and the director of the child abuse center and they present the child abuse center with a check at their school honors program. They raise more than \$2,000. Students also visit the sites of their projects, such as the abuse center. That way, they remember the children of the community they are honoring. It's a good program we've initiated. We have several schools that do it every year.

Holocaust Center of Northern California: The Manovill Holocaust History Seminar (Blum)

The seminar is accredited through San Francisco State University and provides a college level history credit for participants. The seminar provides an opportunity for students throughout the Bay area to interact with a diverse group of participants representing different religious, ethnic, and geographic backgrounds, with whom they do not usually interact. The 20 seminar-type sessions feature guest speakers including three survivors, a 2nd generation Armenian speaker, and someone on Darfur, as well as other experts in the field. Participants have access to films and the extensive archives of the Holocaust Center. Acceptance to the seminar is competitive. Applicants must submit a transcript, an essay and recommendations. Participants are familiar with the Holocaust, and can benefit from a more intensive experience. There is no cost for participation to the students, thanks to support from the Endowment and private donations.

New Jersey Commission on Holocaust Education: K-12 Curricular Topics

- \* Prejudice and propaganda
  - \* Altruism (including empathy and Holocaust rescue)
  - \* Bystander inaction and conformity
  - \* Legal issues and trials
  - \* Victim reaction and resistance
  - \* Accepting differences
  - \* Geography of Holocaust events
  - \* History of Holocaust events
- Source: Sample Assessment Questions provided for classes in grades K-12



### III. PRESENTATIONS BY SURVIVORS AND ALTERNATIVE STRATEGIES

All of the interviewees strongly endorsed the great benefit of Holocaust survivor presenters in educational contexts. Their comments underscore the power of such interactions and reflect their understanding of the loss the field will sustain in the future when survivors are no longer available as speakers.

Some of those interviewed had not yet fully planned for what strategies they would employ in the future, while several others put the inevitable loss of this resource into perspective in two ways. First, they commented that this kind of loss is the case with all historical events. Second, they noted that there are parts of the country, such as rural areas in states without large Jewish populations, where access to survivor-speakers is not easy to arrange at present.

These experts also spoke to the survivor-speaker option and its future in two additional ways, by defining the conditions that are necessary for survivor presentations to be effective when it is an option and by outlining alternate strategies to survivor presentations which could offer new and different values to students.

#### A. THE BENEFIT OF USING SURVIVOR-PRESENTERS

Experts' responses centered on three primary educational benefits to be derived from presentations by survivors:

1. The immediacy of first-hand experience to convey the reality of the Holocaust
2. The possibility of personal interaction with Holocaust survivors
3. The emotional power and connection with individuals who experienced the Holocaust

#### B. NECESSARY CONDITIONS FOR EFFECTIVE SURVIVOR PRESENTATIONS

Interviewees agreed that the paramount factor resulting in the effectiveness of survivor presentations is the creation of a context. According to the experts consulted, both appropriate preparation beforehand and de-briefing afterwards are key to effective survivor presentations. Two quotes from respondents exemplify the consensus of the educators who were interviewed:

*People would say: provide a survivor speaker. It's terrific to have a speaker for 1500 kids in gym. But all by itself, it's moving to a number of kids, and it may solidify some ideas about the Holocaust for them; it provides one simple or complex narrative. But that's an event, not education. Education requires opportunity for reflection, connections, analogies, distinctions. (Weinstein)*

*There's nothing better than encountering a Holocaust survivor – for adults or kids – if the survivor is a good presenter and presentations are rooted in context. Often those two things don't happen. Are the kids prepared to hear the story? (Napolitano)*



## C. ALTERNATIVES TO LIVE PRESENTATIONS BY SURVIVORS

Given the realities of life span limitations, the experts are profoundly aware that the time is rapidly approaching when Holocaust survivor presentations will no longer be options for Holocaust education. Interviewees shared their thinking about alternatives that they are developing and/or considering.

### 1. TAPED TESTIMONIES

Experts acknowledged that videotaped testimonies create very different experiences, from the perspective of the survivor as well as the student. Kim Birbrower, Director of Education at the Shoah Foundation, analyzed the benefits and challenges inherent in using taped testimonies in educational settings. On the positive side, she noted:

*As we are talking to each other, there are things that distract me as we speak: I'm wondering if I'm understood, wondering all kinds of things that are part of the listener and speaker's experience. Watching testimony, you don't have that and it's more intimate. You can stare at them. You can listen to them, unabashed. And the survivors, speaking to the camera, also are not worried about distractions. They are giving their testimony for future generations. It has a profundity. (Birbrower)*

She (and others) noted that educators can select and highlight particular elements of the presentations for educational purposes when using technological modes (videotapes, DVDs, etc.) and thereby have greater control of the educational situation:

*You can make selections that are thematic or content-oriented for a classroom. You can create a reel with selections, for example, that are only about the "hidden child." Then you can relate it to classroom experience directly – for example, if they are studying Anne Frank. Compared to a survivor speaking, this is a very different experience. (Birbrower)*

*Visual history testimony <the DVD's> is, without question, an experience. It is very moving. For students – the ability to connect with someone, even in 3 or 4 minutes, can have a profound effect on how they see history. It's not just dates and figures – it's personal, poignant, it sparks their interest. (Budd-Caplan)*

*Technology will resolve it. It won't be the same. It will be better in a different way.... Because the presentation itself is less reliable, there will be an attempt to better prepare kids for the learning – that's the good news. It necessitates more work from the teacher – that's good. There's a story of African-American kids going to see Schindler's List in L.A. – the kids didn't get it. There was a huge outcry. It's not the kids' fault. You need teaching guidelines and you have to be very thoughtful about this history. (Napolitano)*

*When you are doing it electronically, you can be very selective about the survivor experience that you hear. Typically now you have one day with 35-45 minutes with a survivor, who is telling lots of stories. Now, electronically, you have so many diverse stories – as you are doing a unit, you can play oral testimony that goes with your units – and for 10-12 minutes, which is the maximum attention span. And it's not tied to a site or assembly time or place. You can integrate pieces throughout. There are on-line tours – history, geography, etc. – all integrated into the same moment. You can play an oral history, as they read a primary source, after reading a book chapter. (Napolitano).*



