
**INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR
RESIDENTIAL EDUCATION**

**Heidi Goldsmith
Executive Director**

3726 Connecticut Ave., NW, Ste. 109 (202) 363-3904
Washington, DC 20008 FAX: (202) 244-0820
Email: ICREHG@AOL.COM

All Planning, No Programming

■ BY KAREN PITTMAN

All planning, no programming. This is Zvi Levi's formula for success for the Women's International Zionist Organization.



Hadassim Children and Youth Village, tucked into an affluent Israeli community. The village is home to 500-600 youth, ages 8-19, referred through a network of public and private social service agencies around the world. Living in the village are youth who have been abandoned, abused or separated from their families. They are young people who, in this country, we would label "multi-problem," or, at best, "hard to reach." Yet there were no guards, no gates. No bells, no posted rules. No locks on lockers. No special classes, counseling sessions or therapeutic activities scheduled in 50-minute segments. In short, no programming.

The no list continues. Many young residents arrive at the village abruptly, in crisis, and often from other countries such as Russia or Ethiopia. Orientation sessions? Language immersion classes? Cultural sensitivity training? No. Many children are behind in their schooling or have emotional or behavioral problems. Alternative schools or special classes? No. Students from the village make up over a third of the student body at the public secondary school that borders the village; no special classes are offered. The diversity and backgrounds of students makes for high demands on staff. Special training or professional requirements? No. Staff must have at least a high school diploma — although a college degree is preferred — and a firm belief in youth.

Director Levi's philosophy is simple yet powerful. Learning and healing best occur in a natural environment. The fastest, most effective way to help troubled youth, therefore, is to allow them to live in a well-planned but unprogrammed environment. An environment full of opportunities (a well-stocked art studio, a voc-tech lab, an auditorium with sophisticated lighting and sound equipment), sprinkled with caring staff (35 direct service staff — most living on campus — for 600 youth), but uncluttered with rules, requirements and protocols. An

environment where young people are allowed the time and space to experiment, fail, decide priorities, become self-directed.

Creating environment is not a new idea in U.S. youth work. Rarely is it created as an alternative rather than a complement to programming. And too often environment ends at the program door with little impact on the young person's surrounding world.

Although international cost comparisons need to be made with caution, we should not shrug off the Hadassim's low \$8,000 per year cost (including schooling) as salary and cost-of-living differences. Director Levi's costs are low because he deliberately chose to invest in environment, not programs and nurturers, not professionals. The environment is sparse in amenities but rich socially. Professionals — psychologists, counselors, other specialists — are on retainer to work with staff and youth. The investment is in the residential staff — most married, in their mid-twenties — who are trained as naturally, but as intensely, as the young people are healed.

Nor should we shrug off Levi's success rate. About 90 percent of these young people make it through school, into the Israeli army and on to be productive, contributing citizens. This by U.S. standards, would be considered spectacular.

Increasing expenses, declining resources and lackluster outcomes make it impossible to get every U.S. young person who needs it into a program, especially when greater needs are automatically equated with more intensive programming and services. It may be, however, that there are economies of scale at work that could allow us to create, at modest per child costs, secure environments for youth without families, and youth with families but without sufficient supports. The interest is there. There are teachers in Chicago who are so fed up with the lack of support at home for students that they are arguing to turn their school into residential centers. There are organizations like El Puente in New York that heal and teach by engaging young people in changing the environments they live in. The shift from ongoing programming to up-front planning requires a leap of faith, but perhaps it's time to jump.

Karen Pittman is director of programs for the International Youth Foundation.

March 1996
Youth Today

MARY McGRORY

Saving Children, Themselves

Prep schools for the poor is not a new idea. It pops up periodically as experts ponder how they can make citizens out of children in corrosive environments: drug neighborhoods, crack families, gun-ridden schools. It has become a little more urgent as the despairing debate over welfare advances, and this week it was presented again by a compelling advocate from Israel, Zvi Levi, director of WIZO-Hadassim Youth Village.

He told a breakfast attended by local blacks and Jews—who are wondering if the Israeli model can be exported—that his philosophy of rescuing children is “you don’t save the children, you save yourselves.” It came from a meeting with an 18-year-old village rebel who asked him why he and the other staff members put up with him and his ilk. Because, Levi told him, “I will need a teacher to teach my grandchildren, a plumber to fix the bathroom, a soldier to protect me. I am counting on you.”

Levi is the perfect model of the vigorous, coping Israeli. A man of medium height, he has a head of curly iron-gray hair and that unmistakable everything-is-possible air. He has presided over his village for 20 years. The current enrollment is 500, half native-born Israelis and immigrants from Russia and Ethiopia. The rest are abandoned, neglected or victims of “every kind of abuse imaginable in our society.”

There are 70 such schools in Israel, where Newt Gingrich’s suggestion of reviving the orphanage ruffled few feathers. The tradition of taking care of other people’s children is ingrained. Few Jewish children fall through the cracks anywhere. It’s just about impossible in Israel; the safety net is strong.

Levi spoke at a breakfast sponsored by the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, the International Center for Residential Education and the American Jewish Committee. Eddie N. Williams, president of the joint center, which specializes in social studies of and for urban blacks, spoke sadly of “throwaway children” in our society. Another black speaker was wistful about the differences between Israel and America: “Israel has the view of an inclusive society; the U.S. asks how many we can exclude.”

For Hyman Bookbinder, Washington representative emeritus of the American Jewish Committee, there was nostalgia. Thirty-one years ago, he said, he had been on President Lyndon B. Johnson’s

Force on Poverty was instructed to look into residential education for hard cases in the ghetto. Office of Economic Opportunity Director R. Sargent Shriver hoped the Israelis, with their experience of kibbutzim, would take over the management.

The Job Corps, our one official experiment in full-time rescue of disadvantaged youth, is still flourishing. It has 110 centers around the country and takes care of people from the age of 16 to 24. About 100,000 per year pass through on their way to better times. By day they are taught a trade; by night, social skills: how to deal with difficult people, how to think their way out of tight spots. The cost is \$20,000 per year per student.

Israeli costs are more difficult to reckon. Every Israeli child receives a portable \$1,500 allowance from the Ministry of Education; other subsidies from other nations pour in to offset the cost.

By U.S. standards, the villages are unstructured and underregulated. Levi bragged that he engaged no social workers or psychologists. For house mothers and counselors, he looks for role models and employs immigrant staff to inspire newcomers.

But the secret of the Israeli success is a simple assumption. Says Levi: “You change the child’s basic experience. You tell the child who he is. We are not in the job of telling them what to do, but telling them who they are. Once they know who they are they will know what to do.”

The villages try to replace the family: by a community, one in which the child is both sustained and expected to make a contribution. The family is best, Levi says, the community next best. The more he fails, the more he is pushed.

