

This article was downloaded by: [Rachel Ragland]

On: 28 March 2014, At: 07:17

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



## The Social Studies

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:  
<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/vtss20>

### Holocaust Education: Analysis of Curricula and Frameworks: A Case Study of Illinois

Rachel G. Ragland<sup>a</sup> & Daniel Rosenstein<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Education, Lake Forest College, Lake Forest, Illinois, USA

<sup>b</sup> Teaching Assistant, New Trier High School, Northfield, Illinois, USA

Published online: 26 Mar 2014.

**To cite this article:** Rachel G. Ragland & Daniel Rosenstein (2014): Holocaust Education: Analysis of Curricula and Frameworks: A Case Study of Illinois, *The Social Studies*, DOI: [10.1080/00377996.2013.876384](https://doi.org/10.1080/00377996.2013.876384)

**To link to this article:** <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00377996.2013.876384>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

# Holocaust Education: Analysis of Curricula and Frameworks: A Case Study of Illinois

RACHEL G. RAGLAND<sup>1</sup> and DANIEL ROSENSTEIN<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Education, Lake Forest College, Lake Forest, Illinois, USA*

<sup>2</sup>*Teaching Assistant, New Trier High School, Northfield, Illinois, USA*

This article addresses how far educational institutions have come in designing authentic and meaningful curricula for teaching the Holocaust at the secondary level. Examined in this article are the historical development of Holocaust education in the United States, with a focus on the state of Illinois as a case study, what contributes to the development of a full curriculum, and what constitutes the boundary between a curriculum and a framework, based on examination of the work of scholars and institutions in the field. Analysis of existing frameworks according to criteria developed by the authors has yielded the finding that a framework can only guide teachers to an extent because of its looser structure. A full curriculum, however, is structured with greater detail and more direct ways of determining evidence that demonstrates understanding of the content and mastery of essential skills. Recommendations are provided for Holocaust Education curriculum development, underscoring the significance of an engaging design that makes learning more lasting and meaningful.

**Keywords:** Holocaust education, curriculum design, social studies, history, secondary education

## Introduction: Purpose of Study

The Illinois Holocaust Museum & Education Center is dedicated to preserving the legacy of the Holocaust by honoring the memories of those who were lost and by teaching universal lessons that combat hatred, prejudice and indifference. The museum fulfills its mission through the exhibition, preservation and interpretation of its collections and through education programs and initiatives that foster the promotion of human rights and the elimination of genocide (ILHMEC 2011).

The Illinois Holocaust Museum & Education Center's (ILHMEC) mission statement served as the catalyst for the inquiry undertaken in this study. Because Illinois has been on the forefront of the mandate to provide Holocaust education for all students, it serves as an appropriate case study to trace the history of Holocaust education and determine recommendations for future directions in this crucial component of social studies instruction in secondary schools. This report traces the origins of the movement to teach the Holocaust, examines existing curricula and framework designs, with a focus on the ILHMEC's role in teaching the Holocaust, discusses the structure of curricula

versus frameworks, analyzes the effectiveness of the ILHMEC framework according to best practices in curriculum and instructional design for history teaching, and recommends the future directions such curricula can take. The work is based on collaboration between the authors undertaken in connection with an undergraduate senior thesis project in history education.

Today, in many high school classrooms, it is common to find students spending a significant amount of instructional time learning about the Holocaust, but how do educators decide how to teach such a controversial topic? The fundamental questions that shaped this study are the following: (1) How far have we come as a nation, and in the state of Illinois, in educating about the Holocaust and (2) What direction needs to be maintained and/or changed?

## Historical Context of Holocaust Curriculum Development in American Secondary Schools

For social studies curricula, there is some deliberation on what to include and what to exclude. There is often a mutual understanding between educators on the most traditional concepts to teach. This has not been the case for teaching the Holocaust. Fallace points out several reasons for this contrast, including debates between the political left and right on what should be taught; how it should be taught; its move from recommended instruction to fundamentally

---

Address correspondence to Rachel G. Ragland, Associate Professor of Education, Lake Forest College, 555 N. Sheridan Road, Buchanan Hall, Lake Forest, IL 60045, USA. E-mail: ragland@lakeforest.edu

important instruction; and various campaigns by teachers for various methods of teaching the Holocaust (Fallace 2008, 4–5). This development must be emphasized because from its inception, Holocaust education has been quite controversial. This helps explain what attracted many historians back to the drawing boards in their efforts to propose effective history curricula (Fallace 2008, 8).

