UNLOCKING LEADERSHIP: OBSTACLES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVED DAY SCHOOL VOLUNTEER LEADERSHIP

SEPTEMBER 2020 · ELUL 5780 · אלול תש"פ

FROM PRIZMAH'S CEO

What makes a Jewish day school work? There are so many elements—the physical structure, the educational experience, the passion of teachers, the generosity of donors, the curiosity of children, the vision of founders, the dedication of professionals and volunteer leaders, the community of parents. No one aspect determines success, and all together contribute to a thriving institution. A change in any one of these can dramatically alter the course of a school's trajectory.

The starting point of this study is Prizmah's unwavering belief that it is possible to improve schools by improving the ways their boards function and that the relationship between the head of school and the board chair is critical to school success. Just as we recently studied the landscape, opportunities, and challenges of professional day school leadership, so do we now share the results of an exploration into the realities of day school boards. Thousands of day school believers devote countless hours each year to board meetings and committee work, all of it with a passion for their school, all of it as volunteers. How can we make the most of this precious resource? How can we ensure that being a day school board member is a sought-after role that contributes to stronger and more sustainable schools?

It is in service to these questions that Prizmah, with the generous support of the AVI CHAI Foundation, commissioned Rosov Consulting in a comprehensive study of day school lay leadership. The findings in this report at times validate what many of us think we know about day schools and lay leadership, and also shine a new light on the facets of the board leadership dynamic. This report details the multiple contexts within which day school boards function—most of which are difficult to influence—and the internal factors that affect how boards themselves operate. By understanding the landscape and identifying the levers that can trigger change, we position ourselves to focus on the most promising interventions and approaches.

This study has challenged Prizmah to conceive of new ways to advance our work. Prizmah is committed to strengthening the partnership between board chairs and heads of school and leveraging leading governance practices to improve school outcomes. Our deepen talent team, led by our vice president of leadership development Ilisa Cappell, is excited to work with lay leaders and professionals and invest in strengthening the lay-head partnership.

We invite you to explore the findings, imagine how boards themselves can work differently, and take advantage of Prizmah's expanding resources for boards.

Warmly,

Paul Bernstein, CEO

INTRODUCTION

Project Goals

Since its launch in 2016, Prizmah: Center for Jewish Day Schools has become the preeminent platform for advancing and addressing the needs of Jewish day schools in North America. As part of its efforts to address those needs in a strategic fashion, Prizmah turned to Rosov Consulting for help with capturing the landscape of opportunities by which day school personnel can learn to be more effective school leaders. This work resulted in a study released in 2018 as *The Learning Leadership Landscape: Experiences and Opportunities for Jewish Day School Personnel.*

During the course of the study, it became apparent how much the relationships between school heads and volunteer leaders, board chairs in particular, can be both an enabler and an obstacle to successful school leadership. Further, the study confirmed how few opportunities there are for volunteers in the day school sector to learn systematically how to fulfill responsibilities that go beyond the technical skills needed to fulfill their roles. This scarcity is especially striking in comparison to the plethora of frameworks intended to help professionals improve and grow.

Prizmah has begun to invest its attention in this dimension of day school functioning. As part of this effort, it has turned again to Rosov Consulting to document the ways in which volunteer leaders contribute to the quality and vitality of day school education, and to expose the circumstances that stymie volunteer leaders who might contribute in positive ways to school governance. Through this work, Prizmah seeks to generate knowledge that can be helpful to both professionals and volunteers and that can contribute to developing a pipeline of volunteer leadership for schools. Ultimately, the goal of this study is to generate recommendations for how Prizmah can strategically advance the day school field through enhancing the contribution of volunteer leaders to the governance of schools in our work with both board chairs and heads.

This study began with an assumption that strong board leadership, and, in particular, strong volunteer-professional partnerships, make a difference to the effective governance of schools. Organizations such as BoardSource, generated a body of literature to support this assumption, and there is no reason to assume why good governance should not bear similar fruits in Jewish institutions. Here, we have sought to delineate what obstructs or enables effective governance specifically in Jewish schools. Recognizing that the Jewish communal context is one where there are few if any degrees of separation between volunteers and professional leaders and between leaders and the communities they serve, this study explores how these circumstances complicate or sustain productive working relationships at the most senior levels of school leadership. It also investigates the circumstances that can produce positive and productive relationships. With systematic evidence of what this takes, Prizmah can develop the appropriate interventions to elevate the day school leadership field.

Project Design

AREAS OF INQUIRY

Our team approached its work first by familiarizing itself with practical literature and research directly concerned with volunteer leadership in independent schools and Jewish communal organizations. We reviewed this literature with two sets of questions in mind:

TASKS

What are the primary board tasks that make the greatest difference to the sustainability, stability, and quality of schools? What are the structures, norms, and resources that support best possible board practices? What specifically are the board chair capacities and dispositions that enable these practices to be enacted?

CONTEXTS

What conditions most strongly impact the board's contribution to the sustainability, stability, and quality of schools?

Tasks

Our review highlighted that among the many things for which boards and their chairs are responsible, there are three tasks that are generally considered to be more important than any other in supporting high-quality institutions, and schools in particular.

1. **Steering:** The board looks beyond the immediate horizon to develop a shared vision, articulate guiding values for organizational action, establish major goals, and outline strategies for achieving those goals.

2. **Supporting:** The board ensures that the organization has the resources needed to achieve its goals: people to do the work, money to pay salaries and expenses, and credibility with the public, on whose support it depends.

3. **Supervising:** The board's oversight role also includes supervising, providing feedback to, and supporting the head. The board delegates authority to the head, who is therefore accountable to the board. The board provides oversight not only of the finances and programs, but also of the organization's legal and moral conduct.

There are many aspects of the context that have potential to complicate and/or enrich the work of leadership. The literature we reviewed pointed to the following four circumstances among many more (included in Appendix B) that both help and hinder the work of day school boards, and that call for understanding with greater nuance:

HASHKAFAH (IDEOLOGY)

In the day school context, mission/vision is concerned with Jewish values and commitments, and not only with educational goals. While this lends additional dimensions of meaning to the visioning work, it also brings greater potential for conflict.

MISHPACHAH (FAMILY)

Many, if not most, day school board members are also parents or relatives of students. This can deepen commitment to the work of the board, while also making it harder to separate personal interests from those of the school.