Heidi Goldsmith of the international center leads excursions to Israel’s versions of Exeter and Andover for the unlucky. Many come home thinking it may be the answer for us, although not Secretary of Health and Human Services Donna E. Shalala. She said a village was a “must-see” but not for export. She explained, “We had terrible experiences with orphanages and transitioned out of that.” But Richard English, dean of Howard University’s School of Social Work, said, “It isn’t too hard to see how it would work here. The individual is valued.”

The other morning, a lot of people who also liked the idea of a black-Jewish collaboration agreed with him. In Washington, it is easy to think that anything different would be better.

Washington Post

■ EDUCATION

Itkin proposes 3 residential schools

\$10 million a year sought

By Kenn Marshall
Patriot-News

Rep. Ivan Itkin wants the state to spend about \$10 million a year to open and operate three residential schools, which would house and educate 540 seventh-through 12th-graders from poor, crime-ridden neighborhoods.

The alternative: The state could end up spending even more in the years ahead on many of those same kids, to house them in juvenile detention centers and jails.

"If we don't do something for them now, we'll be spending a lot of money on them in another public institution — the one that has bars on it," said Itkin, the House Democratic Whip from Allegheny County.

Itkin's goal is to remove "at-risk" kids from dangerous, destructive environments and to give them a chance to succeed, and, in some cases, to stay alive.

"These schools are designed to let a kid learn his or her lessons without the distraction of gunshots outside and ceilings collapsing overhead," said Itkin, who answered questions about his plan yesterday before the House Education Committee.

Placements in the proposed state-run residential schools would be voluntary. To be eligible to apply for admission, a student would have to live in one of the poorest one-third of the school districts in the state and in a community where the crime rate

is at least twice the state average.

About 140,000 students in grades 7 through 12 live in communities that meet both sets of criteria. That includes those living in both Harrisburg and York City school districts. The vast majority live in Philadelphia.

Only a small percentage of those students could actually attend the proposed schools.

"I've never proposed this as a program to solve Pennsylvania's education problems, or its social problems, or its welfare problems," said Itkin.

Residential schools work, he said, citing the Milton Hershey School, Scotland School for Veterans' Children and Girard College as successful examples.

Several committee members appeared to like Itkin's idea; others suggested the state's money could be better spent on programs that would benefit entire communities instead of just a few of its children.

The proposal likely will be refined before it is submitted to the committee for a vote and possible action by the full House.

"Pennsylvania already has more residential education than any other state. You really are a leader," Heidi Goldsmith, founder and executive director of the International Center for Residential Education based in Washington, D.C., told committee members. "You have the experience right here in your own backyard."

"You can take some of the best practices that exist and put them into these schools. Until you get the streets safe, until we get the services you need in your communities, let's save this small group."



Itkin

Chicago Prepares to Fill In For Pupils' Broken Homes

Inner-City Schools May Take On Role of Surrogate Parent

By Edward Walsh
Washington Post Staff Writer

CHICAGO, Jan. 27—In 22 years as a public school teacher here, Corla Hawkins has developed some firm convictions about the educational needs of inner-city children. This is one of them:

"One of the reasons that children don't learn is that their environment is too bleak and their future looks bleak and then the community looks bleak. So there are no incentives to do anything."

Six years ago Hawkins, known to students and colleagues alike as "Mama Hawk," began trying to change that dynamic for some of the students at the Bethune Elementary School in an impoverished neighborhood on the city's West Side. She created a special classroom festooned with colorful decorations and a homelike atmosphere. On one wall she placed clocks that show the time in different parts of the world to suggest to the students, she said, "that they are not boxed into the West Side." Eventually, she began caring for some of her students in her home, becoming, in effect, their parent.

Now the Chicago Public School system, one of the nation's largest, is preparing to launch an experiment to emulate on a larger scale Hawkins's role as teacher and surrogate parent. In September, it hopes to open two special, residential facilities that would serve as both school and home, initially for about 100 neglected and homeless children who are already in the legal custody of the state's Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS).

The details of how the children would be selected, and how the costly task of residential care would be financed, have not been decided. But the idea, pushed by Hawkins and Carl L. Lawson, an elementary school principal who wants to convert some unused classrooms at his South Side school into a dormitory, has gained the support of top school officials here. More recently, it was endorsed by Illinois Gov. Jim Edgar (R) in his "State of the State" address and by other

state officials who are exploring various financing plans.

Boarding schools have long existed, mostly to serve the children of wealthy families that can afford such care. In some states, there also are residential public school facilities for gifted students or those wishing to concentrate in a particular field such as science or the arts.

But Chicago's proposed experiment is believed to be the first in the country that would target the growing number of urban children cut adrift by the collapse of their families.

"It's a pretty profound commentary on the range of services that urban schools have to get into and what society in general expects of the schools," said Michael Casserly, executive director of the Council of Great City Schools, a Washington-based organization composed of the nation's largest urban public school systems. "If anything, it's a sad commentary on family structure and support in the country that one of our public institutions has to pick up the slack."

How many children might qualify for a residential school is not clear. DCFS, the state's child welfare agency, has legal custody of almost 50,000 children, the bulk of them in Chicago and surrounding Cook County.

The schools here, as in most big cities, serve an increasingly poor population. Using 1990 census data, a recent study by the school system, the Chicago Urban League and the Latino Institute found that 40 percent of the city's public school students live in poverty, four times the school poverty rate in the suburban areas of Cook County. Half of the Chicago students live in households headed by an unmarried person, according to the study. And 16 percent of Chicago children were victims of abuse or neglect, almost four times the suburban rate.

Hawkins, 47, has seen up close the barriers that confront some of her students. In December, a 12-year-old girl who had briefly lived with her was found with seven other children in a garbage-strewn apartment with no heat or water.

"You're supposed to come to school just to learn," Hawkins said. "But these kids have to come to school to get socks and gloves because they have nothing. They come from violent families; drug and alcohol abusive backgrounds. They don't come from model families where they can say, when I grow up I'm going to be a mother like my mother."

Working as a truancy specialist in the 1980s, Lawson said he encountered "a group of kids who were not really problem kids but who had nowhere to go." Many of them drifted into the streets and away from school, he said.

"These kids are out here on the streets,"



Corla Hawkins says a brighter learning environment

Lawson said. "If this school could house some of them, we could probably save some of them. We can't educate them if they're not here."

Paul Vallas, the chief executive officer of Chicago's public schools, said "we don't want to be in a situation where we are taking kids from their parents." But, he added, there are many children in Chicago who come from broken homes and who are shuttled from relative to relative or from one foster home to another. This is one reason that up to 40 percent of Chicago public school children change schools each year as they move around the city, he said.

"So many of these kids come from terrible homes, dysfunctional homes, in some cases abusive homes," Vallas said. "We can do so much during the day, but then we have to send some of these kids back to that environment. We have to repair the damage the next day."