### ***Holocaust Education's Presence in Jewish Schools in the 1950s and 1960s***

It is reasonable that Jewish educators in private Jewish schools were the first to implement instruction on the Holocaust. Initially, instruction focused strictly on the heroic elements of the Holocaust, so that Jews could overcome the most vicious forms of anti-Semitism (Fallace 2008, 19). The focus on courage persisted through the 1950s at the expense of teaching about the causes and facts. By the early 1960s there was a consensus to propose alternatives to teaching in this manner. In 1964, the National Council for Jewish Education held its thirty-seventh annual conference with a focus on teaching about the Shoah (Holocaust). Three individuals, Judah Pilch, director of the National Curriculum Research Institute for the American Association of Jewish Education, Sara Feinstein, and Rabbi Zalman F. Ury all presented their alternatives to conventional teaching of the Holocaust. For Pilch, as Fallace (2008, 20) notes, the Holocaust should be taught in a context that helps Jewish students embrace their Jewish identity. Feinstein proposed that Jewish students should be more acquainted with the moral dimensions of the Holocaust. She rationalized that teaching the Holocaust could help students understand the social conditions of the 1960s at the same time (Fallace 2008, 21). Ury, by far the most radical, indicated that the Holocaust was a Jewish phenomenon, and its placement as a topic of historical study at the secondary level was absurd (Fallace 2008, 21). The conflicting views on defining how best to contextualize the Holocaust for Jewish youth only invigorated further debate in Jewish education. Despite these differences, the one lingering commonality was that Holocaust education remained focused in Jewish schools.

### ***Holocaust Education in Public Schools in the 1970s***

Breaking the barrier of Holocaust education between Jewish schools and non-Jewish public schools occurred in the early 1970s. In November 1972 Holocaust survivor Elie Wiesel wrote an op-ed for the *New York Times* in which he stressed that the combination of a new generation of children of survivors and non-survivors and the increased willingness of survivors to share their stories were groundbreaking developments toward recognizing that Holocaust education at the secondary level needed to reach a larger audience (Fallace 2008, 26). Wiesel's tenacity served as

inspiration for a group of New York Public School teachers to declare that teaching the Holocaust could no longer be neglected, and by 1973 "the first Holocaust curriculum intended for distribution in public schools was published in New York City" (Fallace 2008, 28).

Friedlander, an earlier scholar on teaching the Holocaust, urged designers to consider several important ideas before publishing (Friedlander 1979, 522). First, authors should dedicate the preliminary piece of their plan to "define the subject of the Holocaust." Second, those who design a curriculum to reflect the Holocaust as merely a Jewish event impose a serious flaw in that there were other victims of sizable numbers (Friedlander 1979, 525). Third, the curriculum should address the elements of fascism and how that directly affects the people that must subscribe to such a rigid form of governance. Fourth, an element that was not touched on as much as it should have been was the preparation of citizens to responsibly elect leaders who do not victimize any particular group of people (Friedlander 1979, 533). This view exemplifies one of the most essential tenets of social studies in that any particular subject must integrate the core value of preparing students to be both productive and responsible citizens in a democratic society. Finally, context is extremely important, for the Holocaust was not an isolated event in the history of the majority of the victims.

### ***Affective Components and Focus on Human Behavior in the 1980s***

Massachusetts teacher Roselle Chartock was a pioneer in Holocaust curriculum design. Her curriculum focused both on Holocaust history and human behavior, an innovative measure of this time period (Fallace 2008, 52). Chartock's curriculum, *The Holocaust Years: Society on Trial*, is significant in the progress of Holocaust curricula because of its goal to elicit emotional responses from students. These responses were designed to foster students' capacities to rationally contribute to society. Rational decision making then became the contemporary platform of the time and was later included by other school systems and organizations such as *Facing History and Ourselves*.

In their construction of the 1982 curriculum for *Facing History*, educators Margot Strom and William Parsons of Brookline, Massachusetts, sought to focus on how what happened to the European Jews could also be related to what happened to the Ottoman Armenians through the amalgamating theme of genocide (Fallace 2008, 63). Like the New York City Schools, which believed genocide was an overarching concept, *Facing History* approached the Holocaust by positing that students need to see historical relationships. The full curriculum, known as *The Holocaust and Human Behavior*, led to many criticisms, however, because once again the Holocaust was being compared to other genocides. In this view, the Holocaust was a unique

example of genocide, and it was preceded by behaviors and decisions that separated it from the realm of conventional genocide.