CHEVRAH (SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS)

Mixing in the same social circles and attending the same places of worship can help create productive bonds between volunteer and professional leaders. However, these individuals can also become too close to one another to be sufficiently dispassionate when making decisions, especially when it comes to assessing performance or discussing emotionally charged issues related to the school's core ideology or identity. These issues often touch at the core of why leaders take on their volunteer role in the school from the start. The close relationships among professional and volunteer leaders and interactions in settings outside the board room can create a sense that "the real work" is being done elsewhere, such as at the shul kiddush club.

HEIMISHNESS (HOMEYNESS)

The intimacy and sense of family nurtured by many day schools means that schools can resemble families more than businesses. This family feeling can strengthen the bonds and commitment of board members, but it also risks undermining the efficient and responsible functioning of the board. Preserving confidentiality is especially challenging in this context. In tight circles, issues of burnout and preservation of boundaries are common challenges.

APPROACH

In order to capture both the specific contexts in which school leaders are situated and the nuances of their interpersonal relationships, we determined that a qualitative methodology would be most effective. An interview-based data-gathering approach would enable the individuals involved to describe in their own words the ways in which they collaborate with one another, what helps and hinders their relationships, and what features of the contexts in which their schools are situated complicate or enhance their work.

Specifically, we developed an approach that involved interviewing heads of school, their current board chairs, and one other volunteer leader with whom they are currently working or have worked. These interviews (as seen in the protocols included in Appendix C) were designed to generate a triangulated set of perspectives within a carefully constructed sample of institutions about: how boards accomplish the three primary tasks we identified as central to their roles; how heads of school and board chairs collaborate to advance the implementation of these tasks; and what circumstances challenge their implementation.

SAMPLE

With an opportunity to gather data from 20 schools, we therefore made sure that our institutional sample included sufficient variation to take into account the following factors and circumstances that, we hypothesized, could impact the functioning of the head of school/board chair relationship and the overall effectiveness of the board.

- **Gender of head of school and of board chair** – We hypothesized, for example, that in some cases when head and chair did not share the same gender, there might be distance or awkwardness that could affect the quality of their relationship. We also wondered about power imbalances more generally when, for example, the head of school was a woman and the board chair a man, or vice versa.

- **Size of school and size of community/day school market** – We anticipated that school size and/or the intensity of competition in the day school marketplace could place special stresses on volunteer/professional relationships. We also expected the size of schools to be related to the available pool of talent from which successive generations of board leaders might come.

- **Grades served by the school** – We expected that for better or worse, parents want to be, and are encouraged to be, more involved in their child's schooling when the school serves younger grades. We wanted to see if and how—as a consequence of such patterns—higher degrees of parent involvement impacted the functioning of boards, and especially the roles played by volunteer leaders.

- **Denomination** – We hypothesized that the norms and procedures of board leadership are more formalized in non-Orthodox day schools than in some Orthodox ones where local rabbis, individual donors, or cultural norms might influence the functioning and turnover of boards. We wanted to check whether indeed this phenomenon shapes day school leaders' relationships.

With attention to these variables, we constructed an interview sample that included 60 individuals: 20 heads of school; 18 current board chairs; 18 former board chairs or volunteer leaders; and 4 individuals who work with schools as consultants to heads and/or chairs. (See the sample breakdown in Appendix D.) We employed a consistent protocol to interview heads of school and other professionals, and a different protocol to interview volunteer leaders.

ANALYSIS

We employed interview analysis software, NVivo 12, to support our examination of interview notes and recordings, and to assist with exploring patterns in the data. Repeated passes through the data, as well as several focus groups with day school board chairs (not featured in the sample), helped produce the findings presented in the next section.

FINDINGS

Nested Contexts – The Circumstances Within Which Boards Function

Day schools exist within a set of nested contexts over which school leaders typically have limited influence. These circumstances impact all day schools to a greater or lesser degree. They can be experienced as particularly challenging by individual school leaders even while they are shared by any number of other institutions in their local community or even on a national scale, far beyond the day school sector. So, for example, when day school leaders talk about how hard it is to find talented volunteers to step up and play a role on their boards, although they may be bemoaning a phenomenon that feels particularly acute in their institution or community, they're actually experiencing a challenge endemic to many, if not the majority, of nonprofit organizations in North America—one of the contexts that day schools inhabit.

We identified three broad contexts of this kind that influence the extent to which board leaders can fulfill their responsibilities and that can introduce stresses or supports into the relationships between board chairs and heads of school.

1. THE MISSION-DRIVEN NONPROFIT CONTEXT – *"A GAME OF 'NOT IT'"*

There are 9,500 Jewish organizations in the United States. They are part of a nonprofit sector in which, as reported by the National Center for Charitable Statistics, there are 1.5 million institutions. Some of what challenges or drives forward Jewish day schools is consistent with the experiences of this far larger universe, particularly among similarly focused institutions. That doesn't mean that the challenges for day schools are therefore insignificant because of their commonplace character. It does indicate that remedial strategies or a wisdom of practice for improving the functioning of day schools with respect to these challenges can probably be derived from resources developed to serve this larger context.

The experiences our interviewees highlighted that are consistent with the nonprofit sector as a whole (as reflected in literature from that field) include, as noted above, challenges associated with recruiting sufficient numbers of appropriately qualified and motivated volunteers to sit on boards and then play a leadership role. Some heads are inclined to attribute the lack of candidates beyond the parent body to an underappreciation of the school's importance in the larger community. Others see their situation as part of a larger phenomenon. As one head reflected:

> *"I believe it's very challenging to find people who are willing and committed to this kind of work, and that also have the time-capacity to lead the board. In discussion with others in the community, people are just not agreeing to sit on boards these days."*

Even when it is possible to recruit volunteers to join boards, persuading individuals to assume the role of chair is no less challenging. A board chair expressed the problem memorably:

> *"The pipe is long—and you say 'run' [for board president] as if it's competitive, as opposed to people running away from it. We have a small board and a lot of new members. There was nobody else. It's more often a game of 'not it.'"*

Without question, this challenge is consistent with broader patterns among nonprofits. A recent Leading Edge report explored this phenomenon, quoting a Jewish volunteer leader's complaint: "I had a checkbook and a pulse, and now I'm board chair."