Vallas conceded that many details of the proposal still need to be worked out, including the crucial questions of how to select students for the residential schools and how to pay for their full-time care. It also could run into opposition from child welfare advocates who generally oppose institutional settings for the care of children.

"We can debate this thing until we're blue in the face," said Vallas, an enthusiastic advocate of the idea. "But the point is there's enough support for these ideas to warrant some experimentation with one or two facilities. We haven't come up with any easy solutions for any of these problems. It's worth at least a little experimentation."

• Summertime, and the *Lernen* is Easy • The New Israeli Fiction
Norman's Conquest: *Commentary* at 50 • "Howar'ya?" "Thank God"

THE JEWISH MAGAZINE FOR THE '90S

JUNE 1995/SIVAN 5755 \$4.50

MOMENT

Summer
Reading
Issue



ORPHANAGES?



Israel Has A Better Idea

ISRAEL HAS A BETTER IDEA



LARRY FRIEDMAN/REUTERS

CYNTHIA MANN

THE MAE BOYER SCHOOL, AN ISRAELI boarding institution for "at-risk" youth, perches on a hilltop in the Bayit V'gan neighborhood of Jerusalem. In the imagination, it sits somewhere between "Boys' Town" and "Oliver Twist," between Newt Gingrich's celluloid dream of an idyllic orphanage and his opponents' Dickensian nightmare of a warehouse for wayward children.

Some 300 disadvantaged students, ages 12 to 18, from across Israel call the school home. Each

had shown ability in elementary school but was at risk of not finishing high school because of socioeconomic or family problems or because of geographic isolation. Joining the boarding students are 600 gifted young Jerusalemites lucky enough to qualify for what is regarded as a first rate public high school—not a "dumping ground" for the children of the poor.

Two counselors—a man and a woman—and a "housemother" are responsible for a group of 75 boarders (for younger students it's closer to 40). There are four full-

time social workers, and any student who needs more sustained psychological treatment is referred to outside services. Boarding students go home every other weekend; parents who live nearby may visit more often.

The daily regimen is strict: wake-up at 7:00 a.m., chores until 7:30, breakfast until 8:00. School starts at 8:10, six days a week, and lasts until between 12:30 and 2:30 in the afternoon, depending on the grade. After lunch, students rotate among library study, sports or enrichment programs—music, chess, drama,

Left: Dinnertime at the Jewish orphanage of Satu-Mare (Satmar), Rumania, c.1920-30s. Above: Israeli youngsters at the Kiryat Yearim youth village near Jerusalem.



Some 45,000 Israeli youths—some from troubled homes, some newly arrived immigrants—live and study at about 250 different youth villages, boarding schools and yeshivot.

After dinner, they attend lectures or films, organized by age group and chosen by members of a student council under the supervision of a cultural coordinator. Younger students must be in bed by 10:30 p.m., the others by 11:30 ("But no one checks," says the principal, Tzvi Galon).

The drop-out rate is negligible: One percent for academic reasons and about the same rate for "personal adjustment problems." Every student takes the *bagrut* exam that is a prerequisite for academic or vocational students interested in higher education—and 96 to 97 percent pass the first time.

The cost of this success is, by U.S. standards, a relatively scant \$5,000 per year for the boarders, paid for by the Education Ministry's Society for the Advancement of Education. By contrast, Boys' Town, the famed program for at-risk youth near Omaha, Nebraska, spends about \$45,000 per student annually; Mercy Home in Chicago spends \$59,500.

Amid a rancorous partisan debate in the United States over welfare, out-of-birth wedlock among teenagers and an entrenched underclass, observers of Israel's sys-

tem of residential education settings say it deserves a close look. The Israeli institutions are not "orphanages" in the technical sense that their charges are parentless (nor, for that matter, were the institutions House Speaker Gingrich proposed as an alternative to child support for unfit mothers). Instead, say supporters, they provide a model to fill the gap between intensive "treatment" centers like Boys'

Israel's 60-year experience with "youth villages" shows that boarding institutions can provide young people an alternative to a chaotic home life—and with safety, education, discipline, even love.

Town and the United States' often maligned foster care system. Israel's 60-year-old system of "youth villages" provides young people with an alternative to a chaotic home life—and gives them the safety, nutrition, education, discipline, even love, they need to prosper.

John Dilulio of Princeton University and the Brookings

Institution recently urged policymakers to consider "urban America's version of the agriculturally based, communally organized Israeli kibbutzim" in their plans for welfare reform. "Children cannot be socialized by adults who are themselves unsocialized (or worse)," wrote DiIulio, a professor of politics and public affairs, in the *Washington Post*. "The only way to prevent these losses [in lives, welfare dollars and other social costs] is to remove the children from their homes to other stable settings."

Currently, 45,000 youths study and live in 250 Israeli *p'nimot*, or residential schools. They are run by 17 different entities, including the Jewish Agency's Youth Aliyah department, women's organizations such as WIZO, Hadassah, Na'amat and Amit, and the Education and Labor Ministries. About 12,000 of these students are in government-funded yeshivot.

"In Israel it works, and it's not so hard to see how it could work in the U.S.," says Dr. Richard English, dean of the Howard University School of Social Work in Washington, D.C., who has observed Israeli facilities first-hand. Israeli youth villages are "places where the individual is val-



ued. They provide a nurturing environment with an educative purpose."

It can even be argued that residential education was instrumental in building the state and producing its leaders. Alumni include Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, Communications Minister Shulamit Aloni, Housing Minister Binyamin ("Fouad") Ben Eliezer, Knesset Speaker Shevah Weiss, Chief Rabbi Yisrael Lau, and the late Haim Bar-Lev, a former Cabinet minister, ambassador, and army chief of staff. In his speech last December accepting the Nobel Peace Prize in Oslo, Foreign Minister Shimon Peres spoke with pride of his high school education at Ben Shimon, one of the Youth Aliyah agricultural boarding schools where urban Eastern European immigrants like him were taught to be farmers.

Youth Aliyah, whose mission has expanded from immigrant absorption to include the education of at-risk and special-needs youth, has set the standard for Israel's youth villages. Since 1933, more than 300,000 youngsters ages 12 to 18 have been educated in Youth Aliyah programs (See "Out of the Whirlwind," *MOMENT*, December 1994).

Today Youth Aliyah places and

cares for about 17,000 students at about 70 different residential settings, half of which are religious and half of which are "secular."

Youth Aliyah owns only five of these outright, while it subsidizes the children it places in those owned by other organizations at a rate of \$5,000 per child, or 85 percent of the per-pupil expenditure recommended by a government committee. The remaining 15 percent is paid by the operating organization, supplemented by the \$2,500 education subsidy all Israeli youth are entitled to. Another 60 Youth Aliyah groups live and study in 50 different kibbutz programs, where "adoptive" kibbutz families offer something similar to foster care. Youth Aliyah also runs a psychological and social services unit with a \$2 million annual budget, serving all the youths in the system; one social worker is provided for every 100 to 150 students.