### ***United States Holocaust Memorial Museum: Developments in the 1990s***

The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum's (USHMM) place in how to teach about the Holocaust at the secondary level serves as a fundamental shift away from the outpouring of scholarly curriculum packages. Instead, the Museum's viewpoint is that it should serve as an institution that allocates resources to educators and provides a rationale for teaching the Holocaust. USHMM's first book, *Teaching about the Holocaust: A Resource Book for Educators* (USHMM 2001), described a framework consisting of suggestions for how to implement lessons about the Holocaust and its context and how to familiarize students with what the Holocaust was (Fallace 2008, 122–23). Most significantly, it also encouraged students in a direction more focused on history as a discipline and teachers to design their lessons so that students can function as historians and use primary sources to understand the conflict.

### ***Holocaust Education in Illinois***

Illinois has been a flagship state in mandating instruction on the Holocaust. One fundamental reason is the existence since 1981 of the Holocaust Memorial Foundation of Illinois. In 1990, this group, composed mainly of survivors and descendants of survivors, argued in front of lawmakers in Springfield to pass a mandate for instruction of the Holocaust in Illinois. The framework developed in Illinois is discussed in detail below.

### **Contemporary Holocaust Education Curricula and Frameworks**

A brief description of a few selected curricula and frameworks are provided because these examples form the basis for analysis and comparison with the ILHMEC, the focus of this study, and recommendations for future curricula.

#### ***Anti-Defamation League: Echoes and Reflections Multimedia Curriculum***

Founded in conjunction with University of Southern California Shoah Foundation Institute and Yad Vashem in Jerusalem, Israel, the Anti-Defamation League's (ADL) *Echoes and Reflections* (ADL 2005) can be considered a cornerstone of Holocaust curriculum that embraces media to a significant extent. One of the core rationales behind studying the Holocaust is to help students understand the consequences that stereotyping, prejudice, discrimination, and scapegoating can have on individual

civil liberties (ADL 2005, 11). The goal is to realign students on a track toward greater awareness of such behaviors in contemporary society that threaten any individual or group's civil rights.

In addition, the lessons are structured with multiple opportunities for different learning activities that charge the teacher with the responsibility of choosing what will be most valuable for the students. Five core learner-centered strategies include directed discussion; small group work for exposure to diverse opinions and perspectives; brainstorming activities; reflective self-awareness through journal writing; and primary media resources, including photographs, visual history testimony, and diary entries. The visual dimension immediately targets the affective domain, a substantial pedagogical goal, that proponents of Holocaust education have continuously aspired to achieve. *Echoes* signifies that this instructional component is the most essential for students because they must develop their own analysis of what they watch, observe, and read (ADL 2005, 17–18).

#### ***David Lindquist and Holocaust Content***

David Lindquist is a regional museum educator for USHMM and assistant professor of social studies education at Indiana University-Purdue University, Fort Wayne, Indiana. The purpose of Lindquist's (2008) discussion on content is to serve as a reminder to teachers that caution must be exercised in selecting content that has the highest authority in conveying the events of the Holocaust. To select content that is less meaningful quite possibly means that the learning experience becomes more vulnerable and students become less appreciative of what they learn. Key elements include historical accuracy, selection of topics and teaching materials, and using graphic materials. According to Lindquist (2008, 32) teachers must preassess their students' capabilities to handle photos representing atrocity. Too much focus on this specific aspect warrants concern because it breaches the threshold of a safe learning environment.

#### ***Kathleen Martin and Best Approaches to Captivating Student Attention***

Kathleen Martin is an assistant professor of social science at Boston University. She advocates four instructional approaches: student presentations on Holocaust survivors; documentary film on ghettos and the camps; student debates on why the Holocaust happened; and evaluation of sources of evidence to determine if the Shoah really happened (Martin 2007). By adopting this approach, teachers can be further assured that they are using materials that accurately reflect the historical record and create a learning environment that shows the teacher is invested in using reliable information that correctly conceptualizes the events of the Holocaust.

### ***Irene Ann Resenly and the Use of Evidence through Understanding by Design***

This curricular approach uses a culminating assessment to help students demonstrate that they can apply the skills acquired throughout the unit to a final product. This requires students to act as historians producing a narrative representing a specific historical moment of the Holocaust (Resenly, quoted in Rittner 2010, 145). Resenly uses Wiggins and McTighe's *Understanding by Design* (Wiggins and McTighe 2011) structure to design the curriculum. The core focus of this curriculum is the assessment feature that is frequently not a primary emphasis when teachers embrace recommendations or frameworks that are not complete curricula. Resenly has developed a curriculum that allows students to demonstrate the products for which historians would be accountable. Getting students to the end results teaches students to use the skills of the historian, the history of the Holocaust, and constructing of narratives (final assessment).

