



THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE  
**AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES**

**MS-831: Jack, Joseph and Morton Mandel Foundation Records, 1980–2008.**  
Series B: Commission on Jewish Education in North America (CJENA). 1980–1993.  
Subseries 1: Commission Meetings, 1988–1990.

---

Box  
2

Folder  
5

13 December 1988 Meeting. Meeting book, December 1988.

For more information on this collection, please see the finding aid on the  
American Jewish Archives website.

---

COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA

December 13, 1988

10:00 A.M. to 4:00 P.M.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Commissioners
2. Senior Policy Advisors  
Consultants & Staff
3. Background Materials
4. Minutes of August 1  
Commission Meeting
5. Design Document
6. Agenda

COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA

Commission Members

Mona Riklis Ackerman (Ph.D.), Riklis Family Foundation, 595 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10022, (212) 888-2035

Dr. Ackerman is a clinical psychologist and President of the Riklis Family Foundation. She is active in UJA/Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York and American Friends of Rechov Sumsum.

Ronald Appleby Q.C., Robins, Appleby & Taub, 130 Adelaide Street, West, Suite 2500, Toronto, Ontario M5H 2M2, (416) 360-3333

Mr. Appleby is chairman of the law firm of Robins, Appleby & Taub, involved mainly in business income tax consultations; he speaks and writes regularly on this subject. He is active in many civic and Jewish causes, including the Toronto Jewish Congress, Jewish National Fund, Council of Jewish Federations, and United Jewish Appeal.

David Arnow (Ph.D.), 1114 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10036, (212) 869-9700

Mr. Arnow is a psychologist, President of the New Israel Fund and chair of the UJA/Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York Subcommittee on Governance.

Mandell L. Berman, 29100 Northwestern Highway, Southfield, Michigan 48034, (313) 353-8390

Mr. Berman was President of Smokler Corporation, a real estate developer. He is Chairman of the Skillman Foundation, President of the Council of Jewish Federations, and past President of the Detroit Federation. He served as Chairman of the American Association of Jewish Education and is Honorary Chairman of JESNA.

Jack Bieler (Rabbi), Hebrew Academy of Greater Washington, 2010 Linden Lane, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910 (301) 649-3044

Rabbi Bieler is Coordinator of Judaic Studies and Supervisor of Instruction at the Hebrew Academy of Greater Washington. He has served as Chairman of the Talmud Department at Ramaz Day School and was a Jerusalem Fellow.

Charles R. Bronfman, 1170 Peel Street, Montreal, Quebec H3B 4P2, (514) 878-5201

Mr. Bronfman is Co-Chairman and Chairman of the Executive Committee of The Seagram Company, Ltd., Chairman of The CRB Foundation and Honorary Chairman, Canada-Israel Securities Ltd. He is Director of the Canadian Council of Christians and Jews, and active in many civic and Jewish causes.

John C. Colman, 4 Briar Lane, Glencoe, Illinois 60022, (312) 835-1209  
Mr. Colman is a private investor and business consultant. He is a member of the Executive Committee of the American Joint Distribution Committee and is active in a wide variety of Jewish and general institutions.

Maurice S. Corson (Rabbi), The Wexner Foundation, 41 S. High Street, Suite 3390, Columbus, Ohio 43215, (614) 461-8112  
Rabbi Corson is President of the Wexner Foundation. He was a director of the Jewish Community Relations Council of Philadelphia, United Israel Appeal of Canada, and B'nai B'rith. He is active in many Jewish and civic causes.

Lester Crown, 300 West Washington Street, Chicago, Illinois 60606, (312) 372-3600  
Mr. Crown is President of Henry Crown and Company, Chairman of the Board of Material Service Corporation and Executive Vice-President of General Dynamics. He has served as Chairman of the Board of The Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

David Dubin, JCC on the Palisades, 411 E. Clinton, Tenafly, New Jersey, (201) 569-7900  
Mr. Dubin is Executive Director of the Jewish Community Center on the Palisades and author of several articles in The Journal of Jewish Communal Service on Jewish education within Jewish community centers.

Stuart E. Eizenstat, Powell, Goldstein, Frazer & Murphy, 1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Sixth Floor, Washington, D.C. 20004, (202) 347-0066  
Mr. Eizenstat practices law in Washington, D.C. and teaches at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University. He was Director of the domestic policy staff at The White House under the Carter Administration. He is active in many civic and Jewish organizations and speaks and writes widely on public policy.

Joshua Elkin (Rabbi, Ed. D.), 74 Park Lane, Newton, Massachusetts 02159, (617) 332-2406  
Rabbi Elkin is Headmaster of the Solomon Schechter Day School of Boston. He has taught in the Jewish Education program at the Hornstein Program in Jewish Communal Service at Brandeis University and has just completed a year as a Jerusalem Fellow.

Eli N. Evans, Charles H. Revson Foundation, 444 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10022, (212) 935-3340  
Mr. Evans is President of the Charles H. Revson Foundation which supports programs in urban affairs, Jewish and general education, and biomedical research policy. He has written two books on the history of Jews in the American South.

Irwin S. Field, Liberty Vegetable Oil Company, P. O. Box 351, Norwalk, California 90650, (213) 921-3567

Mr. Field is President of Liberty Vegetable Oil, and Chairman of the Executive Committee of Luz International Ltd. He is Vice Chairman of the Jewish Federation of Los Angeles and a past National Chairman of the United Jewish Appeal. He serves many other national and international organizations.

Max M. Fisher, Fisher Building, 27th Floor, 3011 Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Michigan 48202, (313) 871-8000

Mr. Fisher was Chairman of the Board of Governors of The Jewish Agency for Israel, President of the Council of Jewish Federations, and President of the United Jewish Appeal. He was Chairman of United Brands Company and has been involved with many other corporations and civic and Jewish organizations.

Alfred Gottschalk (Rabbi, Ph.D.), Hebrew Union College, 3101 Clifton Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio 45220-2488, (513) 221-1875

Rabbi Gottschalk is President of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion. He has written extensively on ethics, education and Jewish intellectual history.

Arthur Green (Rabbi, Ph.D.), Reconstructionist Rabbinical College, Church Road and Greenwood Avenue, Wyncote, Pennsylvania 19095, (215) 576-0800

Dr. Green is President of the Reconstructionist Rabbinical College and the author of many books and articles including Tormented Master; A Life of Rabbi Nahman of Bratslav.

Irving Greenberg (Rabbi, Ph.D.), The National Jewish Center for Learning and Leadership, 421 Seventh Avenue, New York, NY 10001, (212) 714-9500

Rabbi Greenberg is President and co-founder of CLAL: The National Jewish Center for Learning and Leadership. He founded and chaired the Department of Judaic Studies at City College and has taught and written widely on Jewish thoughts and religion.