Experts note, however, that educators will need specific training and professional development to integrate technological modalities into their teaching:

*The medium of visual history. Our focus is just that. This is an emerging field of education. Teachers use movies and other media. But video testimony is a primary source document really. Teachers don't know how to use a primary source video like that. Policy-makers, curriculum developers also don't know how to use it. They don't know how it's different from showing a movie, or how it's different from hearing a live survivor, or how you take a 2.5 hour unedited testimony and find clips that are age-appropriate and how to design classroom materials around it, to create an interactive, empathy-building experience. (Birbrower)*

## 2. SECOND GENERATION AND OTHER SPEAKERS

Some of those interviewed were considering how to integrate second-generation Holocaust survivors into future programming. In the opinion of several interviewees, presentations by second-generation survivors can be very effective, particularly if combined with other speakers and materials. Many currently use second-generation and survivor-speakers from other contemporary or past historical events, such as the Armenian Genocide. As for effectiveness, Vasquez shared that she still recalls how moved she was as a child when she heard a speaker describe the African American slave heritage based on family history.

Even in this case, however, those interviewed stressed that the second generation speaker is notably different from the first generation speaker and educators must consider how best to use them as resources. Weinstein suggests combining second-generation speakers with video testimony or even with first generation speakers in the coming years. He described this approach that while also recognizing the validity of the second-generation story in its own right:

*A combination of these things will be the rule, and what is possible. We will identify and orient people who were children during that era – even babies then – who can speak to their family's experiences. They may not remember the experiences, but it is part of their family history. Children of survivors can provide effective testimony about their own experiences, and not just their parents' point of view. It is equally powerful emotionally, to hear from people whose lives have been impacted by their parents' histories. We might have them speak in concert with video presentation. (Weinstein)*

Others noted the challenge that lies ahead in preparing second-generation survivors to speak to these historical events effectively. Filben noted that many second-generation survivors have not been told of their parents' experience in great detail and therefore are not prepared to speak to these events. In response, academics and others who are interested in this area must take the lead in bringing this issue to the fore and preparing these potential speakers for this role.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Weinstein indicated he will seek significant funding for a project to train second-generation speakers for future programming, just as first generation speakers were trained in the past. Winkler referred to a major event held in September as the first of its kind nationally, the New Jersey Holocaust Commission Second Generation Conference, which brought together second and third generation survivors to address this issue. (Information on this event is available at the following website: <http://jewishstudies.rutgers.edu/events/lecture06/shoah2nd.php>)

### 3. TECHNOLOGY AND THE INTERNET AS EDUCATIONAL TOOLS

Some experts suggested other innovative uses of technology and the internet as educational tools. They asserted that use of electronic technology will be an increasingly essential component of any Holocaust education curriculum. Feinberg argues persuasively:

*Any grant proposal for teaching must include a technology component. Technology is friendly to increasing historical understanding. Use the internet as a historiographical/pedagogical tool, to teach the methodology of doing history – historiography. There's no ultimate thing as objective history – everything has a point of view. This is teaching critical thinking in its basic form. You can use technology to increase historical understanding, then use it in critical analysis of historical thinking <by having students go to different websites and compare the content>. (Feinberg)*

## IV. GUIDELINES FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

### A. INTRODUCTION

In general, experts concurred that teacher training in Holocaust education must adhere to “good professional development” principles, with an emphasis on creating ongoing support for the teachers’ continued learning, interests and work. In addition to providing initial training that has sufficient duration and intensity, follow-up and continuing to involve the teacher in the conversation of Holocaust education is crucial. Professional development in this field must also be coordinated with opportunities within the larger curriculum, as well as meeting the challenges presented by the teacher’s professional demands.

Interviewees cited a variety of delivery mechanisms for professional development for teachers, both local and national, that serve different functions. Later sections of this report address related issues including: outreach to teachers, institutionalizing Holocaust education within the larger educational system, and identifying and working with appropriate teacher targets.

### B. GENERAL PRINCIPLES, STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

#### 1. OVERVIEW

There was general consensus among the experts on professional development for teachers in the area of Holocaust studies regarding the need for a well-designed, effective professional development structure for teachers. According to these experts, this structure ideally must:

- Emphasize content as well as pedagogy;
- Build the ongoing relationship with the teachers over an extended period of time;
- Include opportunities for demonstrations, modeling and coaching;
- Base professional development efforts within schools to maximize impact over the long term and across classes.

The following are some specific additional aspects of these points that were emphasized.



## 2. CONTENT OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Consistent with comments made by others, Stephen Feinberg from the US Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM) cited three deficit areas that require attention and need to be addressed by current teacher training programs:

1. **Historical knowledge:** Teachers are not trained well enough in the history itself and its complexity;
2. **Pedagogies:** Teachers lack knowledge of the methodologies and pedagogic strategies to deliver that history;
3. **Technology:** Teachers are uncomfortable using technology and are unaware of all it offers, both to increase their own historical knowledge and to create learning activities for students.

The experts also made these suggestions on professional development program content:

- Include the theoretical and the practical. Address the “theory” and research related to Holocaust education as well as practical applications in each and every professional development program.
- Follow through on the practical. Practical elements include: instruction in the use of technology as relevant, incorporating and demonstrating specific teaching strategies and effective modeling of teaching practice by the presenter.
- Limited topical focus. Focus the content on a single topic rather than the full range of possible subject areas related to Holocaust education. Examples of single-topic themes include: bullying, the perpetrators, the rescuers, hidden children, and the bystander response.

## 3. CHALLENGES TO MEET IN DRAWING IN TEACHERS

Those interviewed stressed that effective Holocaust education demands investment in the educators, who are the primary transmitters of the content. As such, several suggestions related to drawing in the teachers and maximizing the impact of the programming on their subsequent teaching.

- Scheduling and duration of professional development. According to these experts, the most effective professional development program is ongoing. In Feinberg’s view, an ideal program would include a series of sessions that meet 1-2 times per week for a minimum of three hours per session; the next best option would be a 1-2 day workshop with subsequent electronic follow-up, which would allow the instructor to remain in contact with teachers and continue to supply them with information. In all cases, follow-up and continued contact was viewed as a hallmark of effective professional development.