Compounding this situation is the fact that chairs' terms rarely run for more than two or three years. There is a need to continually search for new leadership. These circumstances start from a positive place—the desire to ensure that volunteer leadership does not demand too much of people's time and is continually refreshed—but it does exacerbate the leadership pipeline challenges. Moreover, the turnover results in a further challenge for school heads, as it does for the CEOs of many nonprofits, and that is the need to work with a new boss every few years. As a board chair noted:

> *"The toughest thing about being head of school is that every two years you have a new boss— there's no continuity and you need to constantly mold yourself to the style of the president."*

A different type of widely shared challenge for nonprofits is that of maintaining the attention and engagement of board members, because their time and attention as volunteers are genuinely limited, the work of boards can sometimes be terribly mundane, or the rapid succession of issues that professional leaders address in the space between board meetings means that boards lose touch with what's happening on the ground. This last issue ought not to be a problem given, that boards are widely advised to focus on long-term strategy rather than day-to-day flare-ups. And yet, it is clear that if board members don't feel that they at least have a finger on the pulse of day-to-day matters, their interest can wander.

The flip side of board members losing interest is a challenge that widely affects the nonprofit sector, especially among independent schools, and most commonly among those where boards are made up of high proportions of current parents. This is the drift of board members' attention to the day-to-day and the minutiae of school life, such as the vacation calendar, homework policy, or packed-lunch policies. Calling such things "policy matters" may in fact be overstating things. The challenge is really that some parents view every issue that comes before the board in terms of what's best or most convenient for their own child.

The board members we interviewed knew they shouldn't be devoting their time to such matters, but they reported an inexorable pull toward these matters for the reasons described above. A former board chair put it like this:

> *"The plan to keep the board meetings to a high level would sometimes break. We could have been much more functional and organized when it came to high-level issues, like should we build a high school or not? Should we partner with a Special Ed school and create a school within the school? We probably got more bogged down in the weeds of fire drills and day-to-day stuff and didn't get to the bigger-picture issues."*

2. THE JEWISH DAY SCHOOL CONTEXT — "THE VERY FEW DEGREES OF SEPARATION MAKE IT HARD."

A second context in which day schools are situated extends to the day school sector as a whole, as opposed to nonprofits more generally. The features of this context invariably pose challenges to a board's healthy operation, but they can also enhance the board's capacity to make a positive difference to a school's overall functioning.

Day schools are, by definition, mission-driven institutions. Without a distinct mission, they have no *raison d'être* that distinguishes them from the larger universe of independent schools. Their Jewish mission has potential to inspire boards, in positive ways, to do hard work and overcome difficult challenges. A former board chair put it like this:

> *"I think it's something that prevails in the school community itself. Anyone that goes to a Jewish day school, regardless how diverse it is, they're coming from a foundational level of common values, and I think anyone who is part of the school shares those values."*

This ideological fuel is unstable. As was previously intimated, *hashkafah*/ideology is akin to kryptonite. It can, and often does, energize volunteers. ("We're all missionaries," as one head expressed it.) At other times, it can translate into inflated, essentially unrealistic, expectations of the school's professionals. Board members, fired up by a sense of mission, can demand too much of the head of school and the professional team, resulting in disappointment and a high turnover in a school's administration. Ironically, this situation is a kind of best-case scenario, where inflated expectations at least stem from lofty sources. More commonly in our sample, inflated expectations of heads of school derive from less-positive sources. A head of school painted a picture of what this can look like:

> *"The ecosystem of day schools is not [built upon] realistic expectations. The structure of it is a pyramid with one person at the top responsible for everything underneath. Organizationally that makes sense. But on the other hand, the head of school's job and the structure is unrealistic. When you have a board member who is a parent who hates the way lunch is managed—that filters into the board meeting. Everyone works through themselves, through their own parent or grandparent lens—everyone operates from their own place, and you have to make it work for everyone. That's hard."*

This dynamic is consistent with what we learned during our study of professional leaders. We can now see how these phenomena are more or less built in to day school culture because of the high proportion of parents on boards and because of the difficulty in maintaining boundaries between professionals and volunteers in this setting [their *mishpachah* and *chevrah* dimensions]. Evidence of these challenges comes from board members themselves and not only from the professionals. Clearly, it's a phenomenon that tests volunteer leaders as much as it tests the professionals.

Again, in the day school context, despite the intimacy and intense sense of community that can make these places so appealing as settings to educate children and build friendships, this same intimacy can express itself in ways that undercut the professional functioning of boards. A chair expressed it like this:

> *"The very few degrees of separation make it hard to have accountability. When they're just volunteers, it's hard to be effective. It's hard to see the quality of professionalism. Sometimes that threatens our ability to be successful—that we all know each other. Sometimes people tend to think that it's just going to work out. In fundraising, the response is often 'Someone will just bail us out' or 'It's the next president's problem.'"*

These phenomena can particularly complicate the relationship between board chairs and their heads of school. It can make it hard for chairs to fulfill one of their primary functions, as supervisor of the head of school. A chair vividly conveyed the double-edged quality of this situation, with respect to his relationship with his head:

> *"We have a very close personal relationship. It has its pluses and minuses. I think the pluses are somewhat obvious. I'm never shy. I literally could knock on his front door. I try not to and be respectful. The flip side is that it's not always easy to convey a difficult message with someone you feel comfortable with. We communicate every day, but it's not always easy to point out when I think something is not done the way it should. That's a challenge. It's a double-edged sword."*

In all day schools, volunteer leaders have an opportunity to draw on a powerful mix of mission, community, and intimacy to advance the well-being of their schools, and yet at the same time these phenomena can weaken the ability of boards, and of chairs in particular, to fulfill their key tasks with professionalism and effectiveness. In other words, they can be hobbled by their *heimishness*.

3. THE LOCAL COMMUNITY CONTEXT –
"IT'S PART OF THE NATURE OF OUR COMMUNITY."

The most immediate context in which day schools are situated is that marked out by the local community. Day schools must function within socio-cultural, demographic, and economic circumstances that are largely beyond their control. Some serve parent communities where the norms of competition trump those of communitarianism. Others are situated in parts of the country experiencing demographic decline or shifts. Some serve wealthy communities with disposable resources that can be mobilized to support their needs. These are givens, and boards can of course navigate these circumstances with panache just as they can they be overwhelmed by environments in which they have limited room to maneuver.

These circumstances evidently impact the functioning of day school boards and of volunteer-professional relationships more generally. In some cases, heads of school find themselves taking the heat from boards for problems that might also be challenging their competitors or other local Jewish institutions. A head complained:

"There are tremendous pressures in terms of enrollment. The president and board members could mistake that and put too much blame on the head, instead of diagnosing the problem appropriately. It's the same issue for affordability."

It might be stating the obvious, but fundraising depends on the community. The human, financial, and social capital on which a board can draw and make available to support the school derive in most instances from local sources, and only at the margins from national agencies, benefactors, and resources. A head of school expressed this insight succinctly: "I don't see there being a magical switch. It's part of the nature of our community."