### ***United States Holocaust Memorial Museum Framework***

Another essential outlet for educators to explore when teaching the Holocaust are museums. Grounded as a trustworthy academic source, Marcus, Stoddard, and Woodward (2012) posit that there are several advantages that a museum can offer classrooms immersed in the study of the Holocaust:

- The context and presentation of a museum is an outstanding asset for teachers to utilize in order to promote a more sophisticated understanding of the past and the development of unique habits of mind (5).
- Opportunity presents itself to learners to investigate historical interpretations by looking at how museums choose to present and interpret the past—how are narratives constructed to discuss our past and relate it to the present (5).
- Authentic history pedagogy and place-based pedagogies are increasingly the vanguard of history education—a definite shift from past practices in the classroom (23).
- While museums were once considered supplemental to social studies education, today they are increasingly becoming laboratories for helping students master historical thinking skills, including how our ideas about the past are generated, mediated, and presented (29).

USHMM (2001, 10) maintains that it is primarily focused on teaching the Holocaust to help students inquire about both the choices humans make and how choices characterize a responsible citizen. The Museum advocates the following fourteen pedagogical considerations in designing a unit or lessons around the Holocaust: define the term Holocaust; avoid comparisons of pain; avoid simple answers to complex history; just because it happened does not mean it was inevitable; strive for

precision of language; make careful distinctions about sources of information; try to avoid stereotypical descriptions; do not romanticize history to engage students' interest; contextualize the history you are teaching; translate statistics into people; be sensitive to appropriate written and audiovisual content; strive for balance in establishing whose perspective informs your study of the Holocaust; select appropriate learning activities; and reinforce the objectives of your lesson plan. USHMM offers concrete frameworks to construct Holocaust curricula. However, they do not recommend one specific curriculum, and they take a liberal (i.e., less restrictive) stance on how teachers should plan a unit on the Holocaust, as long as the pedagogical principles are taken into consideration. Without doubt, the Museum's framework encourages teachers to adopt practices that foster deep inquiry into the subject. Critical thinking and application skills are promoted. Strides also are taken to demonstrate a commitment to the interdisciplinary approach so that students have a well-rounded learning experience.

### ***The Illinois Holocaust Museum & Education Center Framework***

ILHMEC uses the framework approach, instead of a complete curriculum model to support Holocaust education. Director of Education at ILHMEC Noreen Brand emphasizes, "We do not believe in curricula. When the 1990 mandate was enacted an old curriculum existed" (N. Brand, personal communication, September 14, 2011). However ILHMEC believes that teachers need to be accountable for creating a curriculum that best reflects the learning needs and capacities of their specific classrooms. The framework begins with an extensive rationale on teaching the Holocaust in any discipline, how to incorporate the best practices of teaching into a unit on the Holocaust, and recommended learning activities that target specific resources and best practices.

It is also evident that ILHMEC (ILHMEC 2010) framework approaches learning through empathy, one of the six essential facets of understanding according to UbD (Wiggins and McTighe 2011). ILHMEC wants high school students to learn about human behavior and human choices through the lens of a victim, perpetrator, bystander, helper, and the collaborator. These are major ideas that students can apply to other learning environments. ILHMEC's website provides a direct gateway for classrooms to access pertinent artifacts that capture some of the most significant historical moments of the Holocaust. It also provides educators with the steps they need to obtain a teaching trunk, one of the icons of the education center.

The following table (Table 1) summarizes the main guidelines of the framework.

In addition, the following principles are recommended to guide teachers in the construction of their curricula: the Holocaust can be successfully taught; define the

**Table 1.** ILHMEC Guidelines for Developing Lessons on the Holocaust (2010)

Key Questions that Deliver Decisions on What to Teach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why learn this history?</li> <li>• What are the most significant lessons to include?</li> <li>• Why is a particular form of media an appropriate medium to convey topics that I want to teach?</li> </ul>
Key Rationales to Consider in Developing Lessons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understand the value of pluralism</li> <li>• Understand the roots of prejudice, racism and stereotyping in any society</li> <li>• Understand the dangers of remaining silent toward ongoing oppression</li> <li>• Understand the concept of social engineering through technological advancement</li> <li>• Understand what causes the disintegration of democratic values and institutions</li> </ul>
Contextualize the Holocaust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Help understand the roots of anti-Semitism</li> <li>• Help understand Jewish life in Europe before the Holocaust</li> <li>• Help understand what precipitated certain behaviors in the aftermath of World War I</li> <li>• Help understand what allowed the Nazis to quickly rise to power.</li> <li>• Help understand that although Jews were the primary victims and targets of the Nazis, other groups were also targeted</li> </ul>
Categorical Framing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1933 to 1939: Discuss Nazi rise to power, Nazi persecution of Jews and other minority groups, emergence of concentration camps</li> <li>• 1939 to 1945: Discuss racist ideologies, euthanasia program, persecution and murder of Jews and non-Jews, Jewish reaction to the Nazis, ghettos, mobile killing squad, camp expansion, killing centers, collaboration and resistance, rescue, the world response, death marches, and liberation</li> <li>• Aftermath: postwar trials, displacement, and emigration</li> </ul>