Joseph S. Gruss, Gruss & Company, 900 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10022, (212) 688-1500

Mr. Gruss is former head of Gruss & Company. He established the Fund for Jewish Education in New York in association with UJA/Federation of Jewish Philanthropies. He has provided full medical and financial support to Jewish educators, grants to 400 Jewish Day Schools and Yeshivot and to community organizations dedicated to Jewish outreach, and funds for school building renovations. He supports Jewish educators through scholarships for high school and college students.

Robert I. Hiller, Zanvyl Krieger Fund, 101 W. Mount Royal Avenue, Baltimore, Maryland 21201, (301) 727-4828

Mr. Hiller is a consultant to non-profit organizations and President of the Zanvyl Krieger Fund. He has been chief professional officer of the Council of Jewish Federations and the Jewish Federations in Pittsburgh and Baltimore.

David Hirschhorn, The Blaustein Building, P. O. Box 238, Baltimore, Maryland 21203, (301) 347-7200

Mr. Hirschhorn is Vice Chairman of American Trading and Production Corporation. He is a Vice President of the American Jewish Committee and active in Jewish education in Baltimore.

Carol K. Ingall, Bureau of Jewish Education of Rhode Island, 130 Sessions Street, Providence, Rhode Island 02906, (401) 331-0956

Mrs. Ingall is Executive Director of the Bureau of Jewish Education of Rhode Island, curriculum consultant to the Jewish Theological Seminary and representative of the Council for Jewish Education to the Conference on Jewish Communal Service.

Ludwig Jesselson, Philipp Brothers, Inc. 1221 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10020, (212) 575-5900

Mr. Jesselson has served as Chairman of Philipp Brothers, Inc., Chairman of the Board of Governors of Bar Ilan University, Treasurer of the Board of Yeshiva University and President of UJA/Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York Joint Campaign.

Henry Koschitzky, 1 Yorkdale Road, #404, Toronto, Ontario M6A 3A1, (416) 781-5545

Mr. Koschitzky, a former Rhodes Scholar, is President of Iko Industries Ltd. He has served as Chairman of the Board of Jewish Education in Toronto.

Mark Lainer, 17527 Magnolia Boulevard, Encino, California 91316, (818) 787-1400

Mr. Lainer is an attorney and real estate developer. He is active with the Jewish Federation of Los Angeles, Vice President of JESNA, and has been involved with many other civic and Jewish organizations.

Norman Lamm (Rabbi, Ph.D.), Yeshiva University, 500 West 185th Street, New York, NY 10033, (212) 960-5280

Dr. Lamm is President of Yeshiva University, founder of Tradition magazine and the author of many books including Faith and Doubt. He was a member of the President's Commission on the Holocaust and lectures extensively on Judaism, law and ethics.

Sara S. Lee, Rhea Hirsch School of Education, Hebrew Union College, 3077 University Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90007-3796, (213) 749-3424

Mrs. Lee is Director of the Rhea Hirsch School of Education at Hebrew Union College in Los Angeles and Vice Chairman of the Association of Institutions of Higher Learning in Jewish Education. She is a frequent contributor to conferences and publications on Jewish education.

Seymour Martin Lipset (Ph.D.), Visiting Scholar, The Russell Sage Foundation, 112 East 64th Street, New York, NY 10021, (212) 750-6000  
Professor Lipset is a Senior Fellow in political science and sociology at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University. He has been co-editor of Public Opinion and author of many books including Political Man and The Politics of Unreason.

Haskel Lookstein (Rabbi, Ph.D.), Ramaz School, 125 East 85th Street, New York, NY 10028, (212) 427-1000  
Rabbi Lookstein is Principal of Ramaz School and Rabbi of Congregation Kehilath Jeshurun. He teaches at Yeshiva University and has served in leadership roles with the National Rabbinic Cabinet, the New York Board of Rabbis, the Coalition to Free Soviet Jews and the UJA-Federation of New York.

Robert E. Loup, Loup-Miller Construction Company, 10065 E. Harvard Avenue, Suite 900, Denver, Colorado 80231, (303) 745-7000  
Mr. Loup is a real estate developer. He is life president of the Allied Jewish Federation of Denver, National Chairman of CLAL, and past national chairman of the United Jewish Appeal.

Morton L. Mandel, Premier Industrial Corporation, 4500 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio 44103, (216) 391-8300  
Mr. Mandel is Chairman of the Board of Premier. He has been President of the Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland, the Council of Jewish Federations, and JWB.

Matthew J. Maryles, Oppenheimer and Company, Inc., 1 World Financial Center, 200 Liberty Street, New York, NY 10281, (212) 667-7420  
Mr. Maryles is a Managing Director of Oppenheimer and Company, Inc., a New York investment banking firm. He is President of Yeshivah of Flatbush, Chairman of the Fund for Jewish Education and Vice President of UJA/Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York.

Florence Melton, 1000 Urlin Avenue, #1505, Columbus, Ohio, 43212, (614) 224-5239  
Mrs. Melton is the founder of R. G. Barry Corporation where she serves as Design Consultant. She has served on the Board of Huntington National Bank, Columbus, and is an inventor who holds a number of patents. Through her philanthropic efforts, she has initiated numerous innovative projects in Jewish and secular education, including a research project at Ohio State University designed to increase the self-image of junior high school children. She has served on many national education boards.

Donald R. Mintz, McGlinchey, Stafford, Mintz, Cellini & Lang, 643 Magazine Street, New Orleans, Louisiana 70130, (504) 586-1200  
Mr. Mintz is Founder and Director of McGlinchey, Stafford, Mintz, Cellini and Lang and a Professor at Tulane University Law School. He was President of the New Orleans Federation and is now President of JWB.

Lester Pollack, Lazard Freres & Company, One Rockefeller Plaza, New York, NY 10020, (212) 373-4904

Mr. Pollack is a General Partner of Lazard Freres and Chief Executive Officer of Centre Partners. He is Vice President of the JWB and of UJA/Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York.

Charles Ratner, Forest City Enterprises, Inc., 10800 Brookpark Road, Cleveland, Ohio 44130, (216) 267-1200

Mr. Ratner is Executive Vice President of Forest City Enterprises, Inc. He is Vice President of the Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland, Chairman of the Cleveland Commission on Jewish Continuity, and of the Cleveland Jewish Welfare Fund campaign. He is active in other civic and Jewish organizations.

Esther Leah Ritz, 929 N. Astor Street, #2107-8, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, (414) 291-9220

Mrs. Ritz has been President of JWB and Vice President of the Council of Jewish Federations. She is Vice Chairman of Wurzweiler School of Social Work at Yeshiva University and is a Past President of the Jewish Federation in Milwaukee.

Harriet L. Rosenthal, 368 Woodland Place, South Orange, New Jersey, 07079 (201) 762-7242

Mrs. Rosenthal is a Vice President of JWB. She was a delegate of the National Council of Jewish Women to the Conference of Presidents, and serves on the Board of The National Conference on Soviet Jewry.