Inside Schools – Three Ingredients That Make a Difference

The nested contexts in which day schools sit are undoubtedly challenging, and our experience suggests they are more challenging today than they were in the past—influencing the ways in which boards steer, support, and supervise schools. That's the bad news. And yet, as we have implied, these contexts need not ultimately determine the extent to which volunteer leaders contribute to the well-being of schools. That's the good news. The effectiveness with which board members perform their primary functions is, to a much greater extent, a consequence of what happens inside the school, at the board itself, and in the relationship between chair and head of school.

When volunteer and professional leaders reflect on the struggles and strengths of their volunteer leaders, they point most often to three contributing factors located within the institution: their systems and structures; their organizational norms and culture; and the particular dispositions and capacities of the head and board chair. Unlike the phenomena associated with the contexts outside schools, these are factors over which school leaders have some, even a lot of, influence.

> *There are tremendous pressures in terms of enrollment. The president and board members could mistake that and put too much blame on the head, instead of diagnosing the problem appropriately. It's the same issue for affordability."*

STRUCTURES AND SYSTEMS

The literature on volunteer leadership from the greater nonprofit world is replete with recommendations for structures and systems that can enable boards and board chairs to function with maximum possible effectiveness. These recommendations include establishing measures for identifying and training volunteer talent, often through a Committee on Trustees, and procedures to onboard and orient new board members. Other suggestions of this kind are designed to enable boards to work with professionalism by putting in place bylaws and guidelines for board member term limits and role descriptions. Some structures and systems maintain or deepen support for the head of school, through a head of school Support and Evaluation Committee or through the board chair and head holding person-to-person check-ins at regular intervals.

At the schools we studied, when such structures and systems were in place, professionals and volunteers often (although not always) found they helped them fulfill their responsibilities. A head spoke with satisfaction about the role clarity his board achieved:

> *"Our board does a really good job differentiating between governance and day-to-day operations, not meddling into the day-to-day, which I appreciate. They do a lot of work on the major strategic issues."*

Other heads were grateful for the succession planning their board had done, making it possible for them to begin investing in building close relationships with individuals who would take up the position of chair in a year or two years' time. Chairs, for their part, reflected with satisfaction on the effectiveness with which they had established onboarding systems for new board members, whether in the form of mentoring for new board members or by holding a retreat at the start of the year for all board members to review responsibilities and roles.

When these structures and systems didn't work as well as they were supposed to, at least as promised by the many board how-to books, the various players seemed invested in making them work more effectively. Most had an appreciation that practices of this kind could make a difference. The following comments offered by a board chair reflect an effort to make a specific structure work as it should:

> *"They tried to put in a head of school Evaluation Committee, and it failed a few times. We tried to make it less about being critical of the head and more about how to support her... It's still one of those things that's hard to keep going and make work because you're trying to support the head but also pushing back and setting goals for him. It's a delicate balance."*

Some schools have instituted less-commonplace systems that they celebrate for making a difference to how they function. In one school, the head expressed satisfaction that she established the principle that she has a say in the selection of the board president. Recognizing that it is somewhat unusual to do so, she explains:

> *"It's a big priority in my work. It matters. I know how important this relationship is."*

In another school, the board has created the role of Institutional Advancement Coordinator. This person, a member of the school's administration, is responsible for checking in with all board members at regular intervals, ensuring that they feel engaged and able to contribute to the board's primary functions. Tasked with this role, she has relieved her head of school from a task that would otherwise take up a great deal of his time, something for which he is thankful.

The search for ever more effective systems goes on, and the absence of such systems is often acutely felt—when board members overstep their roles, when heads and chairs express distrust of one another or complain that they only communicate when there's a fire to put out, or when highly skilled individuals bemoan the lack of support they get to perform their functions well. In the following instance, a board chair craves a particular kind of systemic support that would serve her school and others:

> *"I came in with the best possible skill set, with organizational consulting skills and people believing in me because of what I did with the parent association, and still it's so hard… You feel really alone in it. There needs to be more peer and training support. Maybe there could be a buddy system [across different schools]."*

ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND NORMS

Structures and systems help many boards fulfill their key roles, and yet in some schools even when these practices were in place, interviewees reported that their boards still struggled to be effective or they complained that volunteer/professional relationships were frayed or unproductive. It was as if they were describing how they had carefully followed a recipe and yet found themselves disappointed with what came out of the oven.

These reflections indicate that high-functioning boards and effective head/chair relationships don't only hinge on the implementation of the right structures and systems, they also depend on the culture of work, on the organizational and interpersonal norms, with which structures and systems are operationalized. To take an example, it's not enough that the board chair and head meet each week (a systems solution) if the school is not an environment where each is assumed to be acting with the best of intentions (a cultural challenge), especially when offering constructive criticism of one another. This does not mean that schools can do without strong governance systems if they operate within cultures that are transparent and collaborative, but those systems have limited value if they're not supported by healthy cultures.

Our interviewees shared some powerful examples of the kinds of cultures that support the effective collaboration of school heads and chairs and the capacity of boards to engage over time in challenging work. At the heart of these examples are three norms: trust, respect, and collaboration.

Trust

The work of school leadership is relentlessly challenging; it is inevitably imperfect. If school leadership is not to be paralyzed by those imperfections and do better, continually, people must be prepared to give and receive feedback, communicate that feedback openly, and assume the best of intentions of those from whom they receive feedback. These are all the markers of trust. As a head of school explained:

> *"My important philosophy is assuming positive intention. So, when we come to challenging meetings, especially when we talk about challenging issues, we need to pause and remember we're all in this together, and that we need to approach things with curiosity and openness."*

It's striking that these reflections are framed in the first-person plural. They indicate something about the school culture as a whole, not just how this one person faces the world. Certainly, the flip side of this ethos can be painful, if not paralyzing, as one former board chair reported:

> *"I felt that anything I said or suggested was viewed as criticism, and reacted to with hostility— instead of seeing it as a way to advance the interest of the school."*

Respect

Respect works both ways: between professionals and volunteers. School heads expect their volunteer partners to appreciate and respect their expertise. A chair, who might easily have upset this fragile balance, explains the tack she takes in her relationship with the head:

> *"I think [the head] expects transparency. He expects me not to pretend to be an expert in high school education. I actually do teach on a regular basis, but I'm there as a sounding board. I can give advice, but that's not my role."*