- Identifying appropriate candidates. Several respondents noted the importance of communities and/or schools identifying appropriate candidates for professional development, to maximize their impact and the communities' investment. In addition to the personal characteristics and interests of the teachers, several respondents pragmatically suggested recruiting less veteran teachers (with the possibility of greater longevity) and cadres of teachers within schools, who could thereby work together to implement their learning and have a more concerted impact.
- Incentives for teacher participation. Many of those interviewed asserted that teachers are over-burdened, and will only participate if they can see a "value added," as opposed to additional work or costs. Several agreed that teachers are most likely to participate in professional development related to Holocaust education if appropriate support and incentives are provided both for participating in the professional development workshops as well as for implementing the programs, materials or strategies that are introduced. Several suggested providing stipends for participation and/or allowances to purchase materials in order to implement what they have learned. On the other hand, at least one respondent expressed that it was also important for the teachers to be required to invest in their own professional development, to ensure "buy-in." Consistent with this philosophy, several of the programs that were cited included a minimal fee for the teacher's participation.

#### 4. INTEGRATE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT MATERIAL WITH CURRICULA AND STANDARDS

Related to the constraints on teachers, respondents also drew attention to the challenges of integrating Holocaust education and professional development modules on it into the current "packed" school curriculum. They suggested that one key element of effective professional development is demonstrating to teachers (and their supervisors) how the content and skills they learn can be integrated into broader curricular demands and mandated standards. For example, one respondent suggested working with World History teachers to show them how they might organize their teaching thematically rather than chronologically in order to achieve standards-mandated goals while incorporating the important values of Holocaust education.

### C. COSTS AND BENEFITS OF TRAINING PROVIDED LOCALLY VS. NATIONALLY

#### 1. OVERVIEW

Respondents raised two main issues in assessing the advisability of relying on local vs. national programs for Holocaust educator professional development. These issues concerned: (1) the quality and impact of the programming; (2) the program cost.

Overall, there was general support that:

- It is wise to integrate the two delivery systems to maximize on the strengths of each;
- It is always necessary to include local follow-up and ongoing relationships with teachers. Neither going to a national program, nor bringing a national speaker in, or even doing local programming, will maximally benefit teachers if there is not ongoing local support afterwards.



## 2. RELATIVE PROGRAMMING ADVANTAGES OF NATIONAL AND LOCAL PROGRAMS

Respondents identified the following benefits and costs associated with different options.

- Sending teachers to national professional development programs:
  - National institutions such as USHMM are known for excellent presentations of museum materials and resources for learning;
  - Participants benefit from the cachet and recognition associated with selection for participation in a national program;
  - Teachers who attend national programs as part of a community or school group can benefit from the group experience and become a local cadre/team;
  - National programs tend to be short-term interventions, and rarely provide ongoing support.
- Bringing outside speakers to local regions:
  - Greater numbers of local educators can benefit from presentations due to potentially lower costs for travel, etc.;
  - Outside speakers can often draw interest and participation;
  - National speakers tend to be one-shot or short-term interventions, and rarely provide ongoing support.
- Locally-produced training:
  - Local trainers are highly familiar with local conditions and can tailor the presentation to local needs;
  - It is easier to provide the ongoing follow-up support, which is critical for impact;
  - Local trainers may lack state-of-the-art knowledge, strategies or rich archival resources;
  - Local trainers may lack the status of field leaders and therefore may not draw participants.

## 3. COSTS OF PROGRAMS AND TRAINING

Respondents also noted that professional development costs vary widely across these options. Sending teachers to national programs and/or bringing nationally known presenters to the community can be very costly in absolute terms, even without a comparison to local options. To save on costs, several community-based respondents advocated developing local programs in collaboration with other organizations and/or funding sources. In addition, several respondents alluded to what we might call a “return on investment” in teachers. To increase that return, the one area of marked consensus was that no matter what mechanisms a community uses for professional development for teachers, the money will be ill spent without proper follow-up and support for participating teachers. Since they acknowledged that communities cannot expect each teacher who participates in professional development to implement it in the classroom,



they reiterated that the likelihood of impact is enhanced greatly by providing support and follow-up.

Overall budgets for teacher education show a range, depending as they do on the specific educational circumstances and the level of programming. Three examples from state commissions demonstrate this diversity. Winkler at the New Jersey commission indicated that the state's budget for Holocaust education was \$250,000. Winkler applies that funding by working with a network of Holocaust education centers located throughout the state to create programming that draws in between 10,000 to 20,000 teachers in a year – acknowledging that this sounds impossible. While the synergies of combining organizational resources can hardly be calculated, this set of figures does suggest the efficiencies of a well-developed and supported system for Holocaust education. This situation of a highly elaborated program can be compared to the example provided by Filben, at the Alabama commission. In a very different environment and financial situation, Filben indicated that he spends \$5,000-\$7500 each year to train 8-10 teachers (about \$1,000 per teacher). In this environment, Filben also indicated that he did not receive the \$10,000 he requested from the state, and therefore fundraises in the community and receives support from the Jewish federation and the Catholic archdiocese. Edelman in California cites figures somewhere between these two. The state-mandated center that he directs in California raised and spent about \$100,000 (in cash and in-kind donations) to reach 1500 teachers this past year; the Center would like to have a budget of \$250,000 and would expect to reach around 2,000 teachers with funding at that level.

As these examples demonstrate, and according to those interviewed, the costs associated with training a teacher for effective involvement in the field of Holocaust education varies depending on all the factors that might influence outcome including, for example, program objectives and realistic goals, geographical location, student population and prior teacher preparedness. Estimating the cost involved in educating a single teacher would involve a separate study that took account of these and other factors.

The specific costs cited by the program providers for teacher training in general include arranging for the program setting and presenters and providing resources directly to the teachers themselves such as a per diem, curriculum materials, and/or a bookstore certificate to purchase relevant books. Detailed examples of costs and budgets related to a variety of program options are provided in Appendix VII.

#### 4. RECOMMENDATION TO COMBINE NATIONAL AND LOCAL STRATEGIES

In the end, there was widespread agreement that communities might gain greatest benefit from intelligently combining local and national professional development strategies. The following outlines the framework for making these decisions suggested by the interviews:

1. Begin with strong and tailored local programming for teachers.
2. Use national programming selectively and integrate it with local efforts. This includes:
  - a. Selectively invest in national speakers and programs to come to the local area and/or send selected teachers to a national location.
  - b. Support nationally trained teachers locally while also integrating them into additional local programming. Do not expect nationally trained teachers to keep the momentum going locally themselves.