Holocaust; create a positive learning environment; embrace the cross-curricular approach; contextualization is critical; use precise language; develop the historical record; focus on the primary sources; emphasize the element of decision

making; investigate local, regional, and global ramifications; sensitize students to all victims of Nazi persecution; statistics do not promote meaningful learning; deciphering appropriate and inappropriate activities; denial and historical credibility; do not compare the Holocaust to other genocides; and educators must be responsive to their students. Finally, ILHMEC’s framework assumes a more literature-centered orientation. Four strategies are suggested for using primary source literature: read aloud; literature circle; readers’ theater; and journaling.

**Analysis of ILHMEC Framework: Comparison with Other Models**

The case study of ILHMEC’s framework is analyzed to examine how the framework addresses and incorporates the best practices of history instruction according to the strategies of the Model Collaboration: Rethinking American History (McRAH), the standards of the National Center for History in the Schools (NCHS 1996), and the curriculum design principles of Wiggins and McTighe’s (2011) *Understanding by Design (UbD)*. The ILHMEC will also be compared to the USHMM, *Echoes* curriculum, and other scholarly curriculum models previously described (*Echoes*, Lindquist, Martin, and Resenly). The analysis and evaluation of the elements of the framework are determined according to a five-point scale developed by Rosenstein, as described in Table 5. This analysis also provides evidence for final recommendations for effective curricula.

**McRAH Instructional Recommendations and the ILHMEC Framework’s Correspondence**

The McRAH strategies for history instruction are the result of an innovative professional development grant awarded by the U.S. Department of Education through the Teaching American History (TAH) program. The twelve strategies demonstrate a significant commitment to a more learner-centered instructional environment for students in history classrooms (Ragland 2007). An analysis of ILHMEC’s framework demonstrates implementation of the following McRAH strategies: use of primary documents and document-based questions; historical artifact analysis; use of “doing history” classroom activities; use historical fact as evidence for arguments; use of “doing history” research assignments; thematic instruction including a variety of textual resources (e.g., perpetrator behavior, rescue, resistance, international response, liberation and responsible decision making); use of conceptual questions to organize lecture material; use of graphic organizers, interactive note taking and maps to develop main concepts; use of images/media/multimedia/technology as sources for historical interpretation; use of counterfactual approach (e.g., teaching students to question individuals who cite

Downloaded by [Rachel Ragland] at 07:17 28 March 2014

the Holocaust as an unfortunate and inevitable event); use of narrative approaches including guided imagery for response (a primary objective of the framework); perspective-taking exercises (e.g., upstanders, bystanders, collaborators, governments, resisters); and use of familiar, familial, and community connections to propose historical links.

### ***National Center for History in the Schools' Instructional Recommendations and the ILHMEC Framework's Correspondence***

The National Standards for History, as put forward by the National Center for History in the Schools (NCHS 1996), help students learn about history using the historical thinking skills that a professional historian would use. All of the standards are reflected by ILHMEC, including chronological thinking, historical comprehension, historical analysis and interpretation, historical research capabilities, and historical issues, analysis and decision making, as illustrated by many of the elements mentioned in regard to the McRAH strategies.

### ***Understanding by Design's (UbD) and the ILHMEC Framework's Correspondence***

UbD has three specific stages of instructional design. In stage one, teachers plan out desired results by constructing long-term aims (transfer goals), big ideas, and enduring understandings students need to know by the end of the unit. During stage two, teachers "consider the evidence needed to determine the extent to which students have achieved the identified knowledge, skills, and understandings in stage one" (Wiggins and McTighe 2011, 22). In stage three, teachers design the actual learning experiences. The ILHMEC framework ultimately leaves assessment completely at the discretion of the instructor planning his or her unit on the Holocaust.