This kind of stance may state the obvious: the head of school has been employed to be an educational authority. And yet often board members, as the employers of the head, assume they know better. What is less obvious is that volunteer leaders also expect appreciation and respect, from both their volunteer peers and from the school's professionals, for the fact that they're giving of themselves so generously and for what they give. They're not being paid to review scholarship submissions and help balance budgets. They're doing so as volunteers. A head of school recollected an experience that captured these issues well:

> *"I remember in [my last school] when I was working with the president. We were building a budget for the school; it took a lot of energy and money out of him; it was a very hard and demanding job on top of his full-time job. There was a certain point when things got heated. His colleagues were criticizing him about the budget, and he turned to me and said, 'I don't get paid for this.' You know, it's important to keep in mind culturally and for all of us who are professionals—that [these people] are volunteering their time."*

Respect underpins realistic expectations. We have already seen how, in day schools, expectations can often become unbalanced. Mutual respect serves as a powerful antidote to such imbalance. Some appreciate this principle more readily than do others. Here's a board chair who recognizes that some of his peers don't see this so well:

> *"The educational world works differently. Say you want to change the schedule around—if it was up to me, I would change the schedule overnight... I work on Wall Street—if something needs to change, it changes yesterday. In education, it works differently. You have to have the right patience level. Teachers have been trained a certain way. You can't walk in and tell them to change the way they do it. That's where the head of school needs to re-educate the board in terms of how realistic the timeline is to get things done. Volunteer leaders who aren't educators don't know enough."*

Collaboration

With the trust and respect that underpins reasonable expectations, it becomes possible for professionals and volunteers to collaborate in productive ways. Effective collaboration does not mean that each party undertakes the same work, substituting for one another; that's not how collaboration works. It is rather that each party makes a distinctive contribution to their shared mission and makes space for others to contribute.

DISPOSITIONS AND CAPACITIES

The examples we have provided indicate how people in general establish ways to work and live productively together in the same institution. These practices don't just express the dispositions of one or two individuals in the institution. They're more generalized; they're part of the culture. Nevertheless, in examining what ultimately makes a difference to the quality of the relationships between volunteer and professional leaders in day schools, it is inescapable that the dispositions and capacities of certain individuals in leadership roles, specifically the head of school and the board chair, do make a difference not only to how those individuals perform their roles, but also how their institutions function as a whole.

With respect to the head of school, interviewees identify a range of critical dispositions, all consistent with those we identified in our previous study of professional leaders. In order to facilitate the board's contribution to the well-being of the school, the dispositions that loom largest are, not surprisingly, interpersonal; they are concerned with the head's ability to work collaboratively and empathetically with board members as a whole and with the board chair in particular. As one head elaborated:

> *"Heads need to have an understanding of the people they work with—to be politically savvy enough to know you cannot do it without the support of your board president and leadership. You have to be able to manage up so that you get what you need from them: the financial support and involvement that the school needs, ambassadorship and someone that has your back when you need it. In some ways, although it sounds backwards, it's the responsibility of the head to manage that relationship—even though it's the board that are the head's bosses."*

Other interviewees singled out specific dispositions: openness to negative feedback, mindfulness of the volunteer nature of volunteer-leader work, the ability to maintain open and positive communication with volunteers, and adjusting one's work ethic to align with the chair's way of working. The only skill or capacity that interviewees called out that couldn't be characterized as a personal disposition was financial acuity. Volunteer leaders, it seems, wished that the heads with whom they work could engage with them as equals in relation to the business aspects of the school. One chair put it like this:

> *"I wish there would be a requirement [for heads] to take some business courses, to understand budgeting and endowment... Very few people can become principals or school heads as teachers—but maybe with an understanding of finances, it would be easier. This is not specific to our school per se—it's something that's lacking in the field... At the end of the day, a school is a business."*

With respect to the board chair, there were a small number of dispositions that interviewees called out as making a decisive difference to the quality of their contribution to a school's functioning. Many of these can be characterized as people-management capabilities—knowing how to get along with or manage diverse and difficult personalities. A good deal of what this involves was described by one board chair:

> *"I have a different style than the previous president. He's very direct and good at pulling the strings and massaging the egos and motivating people to take things on. He's good at laying the groundwork for what he needs to accomplish, building alliances, and getting other folks to join in... and take ownership of a particular issue. I bring people in and I treat people as adults and expect them to act as adults and take their obligations seriously. In retrospect, his approach works better in this context than mine."*

One particular disposition that a few interviewees highlighted was akin to steadfastness, or being able to take and uphold difficult or unpopular decisions. One head of school called this "backbone":

> *"Sometimes as a leader, you're going to be making decisions that people don't like. The downfall of my last chair is she wanted to please everyone and couldn't take this aspect of the work. Not everyone loved my first two chairs all the time, and I think that's what it is. That willingness [to accept] that your job is not going to please everyone. Get a backbone—that's a really important disposition, that's the same thing I've had to learn, it still feels bad that not everyone agrees with what I do [but that's part of the work]."*

In a similar vein, a different head suggested that this steadfast quality enabled volunteer leaders to withstand naysayers or critics and convey a positive message to the school community.

> *"It can be really hard to stay positive as a chair, especially if you let yourself be exposed, if you're a parent at the school, if you allow people to dump thoughts on you, and if you don't allow yourself to take a step back and look at the positive—you can get bogged down."*

IT TAKES THREE TO TANGO: HEAD, CHAIR, AND BOARD

As these last examples indicate, when it comes to what make the greatest difference to the positive functioning of volunteer leaders and to the governance of the schools, it is not just about the quality of the bilateral relationships between volunteers and professionals or between chair and head. In many respects, it is about a triangular dynamic between the head, chair, and board. The following reflections from a current board chair convey how confusing this dynamic can be:

> *"There's an issue around the board's functioning. Who's the puppeteer? We haven't been good at giving the head formal reviews, but even with that, I found that I play a bigger role in creating the framework for it. I don't know where any of that sits. I don't expect [the head] to do it, but then I'm not sure how it gets done. Who is really operationally driving the board, and the board's relationship with the staff? That's most unsettling."*

These relationships are part of a dance that can be hard to execute. Sometimes it seems as if the players are too intimate; sometimes they're too far apart. And, adding a layer of complexity, this is a tango for three; too much intimacy with one partner risks creating too much distance from another. Building these relationships means being ready to be pulled in more than one direction at the same time.