Alvin I. Schiff (Ph.D.), Board of Jewish Education of Greater New York, 426 West 58th Street, New York, NY 10019, (212) 245-8200

Dr. Schiff is Executive Vice President of the Board of Jewish Education of Greater New York, Editor of Jewish Education and Professor of Jewish Education at Yeshiva University. He is past president of the Council for Jewish Education.

Lionel H. Schipper, Q.C., Schipper Enterprises, Inc., 22 St. Clair Avenue, East, Suite 1700, Toronto, Ontario M4T 2S3, (416) 961-7011

Mr. Schipper is president of Schipper Enterprises, Inc., a private investment firm. He is director of several organizations, including Co-Steel, Inc., Toronto Sun Publishing Corporation and the Alzheimer Society. He is past chairman of the United Jewish Appeal of Metropolitan Toronto.

Ismar Schorsch (Rabbi, Ph.D.), Jewish Theological Seminary, 3080 Broadway, New York, NY 10027, (212) 678-8072

Dr. Schorsch is Chancellor and Professor of Jewish History at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. He has served as President of the Leo Baeck Institute and has published in the area of European Jewish history.



Harold M. Schulweis (Rabbi, Th.D.), Valley Beth Shalom, 15739 Ventura Boulevard, Encino, California 91436, (818) 788-6000  
Rabbi Schulweis is Rabbi of Valley Beth Shalom Congregation of Encino. He is a contributing editor to Reconstructionist, Sh'ma, and Moment magazines. He has taught at the University of Judaism and Hebrew Union College in Los Angeles and is on the faculty of the B'nai B'rith Adult Education Commission.

Daniel S. Shapiro, Schulte, Roth & Zabel, 900 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10022, (212) 758-0404

Mr. Shapiro is a partner in Schulte, Roth and Zabel. He has served as President of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York and is Vice President of the Council of Jewish Federations.

Margaret W. Tishman, 1095 Park Avenue, New York, NY 10028, (212) 980-1000  
Mrs. Tishman is President of the UJA/Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York. She has served in leadership roles with the Jewish Community Relations Council of New York, the Jewish Theological Seminary, and Yeshiva University.

Isadore Twersky (Rabbi, Ph.D.), Harvard University, Center for Jewish Studies, 6 Divinity Avenue, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, (617) 495-4326  
Professor Twersky is Nathan Littauer Professor of Hebrew Literature and Philosophy and Director of the Center for Jewish Studies at Harvard University. He has written numerous scholarly books and studies in Jewish philosophy and law.

Bennett Yanowitz, Bond Court Building, 1300 East 9th Street, Cleveland, Ohio 44114, (216) 696-3311

Mr. Yanowitz is a principal in the firm of Kahn, Kleinman, Yanowitz and Arnson. He is President of JESNA. He has served as Vice President of the Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland and Chairman of the National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council.

Isaiah Zeldin (Rabbi), Stephen S. Wise Temple, 15500 Stephen S. Wise Drive, Los Angeles, California 90077, (213) 476-8561  
Rabbi Zeldin is the Founder and Rabbi of the Stephen S. Wise Temple in Los Angeles. He is founding dean of the Los Angeles branch of Hebrew Union College, and past president of the Pacific Association of Reform Rabbis and the American Zionist Council.

COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION  
IN NORTH AMERICA

Morton L. Mandel, Chairman

Senior Policy Advisors

- David S. Ariel - President, Cleveland College of Jewish Studies  
26500 Shaker Boulevard, Beachwood, Ohio 44122  
(216) 464-4050
- Seymour Fox - Professor of Education, Hebrew University  
The Jerusalem Fellows, 22A Hatzfira Street, Jerusalem 93152  
02-668728
- Annette Hochstein - Consultant, Nativ Policy & Planning Consultants  
P. O. Box 4497, Jerusalem, Israel 91044  
02-662296
- Stephen H. Hoffman - Executive Director, Jewish Community Federation  
of Cleveland  
1750 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio 44115  
(216) 566-9200
- Arthur J. Naparstek - Director, Commission on Jewish Education in  
North America  
President, Premier Industrial Foundation  
4500 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio 44103  
(216) 391-8300
- Arthur Rotman - Executive Vice President, JWB  
15 East 26th Street, New York, New York 10010  
(212) 532-4949
- Carmi Schwartz - Executive Vice President, Council of Jewish Federations  
730 Broadway, New York, New York 10003  
(212) 475-5000
- Herman D. Stein - University Professor, Case Western Reserve University  
3211 Van Aken Blvd., Shaker Hts., Ohio 44120  
(216) 368-4380
- Jonathan Woocher - Executive Vice President, JESNA  
730 Broadway, New York, New York 10003-9540  
(212) 529-2000
- Henry L. Zucker - Consultant, Premier Industrial Foundation  
Executive Vice President Emeritus,  
Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland  
4500 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio 44103  
(216) 391-8300

Consultants

Seymour Fox

Annette Hochstein

Joseph Reimer - Assistant Professor, Benjamin S. Hornstein Program in  
Jewish Communal Service, Brandeis University  
Waltham, Massachusetts 02254  
(617) 736-2996

Herman D. Stein

Henry L. Zucker

Staff

Arthur J. Naparstek

Virginia F. Levi - Program Officer, Premier Industrial Foundation  
4500 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio 44103  
(216) 391-8300

Rachel M. Gubitz - Program Intern, Premier Industrial Foundation  
4500 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio 44103  
(216) 391-8300

Debbie Meline - Research Assistant,  
Nativ - Policy and Planning Consultants  
P. O. Box 4497, Jerusalem 91044  
02-662296

**COMMISSION  
ON JEWISH EDUCATION  
IN NORTH AMERICA**

---

BACKGROUND MATERIALS  
FOR THE MEETING OF  
DECEMBER 13, 1988

November 25, 1988

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The Commission on Jewish Education was established with the assumption that its members could **suggest the ideas that would make it possible for Jewish education to play a significant role in ensuring a meaningful Jewish continuity.**

2. The Commissioners suggested ideas, plans and programs that may make it possible for Jewish education to fulfill this function. These ideas were presented in **individual interviews, at the first meeting of the Commission and in written and oral communications.**

3. The Commissioners suggested more ideas than any one commission could undertake. They could easily form the agenda for Jewish education in North America for several decades.

4. To deal with this wealth of ideas, the staff was instructed to **develop methods** to help the Commission **narrow its focus and agree upon an agenda for study and action.** This work was done between August and November 1988 in consultation with the Commissioners and other experts.

5. The method developed involves the following:

a. The Commissioners' suggestions were formulated into a list of **26 options** for study and action (page 3).

b. The implications of each option — **what is involved** in dealing with any one of them — were studied (page 4).

c. Criteria were generated to **assess the options.** These allow us to view each option in terms of the following questions (page 5):

- How important is the option to the field?
- How feasible is the option?
- How significant an impact will it have?
- How much will it cost?
- How much time will it take to implement?