The following anecdote illustrates this combined approach:

*I've done both. Both have value. 101 is educating them locally – it has to be done first. Sending them elsewhere – do that only after you've done the local work. When you work locally, you can have an understanding of local issues; you can create the training depending on the local population. It's a way to draw people in – if, for example, you had a large Armenian community, they have an interest in the Armenian genocide. (Shulman)*

## PROGRAM EXAMPLE: LOCALLY PRODUCED TRAINING PROGRAM

### Warren Fellowship at Holocaust Museum Houston (Myers)

I am a firm believer: you have to build your cadre of teachers. We also put our money in the new teacher. Not those my age, nearing retirement. We went to the most prestigious college in Texas – University of Texas – and said, let us select some of your senior education students, those who are preparing to be teachers. We bring them to Museum for one week. It's an endowed program, the Warren Fellows. They get a week of intensive education. They meet survivors or liberators, learn lessons of Holocaust and genocide. You develop <new> teachers with a lot of knowledge, vs. going to teachers who have 20-30 years of experience already.

## V. EFFECTIVE OUTREACH AND EDUCATIONAL DELIVERY SYSTEMS

### A. OVERVIEW

Respondents suggested a variety of ways to create high profile, vital, community Holocaust education programs that reach teachers and students effectively. Many of the communities with reputedly successful programs have Holocaust education centers and/or museums with staff members who have specific responsibilities for organizing and promoting Holocaust education for students and professional development for educators. Professionals associated with well-developed programs identified several key strategies for reaching teachers:

- Active promotion, networking and outreach
- Having a “central address” for Holocaust programming
- Recognition of the central role of teachers as the “doorway” to Holocaust education
- Ongoing attention to the teachers’ needs and constraints
- Creating and nurturing the “committed” teacher all along their professional path
- Excellent educational content and professional development structures

Across the board, the program organizers stressed the central role of teachers, who they view as the “gatekeepers” and the primary sources of impact for the programs. As a result, many also emphasized the importance of identifying and working with appropriate teachers who have the experience and potential to remain committed to Holocaust education over the long run.



In addition, according to the experts interviewed, best practices related to “market penetration” through teachers involve two main principles: understanding how to capitalize on the teacher’s professional role and getting deeply and appropriately involved in the educational system itself. The former includes understanding the nature of a teacher’s professional life as well as the role that state standards play in their teaching obligations. Penetrating the school structure and working closely with individuals means working one-on-one with those who are well placed to effect change, whether it is the teacher in the classroom or the superintendent at the district level of the system. Finally, while there are some approaches to reaching students, the limiting factor there remains the contention that the true access point is through the teacher.

## B. REACHING TEACHERS WITHIN THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

In order to reach teachers, program providers must understand their professional and teaching situations deeply, from what their day-to-day working lives are like to the curriculum demands being made on them by the schools systems and state requirements.

- Understand and work with knowledge of local mandates and requirements for teachers. The most basic strategy includes understanding local mandates and requirements, and providing programs that are consistent with these in content and/or are designed to meet their needs. (See Appendix V for details of the legislation and regulations in California.)
- Work closely with school systems and their requirements. As schools are subject to state requirements in all areas, these requirements reach into the classroom and affect the options that a teacher has for integrating Holocaust education into the teaching. Effective program providers understand these constraints and the resulting situation for teachers, working closely with them around their larger curricular goals and demands.
- Respect and work with the opportunities available to teachers in different disciplines. According to a study by USHMM, the teachers that devote the most time and emphasis to educational units on the Holocaust are English teachers rather than social studies instructors because English teachers often have more flexibility about how they allocate their instructional time. Program providers interviewed also indicated an awareness of this difference.
- Focus initial efforts on schools that are predisposed to offering Holocaust education. Effective program providers also understand the different opportunities offered by different types of school systems. Besides being aware of these opportunities, one strategy suggested by community-based experts and providers of Holocaust education and professional development programs is to begin with “low threshold” educational institutions (such as parochial and independent schools) that already have Holocaust education programs to build a constituency among these schools, and then to branch out to public schools that may have more stringent requirements and barriers.
- Ensure administrative buy-in. Community-based experts emphasized the need to obtain the buy-in of appropriate administrators at the school and district levels in order to ensure appropriate support and sustainability. Several noted the advisability of educating local administrators, superintendents and principals about the importance of Holocaust education and how it can advance *their* educational goals.

## C. THE PIVOTAL ROLE OF TEACHERS

Overall, interviewees saw educating and developing teachers as the primary entrée into schools. They therefore stressed the importance of attending to the needs and concerns of teachers, and treating them with respect. Several respondents advocated identifying and nurturing (even a small number of) teachers who are most likely to remain active in the field. These interviewees contended that focusing on a smaller number of stalwarts, and integrating them into broader efforts, is more valuable for the field than only creating direct and less intensive interactions with a greater number of teachers who are unlikely to introduce effective Holocaust education in their classrooms. They argued that while casting a wide net is essential, providing sufficient ongoing support for those who show real interest and potential is critical. Specific recommendations around teachers included:

- Demonstrate respect for teachers by providing “high quality” experiences including ongoing follow-up. Respondents felt strongly that offering teachers access to high quality experiences demonstrates respect for them, their profession and their role in the endeavor.
- Go to where the involved teachers are: professional conferences and publications. Respondents suggested that among the most “desirable” teachers (*i.e.*, who are likely to become the most effective Holocaust educators) are those who are already inclined to take advantage of other professional development opportunities such as professional conferences and publications, and are therefore “primed” to benefit from additional opportunities.
- Invest in quality ongoing professional involvement, not quantity. As noted earlier, most of the experts who were interviewed felt that investing in more intensive and ongoing professional development for fewer teachers with potential would be preferable to less intensive intervention with a broader population. To find these teachers with greater potential, one respondent recommended having involved teachers recommend their peers.
- Network out from your core group of involved teachers. The highly involved teachers then become program resources for the larger Holocaust education effort. In addition to having involved teachers recommend their peers, some interviewees suggested bringing these teachers back repeatedly to conferences as models and teachers for others in their field. One respondent conveys this attitude and also describes an in-school strategy to use their involvement:

*Get the few teachers that are committed. Work with them in their schools and let other teachers see, within the school, that it can help reduce prejudice and bias and bullying. Use the ones that are interested. You can't take someone who isn't there and make them be there. It doesn't happen overnight. They see the impact in their classrooms, and then you have them. (Winkler)*

## D. REACHING STUDENTS

While respondents agreed that the primary way to reach students is through their teachers, several interviewees suggested additional strategies to engage students who might not normally be exposed to Holocaust education and/or to provide intensive educational experiences for



students with greater interest. They suggested leveraging students' connections through extra-curricular activities and internships. They also suggested reaching diverse students through informal family and community networks, building on pre-existing interests and values.