All of Youth Aliyah's students are between the ages of 12 and 18, and all admissions are voluntary, with students staying an average of three-and-a-half years. Other agencies place students as young as nine in villages and some placements are compulsory, such as those made through the justice system by the Welfare and Labor Ministry.

Some 279,300 children live under the poverty line in Israel, according to government statistics; of the 183,900 poor families, 18,425 are headed by single mothers. Many Israeli families are as dysfunctional as any drawn from America's underclass. Likely to be school dropouts, their youth act out, are violent, promiscuous, truant or barely functioning. They find their way to Youth Aliyah through referrals by teachers or social workers in cooperation with the parents, says Emmanuel Grupper, director of education and guidance for Youth Aliyah.

By design, no village looks exactly like another, either in its physical lay-out or in its programming, although the students usually live in units of about 40 with a counselor and housemother. "Our kids have one thing in common," says Haim Peri, director of the religiously observant Yemin Orde youth village in the Carmel mountain range near Haifa, "too many separations and too many disappointments." But the youth village is different. "This is a haven for the rest of their lives. They come and go until they are under the wedding canopy.... It's not a boarding school," he adds.

pointing to a map showing the village's 70 acres of mountain slope. "It's a community."

The philosophical legacy of Youth Aliyah can be seen at Hadassim, a youth village entirely owned by WIZO Canada. Located slightly inland between Netanya and Tel Aviv, the village has 500 boarders, ages 9 to 19, and 1,100 day students, from across the socioeconomic spectrum, who commute from surrounding communities. The boarders include 220 native Israelis, 150 immigrants from the former Soviet Union, 100 Ethiopians, and 30 "you-name-its," in the words of Tzvi Levy, the energetic, charismatic and opinionated director. It spends an estimated \$5,500 per student per year, not including the publicly provided tuition; 70 percent of the budget is spent on non-teaching staff.

All the students come from at-risk backgrounds; for the immigrants, says Levy, the village is a "huge shock absorber."

But Hadassim's programming barely distinguishes between immigrants and the troubled native-born, 30 percent of whom come from some sort of abusive background (30 to 40 percent of the native-born girls there have been sexually abused). "A kid who doesn't trust himself and his universe because he is a foreigner encounters the same kind of problems as the kid who doesn't trust himself and his universe because his father is a junkie and his mother is a prostitute," says Levy.

"Aron" is one of the latter kids: Raised in an Israeli "development" town by a family of drug addicts, he was removed from his home by Israeli welfare authorities when he was six. After six disastrous years in smaller group homes, Aron—whom Levy describes as "aggressive, violent, brilliant and charming"—was assigned by social workers to Hadassim. In his first months, he

Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala called one youth village a "must-see," but dismissed its implications for the U.S. social welfare system.

beat other children and tried to rape a girl

For five years, the staff at Hadassim has "endured him and showed him a better way," says Levy. "We showed him a normal life with caring, strong, intelligent adults nearby. Without using punishment, we let him know he inflicted pain on others."

The staff also tried to give Aron a sense of control of his own life by giving him more and more responsibility for himself and others—a process Levy calls "upward failing."

In Aron's case that meant exposing him to a "department store" of optional activities. Levy's staff encouraged Aron's talents as a photographer, and asked him to tutor other students in language and art and to escort younger children to outside medical care.

Aron is now in the 11th grade, a more or less "normal student" who will most likely meet his matriculation demands. If not, he can stay free of charge after he graduates; up to 20 take advantage of this arrangement at a time. "No one should feel forced out," says Levy. Aron's father committed suicide; he keeps in contact with his mother whom he treats less like a parent than a sister.

On the face of things, Israel's youth villages seem to be working; however, few studies have been conducted that provide some standard measurements of the overall performance. The Education Ministry refuses to disclose any matriculation figures for students in boarding schools because, says Shimon Nechama, head of the ministry's

boarding school division, the numbers vary from school to school and "we don't want to place a stigma on one school or another."

Emmanuel Grupper of Youth Aliyah, when pressed, would only say that more than 75 percent of Youth Aliyah's students are earning points, or credits, toward matriculation, either in the vocational or academic track. He estimated that more than 50 percent go on to study at institutions of higher learning.

According to Grupper, 97 percent of Youth Aliyah students finish their 12th grade studies, a three percent drop-out rate compared to a 15 percent drop-out rate in the regular educational system. Ninety-eight percent serve in the military or participate in the national service offered to religious young women as an alternative to the army.

Israeli educators know the residential model comes with tradeoffs. Students at Jerusalem's Boyer School can feel "detached from family and from *chavrut*," concedes director Tzvi Galon, using the Hebrew word for a circle of friends. "When you come back you have nothing in common with your subculture, your family. Students tell us their language is different from that of their brothers and sisters."

Yitzhak Kashti, a professor at Tel Aviv University and an expert on Israeli residential education, acknowledges that residential settings are "a safety net" but also may have made it too easy for "less able kids to be pushed out of the public educational system. The main effort should be to keep children in their own homes and their own schools," he says.

That's a goal shared by a growing number of parents and educators, notes Yehiel Leket, Youth Aliyah's department head. "Mothers and fathers are not as willing as before to send their children away," he says; according to Kashti, enrollments in non-religious residential

settings have begun to drop slightly. In response, there has been a "huge development of local services" concentrated in day centers called *mamloniot*, which support the students and families who otherwise might be candidates for Youth Aliyah boarding schools.

"The name of the game is to provide the children with a future," says Leket, "and I prefer they remain with their families if their future can be assured this way."

Can the best of the Youth Aliyah model be imported into the United States? Residential education is not unheard of in America, whether it's at elite "prep" schools or the small number of oversubscribed institutions for disadvantaged youth, including Boys' Town, the Job Corps, the Piney Woods Country School in Mississippi and the Milton Hershey School in Pennsylvania. At Hershey, 8,000 students apply for 200 spaces yearly.

If the success of these schools is to be widely duplicated, however, advocates will have a number of hurdles to clear.

The highest of these may be the difference between what Israeli and American educators are able to spend on students. A combination of stiff regulations and a larger proportion of the most seriously disadvantaged children can drive the cost of institutional care in the United States to over \$100 per day per child, or \$36.5 billion for every one million children. By contrast, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, the biggest slice of the current U.S. welfare bill and a target of Republican budget-cutters, currently serves over 9 million children at a total cost of \$22.3 billion, or less than \$7 per day per child.