6. A preliminary assessment disclosed that many options offer great opportunities for improvement in the field of Jewish education. The question then arose **how to choose among the many outstanding suggestions.**

7. Following the analysis of each of the options, they were organized into broad categories: **programmatic options** and **enabling options** (page 8-9).

8. Programmatic options approach Jewish education through a particular cut into the field, either through **age groups, institutions or programs** (e.g. college age group; supplementary schools; Israel Experience programs).

9. Enabling options approach Jewish education through interventions that are tools or facilitators - they **serve many of the other options** and could be viewed as means (e.g. curriculum, personnel).

10. These two categories were further analyzed and these findings emerge from the analysis:

A. **Most of the programmatic options offer significant opportunities** for improvement in Jewish education. There are compelling reasons to undertake many of them: all population groups are important; all settings are important. On the other hand, there is no one option that is clearly an indispensable first step — a programmatic option from which we must begin. In fact, at this stage of the analysis, there are no tools that **allow us to rank them or to choose among them.**

B. What characterizes the enabling options is that **almost all the other options need them or can benefit from them.** Upon analysis, we find that **three enabling options emerge** as pre-conditions to any across-the-board improvements in Jewish education. We find that almost all the options require a heavy investment in **personnel**; that they all require additional **community support**; and that most need substantial **additional funding.** These options — dealing with the shortage of qualified personnel, dealing with the community as a major agent for change, and generating additional funding - are also inter-dependent. Dedicated and qualified personnel is likely to affect the attitude of community leaders. On the other hand, if the community ranks education high on its list of priorities, more outstanding personnel is likely to be attracted to the field.

11. The interrelationship of these options and the dependence of other options on them suggest that they may be the way to affect the field of Jewish education in a significant, across-the-board manner.

12. These are the issues that are on the agenda for the next meeting. The Commission will decide how to proceed.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page #
<b>Executive Summary</b>	i
Table of Contents	iii
<b>I. Background</b>	1
<b>II. Method of Operation</b>	2
A. From Suggestions to Options	2
B. Choosing Among Options	2
a. Developing the List of Options	3
b. Developing an Inventory	4
c. Compiling a Set of Criteria	5
d. Examining the Options	7
Interim Summary	8
e. Designing Alternative Possibilities	9
<b>III. Appendix: Individual Options Papers</b>	
Option #3 To Focus Efforts on the High School Age Group	13
Option #6 To Focus Efforts on the Family	16
Option #7 To Focus Efforts on Adults	20
Option #9 To Develop and Improve the Supplementary School (Elementary and High School)	24
Option #10 To Develop and Improve the Day School (Elementary and High School)	28
Option #11 To Develop Informal Education	32
Option #12 To Develop Israel Experience Programs	36
Option #13 To Develop Integrated Programs of Formal and Informal Education	40

Option #15 To Develop Curriculum and Methods	44
Option #16 To Develop Early Childhood Programs	49
Option #17 To Develop Programs for the Family and the Adults (Together with #6 and #7)	16/20
Option #18 To Develop Programs for the College Population	52
Option #19 To Enhance the Use of Media and Technology for Jewish Education	56
Option #20 To Deal with the Shortage of Qualified Personnel for Jewish Education	60
Option #21 To Deal with the Community -- Its Leadership and Its Structures -- as Major Agents for Change in Any Area	64
Option #26 To Generate Significant Additional Funding for Jewish Education	64
<b>Acknowledgement</b>	<b>67</b>



November 25, 1988

**THE COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA**  
**BACKGROUND MATERIALS**  
**FOR THE MEETING OF DECEMBER 13, 1988**

These documents are meant to serve as background materials for the second meeting of the Commission on Jewish education in North America.

Their purpose is to facilitate the work of the Commission as it decides what areas of Jewish education to select and focus its attention upon.

### **I. BACKGROUND**

The Commission was established to deal with the problem of ensuring a meaningful Jewish continuity through Jewish education for the Jews of North America. It was initiated by the Mandel Associated Foundations as a partnership between the communal and the private sector. The partners — M.A.F., in cooperation with JWB and JESNA, and in collaboration with CJF — invited forty six distinguished community leaders, educators, scholars, rabbis and foundation leaders to join the Commission.

In preparation for the first meeting of the Commission, the Commissioners were interviewed to learn of their views on the

problems and opportunities facing Jewish education.

At the first meeting the Commissioners suggested a large number of important ideas that could serve as the agenda for the work of the Commission. A rich discussion ensued, around the following major themes:

- The people who educate
- The clients of education
- The settings of education
- The methods of education
- The economics of education
- The community: leadership and structures

At the end of the meeting and in subsequent communications (written and oral), the Commissioners urged that the next step be narrowing the focus of the discussion to a manageable number of topics. The assignment was undertaken in consultation with the Commissioners, and through a dialogue with them as well as with additional experts.

## II. METHOD OF OPERATION

The staff was asked to develop methods and materials to assist the Commissioners as they consider the implications of the many suggestions and decide which of them to study and act upon. The following steps were undertaken:

### A. FROM SUGGESTIONS TO OPTIONS

1. The Commission was chosen to represent the best collective wisdom of the community concerning the problems and opportunities facing Jewish education in North America. Every effort was made to ensure that the Commission would represent the interests and needs of the Jews of North America. It appears at this time that the Commission indeed fulfills this function. Nevertheless, it is necessary that this prized representativeness be ensured and that all major concerns and needs are in fact expressed. This may require that adjustments be made from time to time and that additional people be invited to join the Commission.

2. The Commissioners considered the areas of most urgent need in Jewish education and expressed their views and suggestions as to what directions — what areas of endeavour — should be selected for the work of the Commission.

They dealt with what should be done now in Jewish education to make it a more effective tool in the community's struggle for Jewish continuity.

These suggestions were offered in the initial interview, at the first meeting of the Commission, in letters and in conversations following the Commission meeting.

The many suggestions were then formulated as options to be considered by the Commissioners for the agenda.

### B. CHOOSING AMONG OPTIONS

1. It was evident from the very beginning that there were too many options (more than 26) for any one Commission to act upon. Therefore the Commission would have to choose among them.

**But how could a responsible choice be made among the many outstanding suggestions?**

A careful consideration of each option was required.

2. For this purpose, tools were developed to help point out what is involved in each choice.

They include:

a. Developing the list of options from the suggestions of the Commissioners.

b. Developing an inventory: identifying the elements that need to be considered when undertaking an option.

c. Compiling a checklist or set of criteria to assess the options.

d. Examining the options in light of criteria.

e. Designing alternative possibilities for selection by the Commission.

### **a. Developing the list of options**

The following options were generated from the suggestions made by Commissioners in the interviews, at the first commission meeting and in post-meeting communications.