## PROGRAM EXAMPLES: REACHING TEACHERS

### Museum of Jewish Heritage: A Living Memorial to the Holocaust (Edelstein)

We work with the New York City Department of Education that has certain formal set-aside days for PD. We reach out to the regions of the city and tell them, "On your day of PD, consider bringing your history teachers to the museum. We'll make a program for you, based on your needs. If you need a space to hold a meeting: we'll offer the space and in exchange, offer a tour for your teachers. We work with the archdiocese of the NY school systems – see what their needs are. They are required to teach about the Hebrew Bible – "the old testament" to them. We look to local educational systems, to see what teachers are required to do and how we can serve them. Before the museum opened, we had big meetings with these systems. You feed them – provide food – and hear from them, ask them "what do you need?" Then develop programs. It's important, too: if working with students – provide transportation, buses, from school to the program.

### Holocaust Center of Northern California (Blum)

You need to think about accessibility to the teacher. 85% don't have an email address at their school. The majority are using hotmail or yahoo – and email is the best way to reach a teacher. They don't sit at a desk, so you can't call them. You can spend two weeks going back and forth, before reaching them by phone. With email – you can communicate back and forth. If you send paper mailings to the school, the chances that the teacher who covers the Holocaust in their class will get it is not high. Schools are understaffed, under-funded and the person opening it up won't make sure it will get to the right teacher. So we focus outreach on emails, through educator workshops and contacting them one-on-one, those who are interested in supplementing what they do in their classroom with what we offer. The challenge is contacting the teachers who are most appropriate in the community. Once you reach them, or they contact us – it's not that they don't want it, it's just so under-funded and understaffed in public schools – it's hard for them to find the time to supplement their curricula.

### Anti-Defamation League (Weiser)

We do a lot of work with Catholic school educators. We have a program called "Bearing Witness" that we started in 1996. It's so popular, it's already booked for 2007, and we're into 2008 now. It's a program for educators in Catholic schools. The purpose is to have teachers examine the historical relationship between Jewish and Catholic communities over the centuries, which was not always pleasant, and how that relationship has influenced Catholic teaching, catechism, and liturgy...and then the Catholic response to the Holocaust. It's a 3-day program. It's fantastic, with huge Catholic communities involved. We've done programs in Houston, NY, Philly, DC, Orange County, Omaha, Florida, Chicago... Can't keep up with it. The program has a two-point emphasis. (1) theological and (2) historical around the Holocaust, Teacher-training is tailored to Catholic schools – that system is so huge. If you deal with the Catholic community in the schools, one person determines the shots – one person makes the decisions. Compared to the public school systems, you don't have to worry about someone nixing it. We are getting a lot of yes's on this.



## PROGRAM EXAMPLE: REACHING STUDENTS/DIVERSITY AND INVOLVEMENT

### Museum of Jewish Heritage – A Living Memorial to the Holocaust (Edelstein)

We have an internship at the Museum, available to public schools students – paid internships. Our internship: they study for 9 sessions of 3 hours each after school with Museum staff – they hear from scholars, from survivors. Then they work at Museum in the summer. They are then welcome to come back during the school year. We work around their schedule, with the school. You have to pay better than the local McDonald's. It's a paid internship and allows students to do something more meaningful. We are conscious about efforts to reach students who might not otherwise see a connection to this story. It's full-time, 40 hours, for 7 weeks, in the summer. In the summer, we have thousands of summer day camp kids from the Police Athletic league. For the older ones, we include tours that include the Holocaust. The high school kids are trained to give tours to the day camp kids – who look just like them. It makes such a difference to have a kid lead a tour rather than an adult. In NY, we have kids who are Black, Latino, Chinese, Middle Eastern, etc. in the public schools.

## VI. ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION IN THE FIELD

### A. INTRODUCTION/OVERVIEW

While respondents indicated that they consider evaluation to be the “new frontier” in Holocaust education, scholars, practitioners, program developers and policy-makers agreed that there is very little systematic evaluation of the impact of Holocaust education on students or of the impact of related professional development on teachers. What little assessment there is tends to be immediate post-training feedback surveys, which no one considers to be measures of “impact.” They cited a myriad of challenges inherent in assessment in this area, including basic questions about what comprises Holocaust education, and more complex questions about what cognitive, affective and behavioral outcomes are desired – and how to measure them. Simone Schweber, a highly respected and involved academic in the field summarized the current state of the field of research and evaluation on Holocaust education:

*ON TEACHERS' CLASSROOM WORK. There's a lot written on what people think teachers should be doing. But little research on what teachers are actually doing and what impacts they are having on students.*

*ON EVALUATING TEACHER TRAINING. FHAO and USHMM are the biggest games in town. There are small organizations around the country, some of those centers have yearly training. There is no reliable evaluation on any of these programs. Most small organizations that do teacher training give out surveys at the end – what did you like or not? It's not particularly useful. There's no research on professional development. There's some, limited work on “this kind of teaching has this impact.” (see reference to Schweber and Juzwik in the annotated bibliography)*

*ON ACADEMIC EDUCATION RESEARCHERS' KNOWLEDGE. So what I say about what's effective or not – has no basis in research. I was in residence at the Museum for six months. There's a huge literature on professional development and no one is applying it to Holocaust education yet. Few of us are doing research on Holocaust education.... To my knowledge, nobody is studying teacher education in Holocaust education. I'm not yet.*

*ON STUDIES OF IMPACT ON STUDENTS. There are not many and they are not finely grained. So we have: “studying the Holocaust has moral impact on students.” That's not useful. We need: what worked toward this end?*



## B. TWO EXAMPLES OF CURRENT RESEARCH AND FINDINGS

The annotated bibliography of research on Holocaust education (see Appendices I and II) presents references to current work in the field, ranging from highly academic to more applied studies. As might be expected, two of the larger scale studies are under the auspices of Facing History and Ourselves (FHAO) and the United States Holocaust Museum Memorial (USHMM), which are among the largest providers of Holocaust education.