A really productive relationship between the head and chair, or head and Executive Committee, risks discounting the contribution of the board as a whole. A head of school recounts how such a scenario came about in her school:

> *"When I came to the school, [the previous board president] saw her work as directly working with me, but the board felt disconnected from her and thought the meetings were very operational. Her entire focus was working with me and talking through the strategy plan and issues around the senior staff... It was a very personalized relationship, but the rest of the board were more like observers. It created a notion of—what are we all doing here? So that created a disconnect."*

In a different case, when the head of school is so well aligned with the board, they can be viewed by their professional colleagues as lacking independence or as having lost touch with their most immediate colleagues. A head recollects how this became a challenge for him:

> *"My admin team felt that I wasn't my own man. They got insulted, and during my second year there were members of the school that were against me. They would look at me as grouped with the board—and then I had to prove myself all over again to my faculty that I have my own opinion and that the final say is mine and not the board's."*

Professional and lay leaders must be willing to sit with this comfort, entering conversations that may not be familiar. Board chairs will often find themselves to be the only volunteer present when attending school events during the school day or joining meetings where everyone else is a professional. It can be hard to make a contribution in these moments, at least one that goes beyond the symbolic. Heads of school, too, typically coming to their role as part of a professional career journey that began in the classroom, must be comfortable in decision-making and social settings where they are the only educational professional in the room. They must be comfortable inhabiting more than one world and be ready for the discomfort that comes from being an outlier in some of the settings they are required to inhabit. It is because of these ambiguities—especially as experienced by board chair and head—that norms and dispositions are so important. These values—ways of being—help people navigate and work productively when they're outside their usual comfort zones.

IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Our findings map the landscape within which schools can build the capacity of their boards. This map can provide a diagnostic to help schools consider where their own difficulties originate. Tackling all these issues at once is too much. When schools use this framework to identify the pressure points where their school is struggling and invest time in one direction at a time, they are more apt to make an impact.

A. Understanding the Landscape

It is possible to improve schools by improving the functioning of their boards.
Volunteer and professional school leaders can make a positive change to governance in their own schools by identifying those challenges that are part of larger contexts and where strong, national allies exist to help with the work; focusing internally on addressing weaknesses over which leaders themselves do indeed have significant influence and for which well-established technical solutions already exist; and applying a degree of introspection and honesty to their own dispositions and the dispositions of others.

Leaders can similarly bring wisdom, relationships, and expertise from their experiences in the local community and the broader nonprofit context. Board members active throughout the community, for example, can advocate for the school and foster connections to local allies. Heads can connect to colleagues at schools throughout North America, enlisting the experiences of others to improve their own school and board.

B. Structures and Systems

To help make a difference to the structures and systems that support schools' governance, volunteer and professional leaders can access resources that exist from well-regarded experts in nonprofit leadership such as BoardSource and ISM. Such resources can help school leaders understand how the multiple contexts in which day schools are situated compare with the circumstances, challenges, and opportunities of board governance more broadly. There is also a rich history of resources (including self-study guides and handbooks) and best practices in the Jewish day school field that can inspire better practice.

C. Culture and Norms

Schools have great capacity to engage in efforts to influence their culture. Leaders can consider implementing intentional processes for onboarding new board chairs or new heads of school, for example. Through Prizmah resources like the Reshet network groups, the online Knowledge Center, or coaching, school leaders can learn about governance cultures across the diverse day school field and experiment with new approaches. Another valued resource is to enlist the experience and expertise of past board chairs as mentors. Creating a learning culture means seeking out and drawing on all available resources.

D. Dispositions and Capacities

Focusing on dispositional change, especially with board chairs, means trying to change the performance of individuals who occupy their positions for limited terms before others take their place. This kind of turnover is certainly a challenge, and yet it also creates an opportunity. Day school volunteer leaders rarely end their "careers" as volunteers once they complete their terms. They usually move on, as they and their children age out of day school, to play other volunteer roles in the community, and sometimes stay on the school's board for a term. Creating connections for board members within a local Jewish community, across institutions, can help people identify and cultivate productive leadership dispositions. If school leaders can find community allies with whom to partner in this work, it would knit day schools more strongly into the fabric of Jewish communal life, to the benefit of all.

Understanding the dispositions that are best suited for leadership can help boards select new board members thoughtfully and identify future board chairs with much greater wisdom and intentionality. Appendix A can be a helpful tool in this regard.

VI. PRIZMAH'S ROLE

Prizmah is proud to partner with schools to co-create opportunities that contribute in significant ways to the effectiveness with which volunteer leaders steer, support, and supervise Jewish day schools. With sensitivity to the nested contexts in which schools are situated, Prizmah is committed to mobilizing already existing resources designed to help address the governance challenges that all schools face, as well as developing customized resources to the unique day school environment. In this respect, we can make a difference without reinventing the wheel. By both drawing on the wisdom of the field and applying strategic interventions to the leadership practices employed by individual schools, Prizmah can help advance a broad change in the culture of volunteer leadership in day schools. We are committed to establishing norms that will benefit not only the Jewish day school sector, but also the broader universe of Jewish nonprofit organizations. Prizmah is proud to partner with day schools in situating themselves at the vanguard of the community.