ILHMEC's framework designers chose not to explicitly use "backward design" (Wiggins and McTighe 2011), although the three stages of the process can be identified in the framework. Instead, they chose to leave the production of evidence of student learning completely at the discretion of the teacher. UbD stage one is addressed through the *guidelines for teaching the Holocaust*, which provides instructors with "big ideas" that allow them to determine the direction of their Holocaust unit, including understanding the value of pluralism, the roots of prejudice, the dangers of being a bystander, the problem of social engineering, and the results of destroying democratic institutions. There are smaller formative activities that serve as checkpoints for understanding in stage two. Delivering specific learning activities for the primary literature embraced by the framework essentially comprises stage three of UBD, the learning activities.

### ***USHMM and ILHMEC Framework's Correspondence***

It is important to qualify that there is a distinct difference between how museums such as ILHMEC and the USHMM and curriculum designers present teaching the Holocaust. A school curriculum adopts a specific structure for learning, but as Beer suggests, museums attempt to loosen that rigid structure and stretch "curriculum beyond its traditional definition. . ." (Beer 1987, 209). Currently, with a movement toward more centralized standards and adherence to the Common Core State Standards Initiative, it is necessary to note that ILHMEC is progressively reviewing its framework structure with respect to the English language arts standards. As the museum's education department vets the high school framework, resource books, and other materials, they will be able to clearly determine the degree of alignment with standards, and what educational items must be updated and/or upgraded. Although the updates are still in progress, the framework's clarity of conceptual relevancy to today's society will continue to remain evident (see Table 2).

These curricular guidelines were selected because their degrees of similarities provide an important message about what both museums value most in planning instruction about the Holocaust. Recognizing these patterns will help construct critical generalizations about where these museums desire to see teachers head with their lesson plans (see Table 3).

### ***Comparing and Contrasting Scholarly Curriculum Models***

In Table 4, the framework is compared to the curricula and scholarly recommendations discussed previously to demonstrate fundamental similarities and differences.

## **Conclusions on Holocaust Education Curricula and Frameworks**

### ***Evaluation of Learning Activities Structure***

The following table (Table 5) provides the system that will be used to evaluate the ILHMEC learning activities. It is important to note that the structure and scale for this evaluation system were developed on the basis of the author's social reconstructionist philosophy of instructional design, a preference for student-centered learning design, and alignment with the best practices of history instruction (McRAH and NCHS). With these serving as a basis for the following scale, the determined score reflects both practicality and the author's perspective (see Table 6).

Ultimately, the framework could become increasingly resourceful if it included additional activity structures that were either more interdisciplinary or discipline-specific for other disciplines, such as history. The framework would be strengthened by the addition of a solid assessment plan that includes a variety of informal and formal assessments

**Table 2.** Parallel Tenets of Illinois and National Museum Frameworks

<i>Tenet</i>	<i>ILHMEC (2010)</i>	<i>USHMM (2001)</i>
Defining the Holocaust	Remind students that the Holocaust did primarily target Jews, but it also included millions of other victims.	The Holocaust was an example of blatant genocide that involved a majority of Jewish victims as well as millions more.
Contextualize the history being taught	Teach the Holocaust in context of European history; how European Jews contributed; contemporary concepts.	Recognize where the Holocaust occurred within the course of European history while attending to idea of the fluid nature of people during the 1930s.
Be sensitive to appropriate written and audiovisual content	Be cautious in designing lessons with material that could put a teacher's relationship with the class at risk.	Construct a safe learning environment for all classes while taking precaution in presenting atrocity photographs in order reduce student vulnerability.
Translate statistics into people	Studying the individual provides the most essential learning experience.	Use personal accounts in order to make the learning the Holocaust more relevant to students' lives.
Choose appropriate activities	Plan activities that encourage students to be empathetic about the individuals that died or survived the Holocaust.	Engage in more high-level types of thinking and stay away from simulations that threaten to trivialize any survivor's experience or any event of the Holocaust.
Precision of language	Using the Holocaust out of context or to describe other genocides trivializes the term and misappropriates its usage. Properly contextualize the term.	Introduce students to specific vocabulary related to the Holocaust so that no one term is misconstrued for another.
Do not trivialize student responses	Valuing student responses in any learning environment promotes a more positive learning experience, which is largely essential when teaching about the Holocaust.	Encourage students to critically think about their reasoning behind why the Holocaust happened; do not accept simple answers or promote simple responses from students.

and formative and summative assessments. The assessment plan should serve as a set of guidelines that still reflects the mission of ILHMEC but does not cross the threshold into a curriculum. If it did, then many other items would need to change, including the structure of learning activities and the development of lesson plans. An assessment, such as outlined by Resenly, targets the big ideas and skills envisioned because students must think like historians in their interactions with these historical narratives by using the primary and secondary sources available to them. Students are also held accountable for distinguishing fact from fiction as they develop authentic work. The proposal by Resenly is definitely a worthwhile assessment, given that one

of the fundamental tenets of ILHMEC's framework for learning about the Holocaust is through narrative.