1. To focus efforts on the **early childhood** age group.
2. To focus efforts on the **elementary school** age group.
3. To focus efforts on the **high school** age group.
4. To focus efforts on the **college** age group.
5. To focus efforts on **young adults**.
6. To focus efforts on the **family**.
7. To focus efforts on **adults**.
8. To focus efforts on the **retired** and the **elderly**.
9. To develop and improve the **supplementary school** (elementary and high school).
10. To develop and improve the **day school** (elementary and high school).
11. To develop **informal education**.
12. To develop **Israel Experience programs**.
13. To develop **integrated programs of formal and informal education**.
14. To focus efforts on the widespread acquisition of the **Hebrew language**, with special initial emphasis on the leadership of the Jewish community.
15. To develop **curriculum and methods**.
16. To develop **early childhood programs**.
17. To develop **programs for the family and adults**.
18. To develop **programs for the college population**.
19. To enhance the use of the **media and technology** (computers, video, etc.) for Jewish education.
20. To deal with the **shortage of qualified personnel** for Jewish education.
21. To deal with the **community — its leadership and its structures** — as major agents for change in any area.
22. To reduce or **eliminate tuition**.
23. To improve the **physical plant** (buildings, laboratories, gymnasias).
24. To create a **knowledge base** for Jewish education (research of various kinds: evaluations and impact studies; assessment of needs; client surveys; etc.).
25. To encourage **innovation** in Jewish education.
26. To generate significant **additional funding** for Jewish education.
- 27, 28... **Combinations** of the preceding options.

#### **● A note on the list of options:**

Some options may appear to be redundant. For example, "To focus efforts on

the early childhood age group” (option #1) and “To develop early childhood programs” (option #16) seem to be similar, as do options #2/3 and #9/10; #6/7 and #17; #4 and #18. On closer observation, this is clearly not the case. There is a significant difference between **developing programs** and **considering the needs of a whole age group**. Developing programs involves a vision of change, improvement, increase, enlargement of what already exists. Focusing on an age group involves re-examining goals and opportunities for that age group and extends the vision to include broader questions such as what kind of education is appropriate for the needs of the whole population. Such an approach invites us to take a fresh look at an entire area — both at existing programs and at creative ideas for different programs, at those who are participating as well as those who are not participating.

To illustrate the distinction, let us look at the two options that refer to early childhood. “To develop early childhood programs” (#16) would probably focus attention on enhancing programs for pre-kindergarten, kindergarten and day care. “To focus efforts on the early childhood age group” (#1) would require us to look at this entire age group and consider how creative educational ideas, such as the media, books, games, parent and family education could be effectively introduced as elements for the education of the very young.

Some Commissioners were chiefly concerned with options that are based on programs because of their impact on large participating populations. Other Commissioners felt that such a focus does not address the large number of people who are not currently participating in programs, and therefore is limiting.

The list of options will continue to be revised in consultation with the Commissioners.

## b. Developing an Inventory

What is involved in an option?

Following the development of the list of options it is important to ask ourselves what is involved in any single option — what are the elements that have to be considered if an option is chosen for action or study. Any option involves elements from all the following categories:

- the personnel for education
- the clients of education
- the settings for education
- the curriculum and methods
- the community.

When we consider an option, we must ask questions such as: who will deliver the programs (what personnel); to whom are the programs addressed (what clients); for what forms of education are they appropriate (what settings); what should their content be and how should the message be delivered (what curriculum and methods); what are the institutional structures, the financial and political support needed to implement the option (the community)?

To generate the relevant questions, we developed an inventory. Each of the five categories (personnel, clients, settings, curriculum, community) was explored and broken down into elements. Thus, the inventory is a list of the elements that must be taken into account when considering an option: the elements that

have to be dealt with in planning for implementation.

For example, when we consider option #19 "To enhance the use of media and technology for Jewish education," we can see from the inventory that the necessary personnel might include: formal and informal educators — classroom teachers and specialists, JCC staff and youth movement counsellors. Such personnel might have to be recruited or retrained. The clients of this option might be: students of various ages, teachers, adults or families. The settings for it could be: classrooms, summer camps, retreat centers or homes. The curriculum and methods might involve: materials to replace existing curricula, to supplement or enrich a curriculum, or possibly to teach what cannot be taught by conventional methods. The community's role in this option might include: the funding of multimedia centers, funding for productions and maintenance, or funding for the training of experts. These are but some examples of the many elements involved in the inventory.

The inventory includes more than 500 elements, making it possible to view the complexity involved when considering an option. It will allow the Commissioners to choose the appropriate angle and depth for dealing with any one option. The inventory will be continuously refined.

### **c. Compiling a checklist; a set of criteria**

There are too many options for any one commission to undertake. It was therefore suggested to develop some means or method to help us select among the options. It was decided that a checklist, or set of

criteria, would help us better understand each option.

The checklist will permit us to disclose relevant current knowledge about each option: how important it is to the field; whether it is feasible; how significant an impact it could have; what its cost might be; and how fast it could be implemented. This checklist was prepared in consultation with Commissioners and other experts, and is likely to be modified as work proceeds.

The checklist includes the following categories:

#### **i. How Feasible is the option?**

**Can the option achieve its desired outcomes?**

**Can the option be implemented?**

#### **ii. What are the anticipated Benefits?**

#### **iii. How much will the option Cost?**

#### **iv. How much Time is required for implementation?**

#### **v. What is the Importance of the option to the entire enterprise of Jewish education?**

Each item on the checklist is briefly described:

#### **i. How Feasible is the option?**

**Can the option achieve its desired outcomes?**

1. Do we know if the outcomes can be achieved? E.g., Is "free tuition" likely to increase enrollment significantly?

Answering this question requires us to consider the option in light of the



knowledge that we possess. By knowledge we mean conclusions based upon research, well-grounded theory and the articulated experience of outstanding practitioners. We have decided to consider each option in terms of three levels of knowledge:

Options for which we **do have knowledge** as to how likely they are to achieve the desired outcomes.

Options for which we have **little knowledge** but we **do have assumptions** (informed opinion) as to how likely they are to achieve desired outcomes.

Options for which we **we have no knowledge** as to how likely they are to achieve desired outcomes.

The level of knowledge about any option is but one element affecting the decision to act. Should an option for which we have little or no knowledge emerge in the eyes of the Commission as central or crucial for Jewish education, the absence of knowledge alone may not invalidate such a choice. It would probably guide and modify the kind of action recommended. (E.g., For an option where there is little knowledge we may decide to undertake carefully monitored experiments.)

2. Are there alternative ways to achieve the outcomes or is this option the optimal way? (E.g., Is there a more effective way than free tuition to increase school enrollment? Some people claim that improving the quality of existing programs will be more effective.)