PRIMARY BOARD TASKS	STRUCTURES & PRACTICES	BOARD CHAIR CAPACITIES THAT ENABLE THESE PRACTICES
Steering: The board looks beyond the immediate horizon by developing a shared vision, articulating guiding values for organizational action, establishing major goals, and outlining strategies for achieving those goals.	**The School:** • Has a written mission statement, vision statement, and code of ethics • Has a written strategic plan **The Board:** • Is actively involved in visioning and strategic planning • Engages in a formal planning process every few years and monitors progress against that plan • Understands the needs of multiple constituencies: professional leadership, donors, parents, and students	• Facilitates strategic discussions and involves/designates others in prioritizing and addressing challenges • Communicates and models the school's vision and code of ethics • Serves as the leader and manager of the board, ensuring that the board does not overstep its limits • Accepts responsibility to bring discipline to the board and helps counsel unproductive and disruptive trustees • Takes care to separate the interests of the school from those of a particular student, family, or constituency
Supporting: The board ensures that the organization has the resources needed to achieve its goals: (i) people to do the work; (ii) money to pay salaries and expenses; and (iii) credibility with the public, on whose support it depends.	**The Board:** • Builds, protects, and promotes the school's public standing • Makes sure that the school has an appropriate mix of income sources • Provides for board training to build fundraising and friend-raising skills, to educate members about their responsibilities and mission, and to onboard new members **Board Members:** • Serve as ambassadors to the community and are an essential element of a school's marketing, communications, and outreach • Are active in fundraising, prioritize their own personal contributions, connect staff to potential donors, and solicit friends, colleagues, and alumni	• Empowers and develops the capacities of others • Creates opportunities for collaboration • Models expectations for individual board members to make a personal financial contribution and participate in fundraising activities • Promotes the school within the community, and integrates it with the community and its institutions • Navigates politics and stakeholder interests/conflicts
Supervising: The board provides oversight not only of the finances and programs, but also of the organization's legal and moral conduct. The board delegates authority to the head, who is therefore accountable to the board. The board's oversight role also includes supervising, providing feedback to and supporting the head.	**The Board:** • Recognizes that volunteer and professional leaders have distinct and separate roles • Works in collaboration with the head of school to understand the scope of the school's programs and services • Establishes appropriate goals for quality and results, and monitors performance data • When fully informed by the head, decides which programs best support the school's mission and strategies for success • Approves the annual budget and monitors performance against the budget throughout the year • Oversees the annual audit to verify that the school is accurately reporting the sources and uses of its funds • Ensures the school has policies in place to deal with HR grievances, discrimination, and sexual harassment • Ensures that a job description outlines the head's duties, then evaluates the head annually and determines appropriate compensation • Works with the head to determine the appropriate levels and forms of communication: how often, by what means (formal and informal), when, and where to share more broadly	• Articulates and enforces role definitions and boundaries • Understands budgeting and financial management • Willing and able to undertake difficult conversations with trustees and/or the head • Establishes a solid and supportive relationship of candor and trust with the head to be a confidante and sounding board • Serves as thought-partner and joint decision-maker with the head

APPENDIX B: THE CONTEXT FOR DAY SCHOOL BOARDS

Jewish day school boards fulfill their responsibilities in contexts that shape and impact their contribution to the sustainability, stability, and quality of schools in both positive and negative ways. This is the context in which board chairs bring their capacities and dispositions to bear.

1. In the day school context, mission/vision is concerned with Jewish values and commitments, and not only with educational goals. While this lends additional dimensions of meaning to the visioning work, it also brings greater potential for personalization and conflict.

2. Many, if not most, day school board members are also parents or relatives of students. This again can both deepen commitment to the work of the board, while making it harder to separate personal interests from those of the school.

3. There is a wide range of practices at day school boards with respect to term limits. On some, members stay on indefinitely as "honorary" or "life members"; on others, there is a high degree of turnover. In either case, it is difficult for chairs to balance their desire to honor previous visions and decisions with their desire to "make their own mark" on the board and school.

4. In many communities, board members (even chairs) sit on boards of other (educational) institutions. These compete for their commitment and support and also provide access to potential partners for the school.

5. Because board members sit on other boards, they are often entrenched in a culture of "this is how we do it there." People can bring poor governance from one board to another or, conversely, they can bring their experience and wisdom to enhance a day school board's functioning.

6. Day schools compete for Jewish communal resources with a myriad of other Jewish institutions serving a wide variety of communal needs (education, social services, etc.).

7. Mixing in the same social circles and attending the same places of worship can help create productive bonds between volunteer and professional leaders. However, these individuals can also become too close to one another to be sufficiently dispassionate when making decisions, especially when it comes to assessing performance. Their close relationships and interactions in other settings can create a sense that "the real work" is being done elsewhere, such as at the shul kiddush club.

8. "*Heimishness*" – The intimacy and sense of family nurtured by many day schools mean that schools can more resemble families than businesses. This family feeling can strengthen the bonds and commitment of board members, but it also risks undermining the efficient and responsible functioning of the board and the school. Preserving confidentiality is especially challenging in this context.

APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS

Current Board Chair Interview Protocol

Thank you for taking the time to speak with me today. I am part of the Rosov Consulting team, and we are conducting a study on behalf of Prizmah on the contribution of volunteer leadership to day school education.

Specifically, we are examining the relationship between board chairs and school heads and the ways in which this partnership can be beneficial and challenging, both for the people involved and the school itself.

We are eager to learn what factors contribute to high-functioning volunteer-professional relationships and, in contrast, what variables undermine good practices. We're paying close attention to the particulars of the Jewish day school context and how these circumstances play a role in the relationship between boards and volunteer leaders.

We are conducting interviews with a wide range of school professionals. The main goal of this study, while understanding leadership to be a key lever for change and growth, is to learn about the conditions for better partnerships with board chairs and school leadership's success.

Our conversation is completely confidential—that is, nothing you say will be attached to your name, and findings will only be reported in the aggregate. Our conversation should last no more than one hour.

Do you have any questions before we begin?

Introduction

1. Can you tell me about your connection with the school? (e.g. kids who are attending, involvement, etc.)

2. Tell me a little bit about how long you've been president of the board at [insert school name]. What leadership roles have you taken on previously at the school or in other community organizations?

3. What were your primary motivations to run for board president?

4. Probes:

   a. Any specific goals that you hoped to accomplish in this role?

5. We've learned a little bit about the school from talking with the head of school and other sources, but in order to get a further picture:

6. If I want to gain a better understanding of the issues in the school, what would you say are the main challenges that the school currently faces?

The Board and Its Role

1. What do you see as the board's primary contributions to the well-being of the school? (identify which framework elements are mentioned: *setting direction, resource provision, providing oversight)*

   a. **[if not mentioned, probe:]** In what ways, if at all, is the board involved in:

      i. Setting direction? (visioning and strategic planning; goal setting, etc.)

      ii. Resource provision? (ensuring appropriate income sources, board training for fundraising skills, etc.)

      iii. Providing oversight? (overseeing the school's moral and legal conduct, annual audit, managing communication structures, etc.)

      iv. Training new board members, grooming future leaders, and ensuring a smooth pipeline toward role of chair

   b. How does your role of board president fit into all of this?

      i. What does your work as board president look like on a weekly basis?

      ii. Do you think there are areas where the board should be more involved?

Relationship With the HoS

1. How would you describe your relationship with the head of school?

   a. What are some factors that impact this relationship?

   b. What about your relationship with the HoS has the most positive impact on the school?

   c. Is there anything about your relationship that you think could use improvement/change?

   d. Are there any challenges to this relationship with the HoS?

2. What did you expect from the HoS? What do you think they expected from you? What did it take to meet her expectations? Were these realistic? (raising funds for the school—how do you feel about that? reasonable expectation?)