**Recommendations for Holocaust Education Curriculum**

The following suggestions indicate how different curricula, frameworks, and scholarly models can contribute to the development of a more comprehensive Holocaust curriculum. Using ideas from USHMM, a curriculum should provide a rationale for how the Holocaust can be incorporated into a wider variety of social science and humanities disciplines. Using the *ADL's Echoes and Reflections*, ILHMEC could deliver more activities that prompt students

**Table 3.** Fundamental Similarities and Differences Between ILHMEC and USHMM

	<i>USHMM</i>		<i>USHMM</i>
How ILHMEC is similar	Defining the term Holocaust is essential as well as how it is associated in contextual terms.	How ILHMEC is different	Does not warrant precaution in using survivor testimony because survivor memory may be distorted.



**Table 4.** Fundamental Similarities and Differences between ILHMEC and Scholarly Models

	Echoes	<i>Lindquist (2008)</i>	<i>Martin</i>	<i>Resenly</i>
How ILHMEC is similar	Interdisciplinary aspect embraced in that narratives, poetic accounts, and artwork are analyzed in how they recall specific moments of the Holocaust.	Avoid using prepackaged materials that use any activities that attempt to trivialize the Holocaust in any way.	Use similar learning activities to account for why certain behaviors and choices produced certain outcomes.	Encourages students to think and learn like a historian would by critically thinking about how the available narratives shape one's understanding of the Holocaust.
How ILHMEC compares	Does not provide platforms for teaching the Holocaust in multiple academic disciplines.	Does not warrant precaution in using survivor testimony because survivor memory may be distorted.	Does not embrace the topic of Holocaust in any part of the framework in order to avoid trivializing what happened.	A structured culminating assessment that provides evidence transfer tasks have been achieved is not a part of the framework.

to understand the consequences of certain decisions made by Nazis (through a more thorough examination of the Nuremberg Trials); incorporate a more substantial level of photographs representative of specific historical moments of the Holocaust; include an activity that specifically

focuses on the American response to the Holocaust before, during, and after the occurrence; and allocate part of the curriculum to investigating video testimony from survivors.

**Table 5.** Evaluative System Scale

<i>Evaluation Scale</i>	<i>Description</i>
5 (5+, 5, 5-) – Highly Effective	The learning activity is learner-centered, requires application of previously learned skills, teaches new skills, promotes high levels of critical thinking, involves engaging tasks that promote analysis, evaluation, and synthesis.
4 (4+, 4, 4-) – Effective	The learning activity is learner-centered or teacher-centered, may require application of previously learned skills, may teach new skills, may promote critical thinking, involves engaging tasks.
3 (3+, 3, 3-) – Appropriate	The learning activity is either learner or teacher-centered, may teach new skills and may involve some engaging tasks.
2 (2+ 2, 2-) – Somewhat Effective	The learning activity is either learner or teacher-centered, may involve some engaging tasks, may work on previously acquired skills.
1 (1+, 1, 1-) – Inappropriate	The learning activity is teacher-centered with few or no engaging tasks and relies heavily on recitation of content.

According to Lindquist's suggestions, a curriculum could utilize and underscore the purpose of survivor testimony when studying and learning about the Holocaust and adjust several learning activities that use lower-level thinking skills and incorporate more high-level thinking activities under the considerations for state learning goals. Using Martin's work, a curriculum should develop a strong rationale that holds teachers accountable for checking on how students use sources to help them understand the history of the Holocaust, consider the use of debates about why certain events happened during the Holocaust as a qualifying learning activity, and construct an assessment that prompts students to investigate survivor testimony or a survivor of personal relevance and present that to the rest of the class. Finally, Resenly's work suggests that a curriculum could include UbD stage two assessments and add a detailed assessment plan that helps teachers lead their classes from one point to another and more fully develop the learning activity of constructing narratives from different perspectives into a potential culminating assessment.