#### **Can the option be implemented?**

Are resources available? If not, how difficult would it be to develop them?

3. Do we have the professional know-how to successfully implement the option? If not, how difficult will it be to develop?

4. Is the personnel available? If not, how difficult will it be to develop?

5. Are materials (curriculum, etc.) available? If not, how difficult will they be to develop?

6. Is the physical infrastructure (buildings, etc.) available? If not, how difficult will it be to create?

7. Do the mechanisms — institutions for implementation — exist? If not, how difficult will it be to establish them?

8. Are funds available? If not, how difficult will it be to generate them?

**Will the communal and political environment support this option?**

9. Will this option enjoy communal and political support? What are likely obstacles?

10. Is the option timely — that is: is it likely to be well received at this time?

#### **ii. What are the Anticipated Benefits?**

1. What needs does this option answer?

2. What is the expected qualitative benefit or impact if it is successful?

3. How many people are likely to be directly affected?

4. What additional benefits can be expected?

**iii. How much will the option Cost?**

What will the cost of this option be (absolutely or per-capita or per expected benefit)?

**iv. How much Time is required for implementation?**

How long will it take until implementation?  
How long until results?

**v. What is the importance of this option to the entire enterprise of Jewish education?**

This criterion seeks to differentiate between options on the basis of questions such as: How essential is this option to the success of the whole endeavour? Could it alone solve the problems of Jewish education? Do other options depend on it? Is this option helpful to the success of other options? Items 1 and 2 address each option with these questions.

1. Is this option a **sufficient condition**? That is: if this option is selected and implemented, will it alone be able to solve the problems of Jewish education?

2. Is this option a **necessary condition**? If we look at the entire field of Jewish education can we identify issues that must be acted upon in order to bring about significant and sustained change? Does improvement in many or all areas depend on dealing with this issue? (E.g., Some people claim that the creation of an adequate climate of support for Jewish education in the community is a pre-condition for the success of almost any other option. Such an

option would therefore be a "necessary" condition. We probably should not act upon any other option without undertaking this one.)

**d. Examining the options in light of the criteria**

The criteria are a means for assessing the options, a way of looking at them. Experts in the field of Jewish education were asked to prepare individual papers on each option, viewing them in light of the checklist, the criteria. The authors of these papers were asked to bring to bear the best available information and to apply state-of-the-art knowledge to their brief summary statements of each option. Their work is presented here as the individual options papers (appendix 1). These papers report on the importance, the feasibility, the benefits, the cost and the time involved for the implementation of each option.

After these papers were prepared, they were reviewed by a group of experts in the field of Jewish education. The assignment could easily have become a multi-year project that would yield more comprehensive and authoritative reports. This advantage had to be foregone for now in order to offer timely and useful information to the Commission as it decides. The papers are tentative and will continue to be refined as the Commission proceeds with its work.

## INTERIM SUMMARY

Following the analysis of the individual options, it is possible to look at them collectively for an overview of the universe from which the Commissioners can choose their agenda. The Commission will then be able to identify possible alternatives for action. In order to facilitate this process we have organized the options into two very broad categories:

- **Programmatic options**
- **Options that can be viewed as enabling**  
— tools, facilitators, possibly as means.

### **Programmatic options**

These options approach Jewish education through interventions that are based on a particular cut into the field — either through age groups, institutions or programs. Some of these options involve improving existing programs or strengthening institutions. Other options call for a fresh look at an entire age group or client population.

The following options fall into this category:

1. To focus efforts on the **early childhood** age group.
2. To focus efforts on the **elementary school** age group.
3. To focus efforts on the **high school** age group.
4. To focus efforts on the **college** age group.
5. To focus efforts on **young adults**.

6. To focus efforts on **the family**.
7. To focus efforts on **adults**.
8. To focus efforts on the **retired and the elderly**.
9. To develop and improve the **supplementary school** (elementary and high school).
10. To develop and improve the **day school** (elementary and high school).
11. To develop **informal education**.
12. To develop **Israel Experience programs**.
13. To develop **integrated programs of formal and informal education**.
14. To focus efforts on the widespread acquisition of the **Hebrew language**, with special initial emphasis on the leadership of the Jewish Community.
16. To develop **early childhood programs**.
17. To develop **programs for the family and adults**.
18. To develop **programs for the college population**.

### **Enabling options**

The options in this category approach Jewish education through interventions that serve many of the other options.



They could be viewed as means for programmatic options.

15. To develop **curriculum and methods**.
19. To enhance the **use of the media and technology** (computers, video, etc.) for Jewish education.
20. To deal with the **shortage of qualified personnel** for Jewish education.
21. To deal with the **community – its leadership and its structures** – as major agents for change in any area.
22. To reduce or **eliminate tuition**.
23. To improve the **physical plant** (buildings, labs, gymnasias).
24. To create a **knowledge base** for Jewish education (research of various kinds: evaluations and impact studies; assessment of needs; client surveys; etc.)
25. To encourage **innovation** in Jewish education.
26. To generate significant **additional funding** for Jewish education.

● **Note on the categories**

The categories of programmatic and enabling options are but one way to organize the options. It is not the only way. Moreover, the decision as to which options to include in each category depends on one's view of education as well as on the strategy for intervention. To illustrate: we have tentatively put option #15 "To develop curriculum and methods" in the enabling category, taking the view of curriculum and methods as tools for other op-

tions. In a different approach it could be considered a programmatic option.

**e. Designing alternative possibilities for selection by the Commission**

Options for action could be selected from either category (programmatic or enabling) or from both. Let us consider the programmatic options first.

When faced with the need to select first options for action, we find that the programmatic category offers difficult challenges. Indeed, the analysis of the individual options does not offer a basis for choosing between them. We find compelling reasons to undertake each one, but we also find that each involves significant problems. Despite the problems, there is no option that cannot be acted upon in some form, whether experimentally or on a wide scale.

How then can one choose, given that all the options remain important and that it is quite difficult to rank the benefits that would accrue from each? How is one to assess the importance of undertaking the elementary school age, versus that of undertaking the high school age? All population groups are important. All the settings are important. We tried to identify one option that might be an indispensable first step – one that could lead us to say "we must start here." But we could not find it. In fact, it appears that choosing among programmatic options, selecting one or many for action following this analysis, may have to be done on the basis of affinities or personal values.

The situation differs with regard to the category of the enabling options. Indeed,

what characterizes the enabling options is that almost all the other options — particularly the programmatic ones — need them, or can benefit from them in one form or another. Moreover, when we analyze these options in the light of the criteria, we find that **three enabling options stand out**, because they are each required — one could say that they are each necessary conditions, pre-conditions — for making cross-the-board improvements in the field of Jewish education at this time. These options are:

#20 — “To deal with the shortage of qualified personnel for Jewish education”;

#21 — “To deal with the community — its leadership and its structure — as major agents for change in any area”;

#26 — “To generate significant additional funding for Jewish education.”