### 1. FACING HISTORY AND OURSELVES (FHAO)

FHAO offers a variety of curricula for high school students related to Holocaust and tolerance education and multiple professional development workshops and resources for teachers. For specific program descriptions, see FHAO's website:

<http://www.facinghistory.org/campus/reslib.nsf/sub/aboutus/faq>.

FHAO has conducted internal evaluations of many of its programs. Results of these evaluations can be found at <http://www.facinghistory.org/campus/reslib.nsf/sub/aboutus/evalimpact>.

Overall, FHAO's evaluations of student programs indicate that after participation students:

- demonstrate a decrease in fighting behavior,
- show increased moral reasoning and empathy,
- have an increased understanding of historical events,
- and engage with one another in personally meaningful ways as they grapple with historical and moral issues concerning inter-group relations.

Similarly, according to FHAO the research to date indicates that after participation in FHAO professional development offerings teachers:

- have a revitalized interest in teaching and in rethinking their methodologies,
- demonstrate an increased ability to relate history to the lives of their students,
- and are more likely to relate their course work to important issues of citizenship and individual responsibility.

The upcoming longitudinal study is notable for its more rigorous methodological design, will be conducted by an outside evaluator and will also track impacts on students as well as teachers.

According to FHAO's Barr, who is guiding this work, the study will examine several student impact areas, including:

- social responsibility and awareness,
- civic awareness and participation,
- historical understanding,
- racism and anti-Semitism,
- as well as measuring students' academic achievement and motivation.



The study will examine several areas of impact of the program's professional development on teachers including:

- teachers' sense of self-efficacy,
- satisfaction with teaching,
- retention in the field,
- and classroom performance as a reflection of their skills and competencies in helping students develop.

## 2. UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MUSEUM MEMORIAL (USHMM)

USHMM conducted a large-scale study of teaching practices in middle and high schools in the field of Holocaust education. The original report was published in 2004 and an article based on the study was published by Donnelly in 2006 (see Appendix I, Evaluative Studies and Reports).

According to the original report (referenced in Appendix I and available at the website [http://www.sri.com/policy/cep/pubs/other/SRI\\_Natl-Study\\_TeachingPractices.pdf](http://www.sri.com/policy/cep/pubs/other/SRI_Natl-Study_TeachingPractices.pdf)), this study pursued two research questions:

- To assess secondary teaching practices in middle and high school Holocaust education
- To investigate teachers' rationales for teaching about the Holocaust

The research concluded the following:

- Holocaust education is well represented in the curricula of the nation's secondary schools.
- Teachers' rationales for providing Holocaust instruction to their students primarily emphasized personal, educational and historical reasons rather than policy-related reasons.
- Teachers believe that the Holocaust's lessons are powerful and pertinent to students.
- Teachers could benefit from additional professional training in teaching the Holocaust.



## VII. PARTICULAR SITUATION IN CALIFORNIA

In order to create and support effective programming in Holocaust education in California, any funder needs to be aware of the state's particular challenges and opportunities. Prior to outlining specific recommendations for the Fund that flow from the experts' comments, the following outlines the challenges and opportunities that exist around California's legislative situation and educational system.

### A. IMPACT OF STATE REQUIREMENTS AND LEGISLATION

Program providers and funders face particular opportunities and challenges posed by current California legislation related to Holocaust education in schools.

#### 1. LIMITATIONS OF CURRENT "MANDATE"

In 1985 California passed legislation "mandating" Holocaust and genocide education in public schools and more recently (2003) passed legislation establishing the Center for Excellence on the Study of the Holocaust Genocide, Human Rights and Tolerance and an associated Task Force (see Appendix V).

While the legislation that has been passed to date in California in the area of Holocaust education to date is often referred to as a "mandate," it is, importantly, not a *funded* mandate. Mandates and particularly funded mandates are difficult to achieve in any state and the effort is worthwhile. According to Winkler in New Jersey, educators and programmers need to work harder in a legislative situation that lacks a funded mandate in order to convince administrators and others of Holocaust education's importance and to place it in classrooms. Others also, including Weinstein and Edelman of California, pointed to the limitations of working in a system that lacks funding associated with the legislation around Holocaust education; without financial resources or a state-level demand for this education, even teachers who want to teach the Holocaust are less encouraged to do so, according to Kenigsberg. In Weinstein's view, the result in California, is that the districts make decisions about how much time to put toward the Holocaust in the classroom and the end-result varies widely. In a 10<sup>th</sup> grade World History classroom the time spent can range, for example, from the low end of "lip service" to spending a few days on the material to implementing a full unit.

Sam Edelman, Director of the Center for Excellence on the Study of the Holocaust Genocide, Human Rights and Tolerance and liaison to the Task Force established by the more recent legislation, describes the mandate in California as being one "with teeth" and as having a real impact via social science and language arts teaching. The legislation embeds the Holocaust and genocide into state of California standards at least 25 to 30 times in the 6<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> grade standards, and also in the kindergarten through 6<sup>th</sup> grades, where the Holocaust can be taught under standards for teaching about human rights.

However, he also notes that the Center and the Task Force which oversees its work operate in a completely unfunded environment (prior to an economic downturn, they were originally slated to be funded at a \$1 million dollar level). The Center raises its own funds annually from sources such as foundations, individual survivors and school districts that invest in teacher training; in addition, the German Materials War Claims Conference matches every dollar the Center raises from other sources.