Over the past three decades, there has been an explosion of curriculum designers asserting that they have the best curriculum or framework on the market for educators to use about the Holocaust. The research presented here is an attempt to show that there are advantages and disadvantages to any curriculum or framework. Some models are more resourceful than others. One conclusion that can be made is that teaching the Holocaust across America has become increasingly popular, and this can only be the result of increasing concern for teaching in the reconstructionist frame of mind in which critical social values are included to prepare students to positively and productively contribute to society. It is possible to contend that the authors of the works investigated here agree that responsible

**Table 6.** Evaluation of Principle Learning Activities of the ILHMEC Framework

<i>Principal Learning Activity</i>	<i>Evaluation</i>
Read-aloud	Rating = 3: The activity is probably teacher-centered, but may rely on the contribution of students and allows students to interpret the novel's characters in different ways with specific devices. The activity can be amended to involve more abstract thinking for the students.
Literature circle	Rating = 5: Poses abstract questions to the students in a smaller cooperative learning environment; encourages students to appreciate the text by applying the content to various concrete and abstract skills such as writing from various perspectives, analyzing choices made by the author, and historical inquiry into various dimensions of a novel.
Reader's Theater	Rating = 4+: Defies traditional prescriptions for reading a specific text, encourages students to learn beyond regular comfort levels, charges the student and teacher with a collaborative responsibility to theatrically interpret an author's work; provides specific parameters, but an opportunity exists to propose additional activities that can be formulated into this learning dimension; addresses specific learning interests.
Journal	Rating = 5-: Best practice for promoting critical thinking, accounts for individual learning needs and individual thinking; challenges students to think beyond the surface and posit critical ideas through reflective writing; helps students analyze at various levels in regards to specific literary devices.

decision making is one of the most significant transferable skills when learning about the Holocaust.

Differences over the most proper method to teach the Holocaust only show the passion that exists for

discovering and sharing the best pedagogical practices that will ultimately benefit the students, as they are poised to assume leadership and continue advancing society in a more positive direction. However, it is perhaps easier to take existing curricula that present the entire package of goals, evidence, and a learning plan. Funding the development of a well-structured, reliable, comprehensive and high-quality curriculum plan that can be transferable among multiple schools in multiple states in accordance with the state mandate for Holocaust instruction might be a productive next step. Such an action plan may resolve the issue of what comprises effective study of the Holocaust.

## References

- Anti-Defamation League, USC Shoah Foundation Institute & Yad Vashem. *Echoes and Reflections: A Multimedia Curriculum on the Holocaust*. Los Angeles: ADL, 2005.
- Beer, Valorie. "Do Museums Have Curriculum?" *The Journal of Museum Education* 12, no. 3 (1987): 10–13.
- Fallace, Thomas D. *The Emergence of Holocaust Education in American Schools*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Friedlander, Henry. "Toward a Methodology of Teaching about the Holocaust." *The Teachers College Record* 80, no. 3 (1979): 519–42.
- Illinois Holocaust Museum & Education Center (ILHMEC). *Investigating Human Behavior: Grades 9–12 Framework for Teaching the Holocaust*. Skokie, IL: Illinois Holocaust Museum & Education Center, 2010.
- . *Last modified* 2011. <http://www.ilholocaustmuseum.org/>.
- Lindquist, David H. "Developing Holocaust Curricula: The Content Decision-Making Process." *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas* 82, no. 1 (2008): 27–34.
- Martin, Kathleen C. "Teaching the Shoah: Four Approaches That Draw Students In." *The History Teacher* 40, no. 4 (2007): 493–502.
- Marcus, Alan S., Jeremy D. Stoddard, and Walter W. Woodward. *Teaching History with Museums: Strategies for K–12 Social Studies*. New York: Routledge, 2012.
- National Council for History in the Schools. *National Standards in History: Basic Edition*. Los Angeles, CA: National Council for History in the Schools, 1996.
- Ragland, Rachel G. "Adopting and Sustaining Use of New Teaching Strategies for American History in Secondary Classrooms." *Journal of Social Studies Research* 31, no. 2 (2007): 43–60.
- Resenly, I. N. "The Historian and the Holocaust: A New Holocaust Curriculum." In *Learn Teach Prevent: Holocaust Education in the 21st Century*, The Ethel Le Frak Holocaust Conference Proceedings, edited by Carol Rittner, 145. Greensburg, PA: Seton Hill University, 2010.
- United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. *Teaching about the Holocaust: A Resource Book for Educators*. Washington, DC: USHMM, 2001.
- United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. *Beyond Our Walls: State Profiles in Holocaust Education*. Retrieved November 20, 2011. <http://www.ushmm.org/education/foreducators/states/index.php?state=IL>.
- Wiggins, Grant, and Jay McTighe. *The Understanding by Design Guide to Creating High Quality Units*, 2nd ed. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2011.