Group homes are also tightly regulated in the United States (Massachusetts' regulations fill 40 pages). "We have a tendency to let the mental health professions take

continued on page 56

Orphans in Jewish History

"Schwabacher, Frowenfeld and Pfeifer. 1 bbl. flour; Mrs. E. Levy. cakes and candies; Mr. Fehrenbach, tuning of piano; Mrs. Florence Kern, 5 pieces calico; Santa Claus, 10 bbls. coal."

So reads the "Sundry Donations and Favors" list of the 1877 annual report of the Association for the Relief of Jewish Widows and Orphans in New Orleans. One of the first Jewish orphanages in the U.S., the organization had taken in 113 "inmates" that year, "66 boys, 45 girls, 2 widows."

Until social welfare attitudes began to change in the early 20th century, orphanages were commonplace in America. There was little if any government funding; most money came from charitable societies and wealthy donors. Jewish orphanages responded to the social crises of their day: the Jewish Foster Home of Philadelphia was founded in 1855 to combat the Evangelical Christian institutions offering poor families medical care, food, clothing, and religious salvation via conversion; the Jewish Orphan Asylum in Cleveland opened in 1868 to house Jewish children orphaned by the Civil War. From the early 1880s on, the mass immigration of Eastern European Jews saw a huge increase in broken homes. Jewish orphanages, like many of the orphanages of the day, not only housed children, but also women—widowed, divorced, or abandoned by husbands. Desperation had become so acute by 1911 that a Jewish-run National Deserter Bureau was established, according to Helena Sigman Freeman, author of *These Are Our Children* (Brandeis University Press, 1994).

The daily routine at a typical Jewish orphanage included the three R's, Hebrew language and vocational training—for boys, carpentry, and for girls, sewing and, in some cases, "umbrella and parasol making and the domestic arts"—indeed, "Jewish families from around the country wrote to the Cleveland orphanage when looking for servants," writes Hasia Diner in *A Time for Gathering: The Second Migration, 1820-1880* (Johns Hopkins, 1992). These institutions were often headed and staffed by women, mostly volunteers or mothers of "inmates."

As early as 1909, at the White House Conference on Dependent Children, social welfare professionals advocated that children should be cared for in a

setting resembling normal family life. Various laws written in the next few decades, culminating with the 1935 passage of the Social Security and Aid for Dependent Children Acts, altered forever the traditional orphanage with its oversized dormitories and orderly routines. Foster care and family preservation became the new goals, seeds of the issues now being debated.

New agencies evolved out of many of the old orphanages, including New Orleans' Jewish Children's Regional Service; Cleveland's Bellefaire Jewish Children's Bureau; Chicago's Jewish Children's Bureau; Los Angeles' Vista Del Mar; and New York's Jewish Board of Family and Children's Services.

Today when these agencies recommend residential care for disabled or troubled children, or those from abusive or broken homes, the setting is usually a foster home or small group home. (Even Boys' Town is a community of group homes.)

Ask about returning to orphanages and the heads of these agencies speak unanimously about high costs and severely troubled children. Dr. Robert Bloom, executive director of Chicago's Jewish Children's Bureau, says most children in need of residential care are "service-intensive kids...and not the population Newt Gingrich envisions."

Yet concern for adolescents—crippled by physical and emotional disabilities—who cannot function in the foster care system is forcing a search for alternatives. "Foster care has turned into a real musical-chairs, short-term crisis intervention system that's neglected the stability of the young person," says Arlin Ness, president of Star Commonwealth, a child services organization near Battle Creek, Michigan. Says Douglas Besharov, resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute in Washington, D.C.: "To criticize an institution because it's large and conglomerate is to oversimplify."

The agency heads concede some children might benefit from a well-planned and fully funded large group setting. However, they see the current welfare reform proposals as efforts to decrease illegitimacy among unwed mothers, not to help their children. "The orphanage [as currently being discussed] is a punitive measure for a parent having a child," says Gerald Zaslaw, chief executive officer of Vista Del Mar in Los Angeles. "But [it] ends up hurting the child." —SHF

nines," he says. "The only culture I have is Jewish culture, and I didn't know much about it. I felt kind of empty."

Joana Fisch, 21, said that she had been raised in a Jewish home where the Jewish holidays were celebrated, but she had lost interest after her bat mitzvah. "I considered myself a Jewish person, definitely, no questions asked," she said. "But I couldn't really explain myself."

Stacy Fox, a 20-year-old student at Arizona State University, stood up the first night of her BCI session and told the group that she came, in part, because things were getting serious with Cory, her boyfriend, and she thought he was about to propose. And she would probably accept. And, by the way, he's not Jewish. Stacy has been teaching in Jewish schools in Phoenix and Tucson since she was 15, went to Jewish camps, regularly attends a Conservative synagogue. "This," she said, "is one situation. I never wanted to be in. I used to think you could control who you fall in love with, but after this, I'm not so sure."

And after BCI? Certainly there are scores of stories like that of Sarah Ben-David, who grew up in Oklahoma and was a junior at Stanford University when she was talked into trying out BCI in 1979. She met her husband, Aryeh, at BCI, and the experience proved a springboard for both. He's now an Orthodox rabbi and teacher. They live in the Israeli settlement of Efrat, intensely bound up in Jewish values.

It would be naive to conclude that every participant leaves BCI determined to make aliyah, or to become a Jewish professional. One of the problems with BCI is that it's not a model of real Jewish life. So when it's over, students are on their own. "I'm worried about next Friday night," said David Loren, a medical student from Chicago, on one of the last days of the session. "What kind of a Shabbat do I want to create? I can't recreate what we've got here. It's not possible."

Yet a majority of participants leaves knowing the ways in which it's possible to be a committed Jew.

Greg told me that he wanted to celebrate Shabbat in some way, that he wanted to connect with the Jewish community, that he didn't think he could marry someone who wasn't Jewish. Joana Fisch said: "It dawned on me that it's not enough just to say you're Jewish—because that's not what's going to keep

it going. After BCI, she traveled to Israel, where she spent several months volunteering on a kibbutz. And Stacy Fox? She was convinced that she didn't want to give up on the Jewish world. She was hoping her gentile boyfriend would convert. But she wasn't going to pressure him. And she wasn't sure BCI had any impact on any of those decisions.

"It's sort of like driving in Los Angeles," says Joana Fisch, explaining her feelings about leaving. "I know I'm a good driver, and I know I do a good job and I follow the rules and I look through my rearview mirror. It's everyone else that I worry about."

When Elisha Alon Murs how to make someone understand what happens in the 26 days at BCI, he comes back to that dance from the first day.

"Everything is embodied in that, metaphorically," he says. "Some of them are better at it, some are worse. Some of them know the dance, some of them never danced before. Some of them have ability, and some have absolutely no ability to use their bodies. But somehow they all join hands and whoever they are they move in the same direction." He pauses and says, "And that's what they're doing here." Then he smiles. ☺

This summer, study
in caves where
ancient sages
once studied.
We're pretty certain
more than
just dust will
rub off on you.