## 2. THE CENTER AND TASK FORCE: FUNDING LIMITATIONS ON CURRENT/ POTENTIAL PROJECTS

When asked about the overall situation at the state level in California, Edelman clearly indicates that all the pieces are already present aside from the need for funds. Edelman describes the infrastructure available as well as the limitations posed by the lack of funding for the work of the Center and the Task Force:

*We don't have a need for more structure. We need more funding. We have the teachers, we have the universities. We have faculty for teaching. We have a state task force and it has great people on it. But it's unfunded so they are not able to enact anything as a result. (Edelman)*

The Center's primary work is to provide teacher-training workshops on its own and also in cooperation with other organizations such as the Wiesenthal Center, the Shoah Foundation, FHAO and the ADL. The Center presently reaches around 1000 to 1500 teachers per year and spends about \$100,000 (including cash and in-kind donations) to do so.

The Center's larger goal for the future is to reach 40,000 teachers and to train as many as 2,000 in a given year with an annual budget of \$250,000 for that purpose. In addition, Edelman is currently working with Michael Berenbaum to create an on-line M.A. degree program in Holocaust and genocide education through the University of Judaism. A similar program was initiated in 1998 through the Chico campus of the California State University system with Endowment support.

Edelman listed three projects that the Task Force, if funded, would pursue concerning Holocaust education in the state:

- to review textbooks for Holocaust education content
- to evaluate the state of Holocaust and genocide teaching in California, which would involve interviewing teachers and school districts
- to work at the legislative level to revamp the state model Holocaust curriculum

## B. CALIFORNIA PROGRAMMING AND POPULATION

Outside of the legislative environment, California as a state also presents other challenges and resources for Holocaust education professionals.

### 1. OPPORTUNITY: DIVERSE STUDENT POPULATION

A challenge cited by Weinstein in California, related in part to the state's diverse population but which is no doubt relevant in any community, is to create educational material that is highly readable. Given its ethnic diversity, California may have a particular challenge around the student population's general literacy and reading skill levels. According to Weinstein, except for the highest-level students, reading is a major block to taking in this material, and pedagogical training must take literacy levels into account in order to move toward effective instruction.

At the same time, the diversity of the student population is seen as an opportunity and enriching aspect to Holocaust education in the state. As those interviewed indicated, among both poorer and wealthier students, it is always a challenge to make the material relevant and to answer the question, "What does this have to do with us?" Weinstein sees the diversity in the Bay Area and



in California as an opportunity that drives the educator to focus more on identifying “what is universal about this human behavior and history” in the classroom. Specifically, the diversity in terms of ethnicity, economics and immigration status provide excellent opportunities to connect to the student’s personal experience of bias and prejudice, as well as making a connection between the Holocaust and historical events that are significant for other ethnic communities. The diversity of the population ultimately facilitates applying a curriculum that demonstrates the universal lessons of Holocaust education.

## 2. CHALLENGE: LARGE GEOGRAPHICAL AREA AND POPULATION

Working in five regions of the state with the statewide organization school superintendents, the Center’s mission takes its educators far and wide. Edelman describes the particular challenge of working in California, compared to other states, due to its large geography and population size:

*We’re big. Therefore we are not easy to deal with. New Jersey and Florida <with their developed programming> are small states. Geographically, California is big and population-wise, we’re huge. For me to fly from LA to Del Norte county to do a workshop – it takes 6 hours to get there, for me or another faculty member doing a training. We have to fly or drive everywhere we go. (Edelman)*

Edelman also cites the issue, also discussed by Myers in Houston and Filben in Alabama, of reaching out to teachers in the state’s rural areas where there are no other resources such as museums and centers for Holocaust education. Speaking of Los Angeles and San Francisco, Edelman indicated, “The two urban areas are covered well. Our goal is to reach the rural areas, where there is no infrastructure.”

## 3. OPPORTUNITY AND CHALLENGE: AVAILABLE PROGRAMMING

The San Francisco area and California in general have a number of resources for programming available already, with university scholars, research centers and related non-profits in place across the state. At the same time, coordination is always a challenge, even in a state rich with centers and organizations focused on Holocaust education, as Schweber indicated. Beyond coordination, there is also the impression, expressed by Myers, that the activity level in Holocaust education is not as high on the West coast in general. In this view, there is a void in California and on the West coast that can be filled by an organization that is willing to take a leadership role in this area. According to Myers, the Association for Holocaust Organizations is specifically working toward creating a greater presence on the West coast and plans to hold a meeting on the West coast in the next year or two, in order to strengthen the connection between the two coasts and support more programming in the West.

## 4. A UNIQUE OPPORTUNITY: CALIFORNIA’S LEGISLATION, POPULATION SIZE AND TEXTBOOKS

At the same time, the legislation passed to date in California does communicate that Holocaust education is recognized within the state frameworks. According to Weinstein and others, textbook companies pay attention to that fact, creating a particularly synergistic opportunity in California. Standard textbooks are used across the country and large-population states like California have a significant influence in the textbook market nation-wide, as companies accommodate the demands in those states first. Consistent with Edelman’s’ ideal goals for the state, one strategy advised by Myers in Texas is to take advantage of this opportunity almost unique to California by getting the teachers you have involved in Holocaust education into reviewing positions at textbook companies, as some have already done in the state.



## VIII. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

### A. SUMMARY OF REPORT FINDINGS

#### 1. Effective Holocaust education:

- uses powerful teaching vehicles and materials
- connects with larger curricular goals and longer curriculum time-frames
- attends to cognitive and affective goals
- creates an emotionally safe environment for learning this material

#### 2. Survivor presentations:

- are currently invaluable
- require preparation in order to be used effectively
- are not the only means of reaching students in an impactful way
- can and will be effectively replaced in the future with second generation and other alternative speakers, taped testimonies and combining multiple media

#### 3. Effective professional development for teachers

- must be structurally well-designed and must include ongoing support
- emphasizes content effectively as well as incorporating pedagogy
- includes demonstrations and modeling of teaching methods
- must be school and curriculum-based
- respects the demands and needs of teachers professionally and in their school settings
- identifies, rewards and reinforces the most committed teachers of Holocaust material
- contains content that is shaped with state standards clearly in mind
- balances national and local resources while always including local follow-up and support

#### 4. Effective outreach and delivery systems:

- actively promote and network to create programming
- work from a central locus of action in a community
- focus on teachers as the gateway to reaching and affecting students
- facilitate teachers' involvement by meeting them where they are, respecting their constraints and supporting their personal professional development
- provide excellent educational content and professional development structures



5. Assessment and evaluation in this field:

- is currently extremely limited
- requires significant work in order to answer basic questions about student outcomes and to describe current educational resources

6. The state of California:

- has important challenges regarding funding and its large educational needs
- offers significant opportunities in its diverse population and size
- has rich resources available for Holocaust education, particularly in its urban areas

## B. EXPERTS' RECOMMENDATIONS TO INCREASE FUNDING IMPACT

The national and community Holocaust education experts who were interviewed recommended a variety of ways to maximize the impact of the community's available resources for Holocaust education. Their recommendations provide ideas about the larger framework for applying funds as well as specific suggestions for projects with impact.