Indeed, most of the options require a heavy investment in personnel, the community

and funding if they are to be successfully implemented. Almost all options require the improvement of existing personnel, and/or the recruitment and training of additional personnel. All options require additional and sustained community support, that is, a change in climate and decision-making that will give them the priority status needed for change. Several of the options cannot be undertaken at all, until significant additional funding and support is secured.

The inter-relationship of these three options as well as the aforementioned dependence of the other options on them, supports the view expressed by Commissioners that the way this particular Commission can make its biggest impact is by **affecting the macro picture**, that is, dealing with the conditions or options that are likely to affect the field across-the-board.

These are the issues that are on the agenda of the next meeting. The Commission will decide how to proceed.

### **III. APPENDIX**

## THE OPTION PAPERS

These papers offer brief overviews of the options as they are assessed in light of the criteria. They are presented here as a means of sharing with the Commissioners relevant data that informs the analysis. The papers were prepared by members of the staff with the assistance of Commissioners and some 40 experts in the field of Jewish education. They are first drafts, with some of the data still being gathered. They will be continuously revised and updated. Some of the options were combined into a single paper (options 6/7 and 17; options 21 and 26), because the author believed this was appropriate and useful. Included in this appendix are those papers available at this time. Several additional papers will be ready for the meeting of the Commission on December 13th.

## **OPTION #3 – TO FOCUS EFFORTS ON THE HIGH SCHOOL AGE GROUP**

### **DESCRIPTION**

---

As mentioned in the note on the list of options (page 3), there is a significant difference between developing programs and planning for the needs of a whole age group. In dealing with a specific population, we need to take a fresh look at an entire area, to ask broad, speculative questions about seemingly-familiar subjects. This particular option challenges us to ask: What does our general knowledge of adolescence suggest can be done in Jewish education for this population?

#### **What is the target population?**

The population is all Jews of high school age in North America.

#### **What are the desired outcomes of this option?**

To help the Jewish adolescent develop an identity in which Jewish ideas, practice and involvement with the Jewish people play an important role.

### **CRITERIA**

---

#### **Do we know if the outcomes can be achieved?**

Some experts view adolescence as a time for separation (or even rebellion) and that the “normal” course is for adolescents to resist parent-identified themes such as religion and ethnic solidarity, thus rejecting the familiar fare of Jewish education received throughout their childhood. At the same time, however, what adolescents most deeply seek – new ideas, experiences, peers and leaders – are resources that the Jewish community has to offer. With sufficient imagination and resources, the Jewish community could become competitive in the market of attracting adolescent attention.

We do not yet have specific answers as to how these outcomes could be achieved. The very purpose of this option is to start afresh in thinking about this age group; it is premature to list possible solutions to the problems. What follows are some first thoughts.

Until now we have rested primarily on the mass appeal of wide-ranging youth groups or on the specialized appeal of, for example, Torah study in yeshivot. While each of these has its own successes, some of the things that have not yet been tried are specified, talent-based options which could draw high school students on the basis of interest. For example, excellent music or theater groups, journals or radio shows, political or social service movements which could attract serious youth from different denominations

and communities. Israel programs as well could be designed based on the serious pursuit of excellence in learning about Israel from specific perspectives – be it politics, the arts or computer science.

**Do we have the know-how to implement this option?**

We know how to put together certain elements of this option, but not a whole package. We would need to identify which resources of the Jewish community could be used to serve this population. For example:

1. Intellectual resources – how do we bring the brightest of our high-schoolers into fruitful contact with the best minds of our community?
2. Political resources – how do we let high schoolers participate in the serious political debates that take place in North America and Israel?
3. Social resources – how do we build the right social contexts in which high schoolers can come together and powerfully experience community and community action?
4. Cultural resources – how do we build the youth orchestras, drama and dance groups, etc. which would bring Jewish culture alive for high schoolers?
5. Religious resources – how do we let high schoolers into the rich and diverse religious possibilities which are available in our tradition?

**Are the materials available?**

No.

**Is the physical infrastructure available?**

No.

**Are institutional and political support available?**

Institutions are invested in their own current programs. This option may require breaking out from current patterns and could involve building new institutional and political support.

**Is the funding available?**

No.

**Is the option timely?**

Yes. There is widespread awareness that the majority of this population has dropped out and concern to remedy that.

**What would the cost be?**

Unknown.

**How long would it take to implement?**

Initial experiments could be planned and implemented in 2 years. Retraining personnel, etc. would require a substantially longer time — at least 5 years.

**How important is this to the field?**

It is not a necessary condition. However psychologists speak of adolescence as the time when the developing individual begins to establish a mature identity in areas like occupation, politics, and religion, and sets his/her priorities. This view of adolescence suggests that the high school years are a time when the Jewish community would want to have significant input into the decisions young people are making. There is research in the field of Jewish education that shows that an individual's decision to continue his/her Jewish education into the adolescent years is a significant indicator of future involvement and adult Jewish commitment.

**OPTION #6 – TO FOCUS EFFORTS ON THE FAMILY and  
OPTION #17 – TO DEVELOP PROGRAMS FOR THE FAMILY**

**DESCRIPTION**

---

**What is the target population?**

The target population is the universe of Jewish families. Two particular family constellations which have, until now, received the most attention by the field of Jewish education are parents and their school-age children and senior adults and their grown children and grandchildren. That is, the majority of existing programs are geared to these two types of families.

**What are the desired outcomes of this option?**

1. Greater involvement of the family unit in Jewish life and learning.
2. Greater involvement of parents in the Jewish education of their children.
3. A chance for adults to learn about and practice Judaism.
4. Reinforcing children's learning by increasing Jewish learning and practice in the home.
5. Potential strengthening of the cohesion of the Jewish family.
6. Potential building of a sense of community among Jewish families and a collective attachment to Jewish institutions.

**CRITERIA**

---

**Do we know if the outcomes can be achieved?**

There has been much research done that has argued for the importance of the family as educator but programs in family education are still in an experimental stage. Educators involved in early experiments believe they have achieved some of the objectives. Models for replication have yet to emerge; no large-scale expansion has been attempted.

**Are there alternative ways to achieve these outcomes?**

1. Adults can learn directly through programs in adult education.



2. Family members can be involved in children's education through school participation (committees, fundraising, etc.) and more creative homework specifically designed for family participation.

3. A sense of community can be enhanced through social, political or religious activities for adults.

### **Do we have the know-how to implement this option?**

Very little. Some educators involved in family education believe they are developing the know-how to implement single programs and may be ready to develop a model for replication.

### **Is the personnel available?**

Presently, family education draws from existing personnel pools — particularly rabbis, social workers and educators — but very few Jewish professionals identify themselves as family educators. Existing personnel may be qualified for the few existing models of family education, but if family education is to be developed, personnel will have to be trained appropriately for the new programs and approaches.