Now is your chance to experience a summer study-abroad program that is sure to be unique. From July 3rd to August 7th you'll travel to Israel to gain an enriched understanding of Judaism while at the same time earning up to 12 credits towards graduation. You'll relive the atmosphere of ancient times, studying on-site at Masada, the Old City of Jerusalem, and more. **Call or write today to learn more about this exciting program.** Rabbi Noson Gurary/Judaic Studies Program/SUNY at Buffalo/Clemens Hall, Buffalo, **israel uncovered** NY, 14260. Tel: (716) 645-2154 or (716) 688-1642.

Youth Villages

continues from page 37

over all the rule-making," says Paul Olfner, who as chief welfare counsel to Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D-N.Y.) has observed Israeli youth villages. "In youth villages we looked at, cottages were run by young couples who slept there—no three shifts stuff. And the staff-to-kid ratio was one to four; here it tends to be one-to-one."

But what might enviously be called "autonomy" in Israel is thought to be "under-regulation" in the United States. Various ministerial committees in Israel do set guidelines and "recommendations": on expenditures, staffing (two adults to 40 students per dorm), nutrition and health care. But these and other recommendations have no teeth. "We want, we ask, we request, but we can't require. We don't have laws," says Shimon Nechama of the Education Ministry. "No one has the power to impose" regulations, says Youth Aliyah's Grupper. "The residential system is very autonomous."

Finally, there is a philosophical divergence between the two countries' social welfare systems that goes beyond finances. Israeli society is based on a communal philosophy established by the state's Socialist-Zionist founders, symbolized by Youth Aliyah and the kibbutz, and maintained by universal military service. In contrast to the United States, where "family reunification" and temporary foster care is the core of the child-welfare system, living and learning away from home in Israel has been "a normative way of getting an education in Israel. It is not stigmatized," says Sylvia Tempkin, director of overseas operations for Youth Aliyah.

The difference is also one between residential "education" and residential "care," says Heidi Goldsmith, executive director of the Washington, D.C.-based International Center for Residential Education (ICRE). "In Israel, they talk of education [for at-risk children], which represents a more positive view of the students, and emphasizes strengths and hope for the future. In the U.S., the term is 'care' or 'treatment,' implying that someone is ill, a problem to be solved."

Israel does have residential settings for youth with more severe psychological problems and criminal records,

like the Manot school near Acco, sponsored by the National Council of Jewish Women and the Rothschild Foundation. But a typical Israeli attitude toward "therapy" can be seen at Hadassim. Director Tzvi Levy acknowledges that its "one-and-a-half" social workers and one psychologist barely meet the therapeutic needs of the students, but he's not complaining. Rather than relying on psychotherapy, he prefers to modify the children's environment and to provide strong role models such as the dorm counselor and the housemother.

Goldsmith's group leads tours of Israeli youth villages for American educators and policy-makers, in hopes of erasing stereotypes and bad memories of "institutional" care. The difficulty of that task was made clear last November, when Secretary of Health and Human Services Donna Shalala visited the Yemin Orde youth village during a whirlwind tour of the region.

Shalala described Yemin Orde as a "must-see" for anyone interested in children, education and the family. But in nearly the same breath, the nation's chief social service administrator dismissed the youth village wholesale as an educational model for the United States. "Our experiences with orphanages were terrible and we transitioned out of that," said Shalala, citing the failure of U.S.-run boarding schools for Native Americans.

Goldsmith and others are not giving up, and say the current debate provides an opportunity for considering new approaches. America's "reliance on short-term alternative [foster] care is inadequate and destructive," says Arlin Ness, president of Starr Commonwealth, a children's services organization near Battle Creek, Michigan. But Ness says he finds a new willingness among policy-makers to look for alternatives, including the Israeli one. The Federal government or the states can put out requests for proposals from major organizations to run residential pilot projects, he says.

For starters, they can look to some promising residential models already being paid for with tax dollars. Job Corps, funded by the Department of Labor, is a comprehensive residential education and job training program which serves 62,000 students per year—mostly high school drop-outs with a disruptive home life—at a cost of \$55 a

day per student, or \$20,000 per year. By contrast, group homes average \$85 a day, and foster care, \$100 a day. Incarceration costs \$104 a day, or \$38,000 a year, according to the Department of Justice. Seven out of every 10 Job Corps graduates get jobs, enter the military or pursue further education, according to LaVera Leonard, chair of the National Job Corps Foundation and a member of the ICRE board of advisors.

The National Guard is in the third and final year of a pilot program called ChalleNGe [*see*], a 22-week, quasi-military residential program for 16-18-year-old high school dropouts, run at a cost of about \$14,000 per student. Seventy-three percent of the enrollees finish the program; of those, 75 percent earn their high school equivalency diploma. "What we've really done is give kids a structured environment. That's what they've been lacking," says Joe Padilla, a National Guard spokesman. "We give them tough love. Once you show them you care, you see them blossom." Congress will discuss extending the program sometime this spring.

Of the privately run residential programs in the United States, the best known is the Piney Woods Country Life School near Jackson, Mississippi, one of seven historically black boarding schools for disadvantaged students. The school boards 370 students, from pre-kindergarten through grade 12, at an annual cost of \$18-19,000 per student. Students are usually referred by social services agencies, although not the court system. The Christian-oriented program stresses discipline—strict rules, uniforms, manual labor, and separate classes for boys and girls—and academics: the college placement rate is 90 to 95 percent, according to its president, Dr. Charles Beady, who took part in one of Goldsmith's Israel tours in 1993.

Beady has seen all kinds of students prosper at Piney Woods, from middle class kids with attention problems to one girl who was found in a crack house raising her younger brother and sister. "Residential academics can provide an alternative to the one-size-fits-all approach" of public schools and foster care, says Beady. "We say all children can achieve academic success if they are given the opportunity in a disciplined, caring environment." ❧

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

at

The International Center for Residential Education (ICRE)

Issue no. 3

November 1995

Study of U.S. Residential Education Models Completed by ICRE

"Overview of U.S. Residential Education Programs for Youth", a descriptive and comparative review of nine of the major residential education programs in the U.S., has just been published. This study was conducted under a contract with the U.S.

Department of Labor's Office of Job Corps.

Overview provides a wealth of information about existing American residential education program models, including goals, costs, target populations, what the programs have in common, and where they differ.

Three federal government programs were reviewed: Woodland Job Corps Center, Camp Smith ChalleNGe Program (New York), and Bureau of Indian Affairs programs; Six privately funded programs: Girard College, Milton Hershey School, Father Flanagan's Boys Home (BoysTown), Piney Woods Country Life School, Starr Commonwealth, and Phillips Exeter Academy.