Overall, interviewees offered two ideas consistently regarding financial aspects of supporting Holocaust education. First, organizations can usefully leverage their funds in order to create effective programming by working closely with other organizations, whether nationally or locally. Second, since bringing in national speakers is an expensive choice, it must be considered carefully and pursued selectively within a larger plan of action.

Specific recommendations by these experts suggest:

- invest in teachers as a way to impact Holocaust education
- work at broader organizational levels to raise the profile of Holocaust education as well as the resources available for it in a given geographical area

### 1. INVEST IN TEACHERS DIRECTLY

There was nearly unanimous agreement among interviewees that the Fund will maximize its impact by focusing on professional development for educators. Specific suggestions here include the following:

- Focus on in-depth investments in teachers. Focus efforts intensively on a more limited number of teachers, who can become standard-bearers. For example, create a 3-day workshop for teachers. Follow up with the teachers and reward them by, for example, giving them the title of Fellow and bringing them back on a yearly basis. Then involve these teachers as peer mentors and presenters at subsequent conferences.
- Support teachers in their own schools. Provide stipends to teachers who are trained intensively to serve as "turn-key trainers" and mentors for others in their schools.



- Follow up after national teacher training. Invest funds in continuing the relationship with teachers after they attend national professional development programs (e.g., USHMM). Provide them with quarterly gatherings and opportunities to hear speakers, to create a core of people who are stakeholders in the mission.
- Create an area-wide trainer to provide in-school professional development. Provide the community with a high-quality part-time trainer who would be available for professional development days in local schools or statewide conferences for teachers and present on the Holocaust. Schools appreciate the “free service” and often seek topics and presenters; teachers are obliged to participate and might select this learning opportunity.

## 2. BROADEN COMMUNITY IMPACT

Expert suggestions also include a variety of ways to have a broader impact through program-selection and support. These options focus on networking, work at higher organizational levels and thinking longer-term.

- Consider the future of supported projects. Make replicability and capacity-building criteria for decisions to fund projects. A related suggestion is to improve ongoing access to resources in the community by directly providing materials such as, for example, Holocaust-relevant books for libraries or curriculum materials for teachers.
- Support collaborative projects. Support projects that involve partnerships among multiple organizations. Many respondents advocated local organizations partnering with national and/or other local organizations to improve the quality and reach of Holocaust education in the geographic area. Some suggested this would also be a way to access additional funding and resources for the local area, if funders also partnered.
- Create visibility and strengthen the network among local Holocaust education providers. Raise the profile of Holocaust education and strengthen the connections among its local providers by investing in an active planning committee for professionals involved in Holocaust education in the community. Supported projects might also create mechanisms to encourage synergy among groups that provide Holocaust education by, for example, convening various organizations and program providers to discuss common issues and possibly to develop joint ventures. Similarly, funders might advocate for Holocaust education by supporting projects that publicize the programs and impact of the work being conducted and supported locally.
- Work at the level of the school system or district. Develop strong working relationships with local school systems and administrations. Suggestions for action here include:
  - Begin by initially working with a limited number of schools or systems. At that level, seek to change the conversation by educating administrators and providing them with opportunities to create high quality Holocaust education.
  - Work in partnership with one school district to create a model for positive Holocaust education. By working with the educators and administrators in a single school district over a multi-year period to improve teachers’ historical knowledge, appropriate use of technology and teaching strategies, the district can become a model for others in how to implement Holocaust education

effectively. Prepare to share the model with other districts by including evaluation as a component of the project from the beginning, so as to document impacts and the lessons learned about how to create this outcome.

- Work with one or more local school districts to create a high level two-day or week-long teacher institute held at a college or university in collaboration with a national organization located in California such as The Shoah Foundation Institute, The Wiesenthal Center or The “1939” Club.
- Work at the national level. Become involved on the national level by networking with others across the country. This would include becoming involved in the Association for Holocaust Organizations (AHO) network and conferences and working with local and national organizations such as FHOA, ADL, Jewish Partisan Educational Foundation, Jewish Foundation for the Righteous, etc.
- Become active on the state legislative or organizational level. Interviewees emphasized that it is impossible to “operate from the outside,” and that without the strongest support possible from the legislature or school system the efforts of communities (and states) are highly limited. They suggested that a key first step would be to identify an interested legislator or a key person in the department of education or local school system.
- Create a significant event or theme-based program for the community. Supporting high-quality programming that may be limited in scope can be impactful due to the program’s high profile and focus. Convening a single significant event not only conveys content, but also is a vehicle to promote and advocate Holocaust education. In this scenario, consider funding programs that all focus on a given theme or objective. Proponents of this suggestion advised that not only is such a focus likely to have impact, but that targeting a theme may allow organizers to attract other funding and new audiences. Such a theme-based program may include several elements: a lecture by a scholar along with a related exhibit and a teacher-workshop that shows how to teach that material in the classroom. These events can also integrate survivor testimony and include follow-up to see the impact in the classroom.
- Engage further in the larger research conversation on impact. It is also possible to forward the efforts of Holocaust educators by collaborating with program providers and researchers to conduct research on the impact of Holocaust education. As the various parties involved in Holocaust education forward this research agenda, funders and program providers will gain a more objective basis for future decision making and planning.

### C. FINAL NOTE ON COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION AND SYNERGY

The benefits of clear focus and of integration and synergy were recurring themes in the interviews. Directors of well-reputed community Holocaust Centers spoke of developing a clear mission and focused goals for Holocaust education, and creating workable strategic plans to achieve these goals. They also repeatedly emphasized the benefits of working collaboratively – across national and local programs, state government, local departments of education, schools and other educational institutions and programs and teachers – to advocate for Holocaust education, to gain access to potential participants and learners and to leverage resources.