3. How much of this was on your radar when you took on this role?

4. What kind of conversations did you have with the HoS in terms of setting the ground for the work?

5. Tell me a little bit about how the rest of the board interacts with the HoS.

6. What are the structures or systems that support the relationship between the HoS and yourself, and/or other members of the professional team? (e.g. written strategic plan, board training, clear role descriptions, performance data monitoring, annual budget evaluation process, etc.)

7. What specific practices do you and the HoS engage in that demonstrate the type of partnership you have? (e.g. weekly meetings, norms for communication, structured feedback sessions)

   a. What are the specific qualities that are cultivated by these practices? (e.g. trust, open and honest conversation, collaboration)

   b. Has the school developed any intentional practices around the development of trust that impacts your relationship with the HoS?

   c. How much time would you say do you devote to working with the HoS?

Reflections on Working With a HoS

1. **[only if this is relevant]** When you reflect on your relationships with previous HoS over the years, what was it about these relationships that made your work more or less productive/easier or more challenging?

   a. **[only if relevant, for current board chair]** To what extent was it different working with the previous HoS compared to the current one? What factors do you think play a role in these differences?

   b. Have you chaired other boards? If so, how does your role at [insert school name] compare?

2. What do you think are the **dispositions or characteristics** of a HoS that make the relationship with the board leadership beneficial or challenging?

The Jewish Community Context

1. What is different about the Jewish day school context that might hinder or improve the relationship between the board president and HoS?

   PROBES

   a. The mission/vision of a Jewish school is concerned with Jewish values and commitments

   b. Day school board members are often parents or relatives of students

   c. High board turnover

   d. Competition with other Jewish institutions for resources

   e. *"Heimishness"*

HEAD OF SCHOOL INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Thank you for taking the time to speak with me today. I am part of the Rosov Consulting team, and we are conducting a study on behalf of Prizmah on the contribution of volunteer leadership to day school education. Specifically, we are examining the relationship between board chairs and school heads and the ways in which this partnership can be beneficial and challenging, both for the people involved and the school itself. We are eager to learn what factors contribute to high-functioning volunteer-professional relationships and, in contrast, what variables undermine good practices. We're paying close attention to the particulars of the Jewish day school context and how these circumstances play a role in the relationship between boards and volunteer leaders.

We are conducting interviews with a wide range of school professionals. The main goal of this study, while understanding leadership to be a key lever for change and growth, is to learn about the conditions for a school head's success and work toward better partnerships with board chairs.

Our conversation is completely confidential—that is, nothing you say will be attached to your name, and findings will only be reported in the aggregate. Our conversation should last no more than one hour.

Do you have any questions before we begin?

Introduction [About the School]

1. Tell me a little bit about how long you've been HoS at [insert school name]. Where were you beforehand, and how you got to this position? (if held a HoS role previously, probe: how does working at this school compare to where you worked previously, in terms of the relationship with the board, the role of head, etc.)

2. We've learned a little bit about your school from the website and speaking with people, but in order to get a further picture:

   a. If I would be a prospective parent, what would be the three things you would tell me about your school?

   b. From a different angle, if I want to gain a better understanding of the issues in the school, what would you say are the main challenges that the school currently faces?

   c. Is there anything else important for us to understand about your school context to get a full picture?

The Board and Its Role [About Functions of the Board]

1. What do you see as the board's primary contributions to the well-being of the school? (identify which framework elements are mentioned: *setting direction, resource provision, providing oversight)*

   a. **[if not mentioned, probe:]** In what ways, if at all, is the board involved in:

      i. Setting direction? (visioning and strategic planning, goal setting, etc.)

      ii. Resource provision? (ensuring appropriate income sources, board training for fundraising skills, etc.)

      iii. Providing oversight? (overseeing the school's moral and legal conduct, annual audit, managing communication structures, etc.)

      iv. Training new board members, grooming future leaders, and ensuring a smooth pipeline toward role of chair.

   b. If the board is not involved, do you think these are areas where the board can/should step in?

Relationship With the Board Chair [About the Relationships]

1. Where does the board chair fit into this picture? What is his/her specific role as part of this contribution?

2. What are the structures or systems that support the relationship between the board chair and you, and/or other members of the professional team? (e.g. written strategic plan, board training, clear role descriptions, performance data monitoring, annual budget evaluation process, etc.)

   a. Are there any challenges to this relationship with the chair?

3. What specific practices do you and the board chair engage in that demonstrate the type of partnership you have? (e.g. weekly meetings, norms for communication, structured feedback sessions)

   a. What are the specific qualities that are cultivated by these practices? (e.g. trust, open and honest conversation, collaboration)

   b. Has the school developed any intentional practices around the development of trust between the leadership team and the board chair?

   c. What percentage of time would you say do you devote to working with the board?

4. How would you describe your relationship with the board chair?

   a. What are some factors that impact this relationship?

   b. What about your relationship with the board chair has the most positive impact on the school?

   c. Is there anything about your relationship that you think could use improvement/change?

Reflections on Board Chair

1. **[only if this is relevant]** When you reflect on your relationships with previous board chairs over the years, what was it about this relationship that made your work more or less productive?

    a.   In your experience of working with multiple board chairs, how do the dynamics shift over time?

2. What do you think are the dispositions or characteristics of a board chair that makes the relationship with the professional leadership beneficial or challenging?

The Jewish Community Context

1. What is different about the Jewish day school context that might hinder or improve the relationship between the board chair and the head?

    PROBES

    a. The mission/vision of a Jewish school is concerned with Jewish values and commitments

    b. Day school board members are often parents or relatives of students

    c. High board turnover

    d. Competition with other Jewish institutions for resources

    e. *"Heimishness"*

2. As part of our data collection, our scope allows us to speak with two additional people besides the board chair. Who do you think I can speak to that can give me an understanding of the chemistry of the working relationship between the school and the board chair here at [insert school name]?

APPENDIX D: STUDY SAMPLE

(Small Size: School=Fewer than 100 students; Community=1 day school. MO=Modern Orthodox; CO=Centrist Orthodox)

GENDER				SMALL SIZE		GRADES			DENOMINATION		
Head		Chair									
M	F	M	F	School	Community	K–8	K–12	9–12	Conservative	Community/Reform	MO / CO
	■		■			■				■	
	■		■	■		■				■	
	■	■		■	■	■				■	
■		■						■			■
■		■						■			■
	■			■						■	
■				■					■		
■						■	■				■
	■					■					■
	■									■	
	■										
■		■						■		■	
■		■					■		■		
■		■					■				■
	■		■			■				■	
■			■			■					■
■			■				■		■		
■		■									■
■						■					
	■	■		■	■	■				■	