Among the conclusions was that residential education programs reputed to be most successful provide young people with at least the five following elements: Safety - physical and emotional, Education, Community, Self-Esteem, and Structure. Copies of *Overview* are available through the Office of Job Corps, Phone: (202) 219-5559, or ICRE.

Coalition For African-American Students Forming

At the suggestion of Dr. Eric Winston of Wilber Force University, who brings African-American students to Israel every summer, a number of national programs which bring African-American young people to Israel are considering forming a coalition to strengthen the individual programs through the exchange of ideas and information. ICRE would join other programs, such as Wilber Force and New York City-based YouthWorks in this coalition.

States Planning Publicly Supported Residential Education Programs

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is a front runner in the development of publicly supported residential education programs. The Joint State Government Commission, the research arm of the Commonwealth's legislature, convened a Working Group over the summer, of which ICRE's Goldsmith was a member. Drawing on the Group's recommendations, and with ICRE input, the Commission produced a study, "The Feasibility of Publicly Funded Residential Education in Pennsylvania" to accompany proposed legislation to support such programs. The legislation and study were submitted to the legislature on October 31 by Ivan Itkin, Minority Whip of the House, with the endorsement of the Majority Leader.

ICRE is assisting a number of states, in addition to Pennsylvania, who are seriously considering the benefits and feasibility of publicly supported residential education programs. Most plans include encouraging private funding to supplement and leverage public dollars.

Followup to Congressional Staff Seminar in Israel

November 1994 ICRE assisted the American Youth Policy Forum in bringing to Israel a group of thirty Congressional staff members and

Administration officials in fields related to youth policy. A significant portion of the seminar focused on residential education, including visits to four residential education settings and meetings with Israeli experts in this field. Participants agreed that many of these programs could work in the U.S., but only if the American people were truly committed to improving the quality of life of its citizens and were willing to spend the resources necessary to do so.



June 1995 many Seminar participants attended the AYPF luncheon forum on Capitol Hill where Zvi Levi and Heidi Goldsmith discussed, respectively, Israeli and U.S. residential education programs.

Policy Paper Published

"Residential Education - An Option for America's At-Risk Youth: Policy and Practice", written by Heidi Goldsmith, was just published. The paper describes the evolution of residential education in the U.S., current policy, the most contentious issues in this field, and the prevalence of residential education settings in the U.S. and abroad. It poses key questions relating to national policy and those involving operational concerns. Goldsmith urges readers to "take the next step: to engage in a substantive debate which begins to answer some of the key questions and, ideally, move toward further development of high quality residential education programs."

The paper was commissioned from ICRE by the Milton Hershey School, via the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. It will be used to stimulate and guide national dialogue about necessary components of residential education programs and where this option fits in the continuum of services that need to be made available to at-risk youth. Copies may be obtained through the Milton Hershey School, Phone: (717) 534- 8763.

Public Information

ICRE has provided information about Israeli and American residential education programs to Congressional staff on five key committees and subcommittees, the General Accounting Office (GAO), numerous non-profit organizations, a variety of congressional caucuses (Democratic and Republican), political party think tanks, and five federal agencies. ICRE also stimulated the publication of a number of articles including:

- The cover story in "MOMENT" magazine's June 1995 issue entitled "Orphanages? Israel Has A Better Idea", highlights a number of Israel's varied residential education programs, and compares and contrasts them with similar programs in the U.S.
- The "Washington Jewish Week" published a two-page article June 9, 1995 describing ICRE's efforts

to replicate Israel's residential education for at-risk American young people.

Washington Post Column on Israeli Residential Education System's Potential for U.S. Youth
Zvi Levi, Director of WIZO-Hadassim Children and Youth Village in Israel, and ICRE Board member, was the keynote speaker at a June breakfast forum co-sponsored by ICRE, the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, and the American Jewish Committee. Seventy community leaders, predominantly from the African-American and Jewish-American communities attended the event. Nationally syndicated columnist Mary McGrory published a column about the event and Levi's talk on June 9. Titled "Saving Children, Themselves", McGrory recapped Levi's description of the Israeli system, forum participants' positive reactions to it, and urged consideration of this type of system in the U.S. in order to "make citizens out of children in corrosive environments." The column has since appeared in newspapers throughout the U.S.

ICRE Expansion

- Funding for ICRE operations and special projects is being vigorously sought from major and family foundations, and individual donors.
- Public education materials, including a 12 minute video of the Israeli residential education system, are being developed.
- ICRE is planning a series of national and international conferences in the U.S. on residential education.

"RECENT DEVELOPMENTS" is sent to supporters of the International Center for Residential Education. Contributions to ICRE are tax-deductible and greatly appreciated. For more information contact the ICRE office:

Heidi Goldsmith, Executive Director
International Center for Residential Education
3726 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 109
Washington, D.C. 20008
Tel: 202-363-3904; 966-4304 Fax: 202-244-0820

Residential Education as an Option for At-Risk Youth:
The International Center for Residential Education

Heidi Goldsmith
Executive Director
International Center for Residential Education

3726 Connecticut Avenue, Suite #109
Washington, D.C. 20008
(202) 966-4304
Fax (202) 244-0820

It takes a whole village to educate a single child.

— *African proverb*

There is evidence to question today's tendency to see youth mainly as problems to be solved, rather than as assets to be developed and helped to grow.

— *The Forgotten Half*, William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family, and Citizenship

It is my firm belief that effective residential programs which serve inner city foster care and delinquent adolescents are the best placement choice for many of our kids. We are facing a crisis today in many of our inner city communities. A crisis of extreme proportion. We are losing the hearts and minds of our kids. They are no longer accepting our values. They are, in fact, taking their lives into their own hands and building a world of their own. A world dominated and controlled by a powerful street culture.

— *Dr. Thomas L. Webber, Executive Director of the Edwin Gould Academy, New York*

The goal (of residential education) is a well-integrated human being. To restore a child's sense of right and ability to take control over his or her life. To tell the child, 'The sky is the limit' rather than trying to 'tame' him.

— *Zvika Levi, Director of WIZO-Hadassim Youth Village, Israel*

The underlying philosophy is that each student can succeed.

— *Yaakov Ochayon, Director, Manof Youth Village, Israel*

In Israel it works and it's not too hard to see how it could work in the U.S. They (Israeli youth villages/ residential education sites) are places where the individual is valued. They provide a nurturing environment with an educative purpose.

— *Dr. Richard English, Dean, Howard University School of Social Work*

The increase in the number of American children and adolescents who are neglected, abused, and/or in trouble with the law is decried in the media and public forums on a daily basis. Children who have been abused or neglected are more likely than other children to suffer serious and costly health, emotional, and developmental problems and to do poorly in school. Since the mid-1980's the number of foster family homes has declined, coinciding with a sharp rise in the number of children requiring care and an increase in the complexity and multitude of problems presented by children entering foster care, most notably the effects of parental substance abuse.¹ By 1990, almost 10% of American children lived in households not headed by a parent.² Residential "Treatment Centers" are available to only the most seriously disturbed, are expensive, and are available for increasingly shorter periods of time, with few options of appropriate residential settings for children and youth following their stays at these centers.

Many economically disadvantaged youth have great potential for achievement but live in neighborhoods conducive only to the wrong kind of learning. By their teens they are already dropping out of school and engaging in a range of self-destructive behaviors.

One Option: Residential Education

Educators and child protection professionals around the country are beginning to examine alternative approaches to and programs for these youth. One option currently being considered by educational organizations, school boards, the military, and other groups as well as a few policymakers is "residential education." In these "boarding schools," responsibility for the children's emotional support and moral guidance, traditionally assumed by the family, is met by professional staff for a limited period of time. These settings provide social, academic, and vocational components which are unavailable to these youth in their own environments. They are safe environments where young people have the opportunity to gain increased knowledge and self-esteem.

Residential education programs already exist in the United States. Traditional "preparatory schools" such as Phillips Exeter and Deerfield Academies are geared primarily toward children from economically advantaged families, and their primary goal is preparation for college. There are few programs for economically and socially disadvantaged youth, and for youth who do not have family or neighborhood environments capable of caring for them. They include the Job Corps, Piney Woods School in Mississippi, Boys' Town, the Milton Hershey School in Pennsylvania, and a few others. These schools claim proven success records, and there is a long waiting list of young people for each available slot. There are also numerous new programs in various stages of development.

Residential Education in Israel

Residential education is not limited to the United States. Israel, Germany, Kenya, and England have developed effective programs utilizing out of home placements in "youth villages." According to American experts, these countries' systems, particularly Israel's, could serve as models for sites being developed in the U.S. as well as for improving existing American sites.

Based on a hybrid of the principles of the European boarding schools and the Kibbutz (communal settlement), Israel's residential education system began in 1933, when thousands of Jewish children were rescued from the Holocaust in Europe and brought to what would become the State of Israel. Special residential schools were created to house and care for these young, traumatized refugees. These schools have adapted over the past 60 years to the changing needs of Israeli youth who, for various reasons, lack sufficient support from their families. Many of Israel's top politicians, artists, military heroes, and business executives are graduates of these schools. The current mix of students is approximately half disadvantaged Israelis born in Israel and half new immigrants, primarily from Ethiopia and the former Soviet Union.

Israel's residential education system differs from what exists currently in the U.S. Residential education is far more widely available in Israel, and is less expensive. Israel does not have an elite tuition boarding school system but does have a system made up of child-centered communities which are not necessarily for "misfits" nor for those from financially advantaged backgrounds, but for "normal" children and youth who have troubled home environments.

Even the terminology used by the two countries is telling. "Residential education" is the term used in Israel, whereas "residential treatment" or "residential care" are most often used in the U.S. The former represents a more positive view of the students, and emphasizes strengths and the future, whereas the latter indicates a more problem-to-be-solved approach. The system focuses on education and/or vocational training, with the caregiving, therapeutic treatment, and behavior modification a significant but subtle goal. It is group-centered, heterogeneous in population, and not stigmatized. "There is an underlying conviction that all young people can succeed, and it is the adult community's responsibility to see that they do.", according to Zvi Levy, Director of WIZO-Hadassim Youth Village in Israel. Cultural pluralism, transfer of values, improved identity, a lifelong commitment to the child, and maintaining family connections are emphasized.

The International Center for Residential Education

Those seeking to better establish residential education for economically and socially disadvantaged youth in the U.S. are, unfortunately, too often unaware of domestic and international models on which to draw. There is little communication between and no central body facilitating communication between various programs in the U.S. Nor is there a central organization developing linkages with international models of residential education for at-risk youth. Few coordinated efforts have taken place to improve the quality of these schools. Policymakers, funders, and the public need to know about the existence of these facilities, and the need for more such healthy, educative environments.

The International Center for Residential Education was launched in 1993 to spearhead a national effort to improve the quality and increase the availability of residential education in the U.S. for economically and socially disadvantaged youth. The Center's objectives are to increase knowledge about residential education, coordinate efforts to make residential education more widely available, stimulate evaluation and cross-fertilization of domestic and international efforts in order to improve existing programs, and assist communities in developing new programs.

The Center's Founder, Heidi Goldsmith, has recently completed a national study of American residential education models under a grant from the U.S. Department of Labor's Office of Job Corps. The Center is providing guidance to existing programs interested in updating their mission and improving their effectiveness, advising a few communities on the feasibility of beginning local residential education programs, and completing a number of publications on this option for at-risk youth. A Board of Advisors of domestic and overseas experts in fields and systems related to residential education is utilized, ensuring dialogue and joint ventures are undertaken by experts across professional, academic, geographic, and therapeutic boundaries.

1. Spar, Karen, *"Orphanages: A New Issue in Welfare Reform"*, CRS Report for Congress, Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, December 8, 1994
2. Gross, Jane, *"Collapse of Inner-City Families Created America's New Orphans"*, New York Times, March 29, 1992

ICRE Board

Dr. Chaim Adler, Dean Emeritus, School of Education, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel

Dr. Charles Beady, President, Piney Woods Country Life School, Piney Woods, MS

Dr. Richard English, Dean, School of Social Work, Howard University, Washington, D.C.

Charles Geboe, Chief, Branch of Elementary and Secondary Education, Office of Indian Education Programs, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Andrew Hahn,* Associate Dean and Human Services Research Professor, Heller School, Brandeis University, Waltham, MA

Gerard Hawkins, Esq., attorney, Elias, Matz, Tiernan, & Herrick, Washington, D.C.

Stephen Joffe, President, Concord - Assabet Family and Adolescent Programs, Concord, MA

Dr. La Vera Leonard, V.P. for Corporate Affairs and Job Corps Head, Home Builders Institute, Washington, D.C.

Hannah Levin, Israel Affairs Director, National Council of Jewish Women, New York, NY

Zvika Levi, Director, WIZO-Hadassim Youth Village, Israel

Rae Linefsky, Assistant Executive Vice President, New York Association for New Americans, New York, NY

Sonia Perez, Senior Poverty Analyst, National Council of La Raza, Puerto Rico

Dr. Richard Pierce, Dean of Community Life, Milton Hershey School, Hershey, PA

Professor Jack Richman, Co-Director, Family and Children's Resource Program, School of Social Work, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C.

Reginald Robinson, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

Tim Wuliger, President, Mallard Investments, Inc., Cleveland, OH

Jay Yoskowitz, Executive Vice President, United Israel Appeal, New York, NY

Alan Zuckerman, Executive Director, National Youth Employment Coalition, Washington, D.C.

*** Chair of the Board of Advisors**