### **Are the materials available?**

A good deal of materials from other areas may be adapted for family education, but a serious curricular effort will be necessary if this area is to be fully developed.

### **Is the physical infrastructure available?**

Yes. Programs take place in synagogues, JCCs and camps. The only addition could be retreat centers.

### **Is institutional support available?**

The idea is new, but is considered by some experts in the field to be so potentially important as to merit immediate support. Existing programs are to be found in synagogues, JCCs, federations and camps, and there is a call for additional programs. For widespread replication, more national institutional support will be needed.

### **Is the funding available?**

Funding for existing programs comes from host institutions and the families themselves. Replication requires production of materials and retraining of personnel. Currently funding for large-scale development is not available.

### **Is the political support available?**

The political support is growing in selected locations, but is yet untested in many other locations.

### **Is the option timely?**

Yes. With concern about family cohesion and parental non-support for children's education, many feel this is a most timely option especially for families involved with congregational schools, day schools and other forms of Jewish education.

### **What needs does this option answer?**

The need of families to find ways to be involved together in Jewish life. The need of schools to involve parents in their children's Jewish education. The educators' needs to feel supported by the home and the children's needs to have continuity between the school and the home.

### **What benefits could be anticipated?**

1. Family education could enrich the whole pattern of participation of the family unit in Jewish life — in the home and in the community.
2. Family education could build a connection between what is learned at school and seen at home.
3. It could help revive supplementary schools and strengthen day schools by bringing the parents more closely in touch with their children's and their own Jewish education.
4. Family education could enhance the possibility that children would continue education beyond bar mitzvah.
5. It could raise the demand for more quality adult education; and it could involve rabbis more fully in the practice of Jewish education.

### **What would the cost be?**

The immediate costs of moving from local experiments to producing models for replication would be low. To move to full implementation and long-term development would involve more substantial costs for the salary and training of personnel and the production of materials.

**How long would it take to implement?**

The first stage could be achieved in 2 years. Full implementation would require 5-7 years.

**How important is this to the field?**

Some experts believe family education may be a necessary condition in the sense that with more family involvement, many other forms of education for children and adults would be far more effective. Others caution that the work in this area is on an experimental level and has yet to be proven effective on a wider scale.

**OPTION #7 – TO FOCUS EFFORTS ON ADULTS; and  
OPTION #17 – TO DEVELOP PROGRAMS FOR ADULTS**

**DESCRIPTION**

---

**What is the target population?**

The target is the whole adult population of the Jewish community. This is sometimes divided into subpopulations by age (young or senior adults), status (single, parents), level of commitment (affiliated or unaffiliated) or profession.

**What kinds of programs currently exist?**

There is a wide array of programs for adults in the realms of both formal and informal education. On the formal side there are lecture series, classes, institutes and schools sponsored by synagogues, community centers, national and local organizations. There are also university programs, study groups, havurot and study retreats, as well as special study programs for leadership groups. On the informal side there are interest and self-help groups, cultural events and Israel experience programs as well as retreats and weekends of all sorts.

**What are the desired outcomes of this option?**

1. To encourage greater personal commitment to Jewish life.
2. To increase engagement with Jewish sources.
3. To increase participation in Jewish communal activities.
4. To encourage more knowledgeable participation in Jewish life.
5. To improve adults' ability to transmit Jewish tradition and culture to the next generations.
6. To strengthen the connection of North American Jews to Israel.
7. To involve many more adults in formal and informal Jewish learning and activity.

**CRITERIA**

---

**Do we know if the outcomes can be achieved?**

We know through experience that there are programs that have achieved many of the above outcomes. We know less about developing clear models that can be replicated,

and do not know the impact of different programs on adults. We do not know the numbers of adults who have been reached or potentially could be reached by these programs.

### **Are there alternative ways to achieve these outcomes?**

In addition to many kinds of programs listed above, there are alternative modalities which have been suggested:

1. More systematic use of the media (including public and cable television, videos, tapes, computer programs) for reaching adults in their homes and communities.
2. More effective use of book clubs and other library or home reading programs.
3. More creative use of university programs through extension courses, etc.

### **Do we have the know-how to implement this option?**

We have the know-how to run individual, successful programs of many different kinds. We are first gaining know-how to develop successful models and replicate them. But we still do not know much about how to market available programs.

### **Is the personnel available?**

The personnel picture is uneven. There is a great potential if rabbis, scholars and informed professionals can be channelled to this area. There is a need here for retraining. There may also be a role for training paraprofessionals and supporting peer learning as in yeshivot and havurot. If this field is to be expanded significantly there will be a need for full-time personnel and much more part-time personnel.

### **Are the materials available?**

There is much material for the adult learner, but it is not arranged in curriculum form for teaching purposes. Some curricular efforts have begun; more would be needed for fuller implementation. Use of the media (films, video, etc.) has begun, but much material is yet to be made commonly available or incorporated into curriculum.

### **Is the physical infrastructure available?**

It appears to be available, though careful study might indicate need for more retreat centers and vacation sites.

**Is institutional support available?**

Yes. On both a local and national level there are many organizations involved and supportive. What may be lacking is coordination among organizations to avoid overlap and increase marketing effectiveness.

**Is the funding available?**

Not for personnel retraining, development of materials, a serious effort at model-building or replication.

**Is the political support available?**

Yes. As more communal leaders are themselves touched by adult programs, they become their supporters. There is also more general awareness that we cannot educate the younger generation without also educating the adult population.

**Is the option timely?**

Yes.

**What needs does this option answer?**

1. The need of adults to learn and re-learn more about Jewish tradition and culture.
2. The need of the community to have a more knowledgeable and committed membership.
3. The need of the younger generation to see their elders also involved in Jewish life and study.

**What benefits could be anticipated?**

1. Adult education could change the nature and kind of Jewish involvement of the adult population.
2. It could involve hundreds of thousands of adult Jews in Jewish activity.
3. It could enable education for children and families to be improved as more people would have a stake in the educational enterprise.
4. It could help turn education into a top priority of national and local communal and religious organizations.

**What would the cost be?**

Initial efforts at developing model programs could be begun at low costs. As efforts to expand programs, retrain personnel and develop materials got underway, costs would rise.

**How long would it take to implement?**

There could be a one year planning period followed by a 2-3 year effort at developing model programs. Full fledged implementation would require a 5-7 year period.

**How important is this to the field?**

Although this is not a necessary condition, adult education is considered by some to be a very important option because it could reach a very large number of Jews and also help to develop current and future leadership for the community.



## **OPTION #9 – TO DEVELOP AND IMPROVE THE SUPPLEMENTARY SCHOOL (ELEMENTARY AND HIGH SCHOOL)**

### **DESCRIPTION**

---

#### **What is the target population?**

The population is all Jewish families with children of school age who are enrolled in supplementary schools. In the U.S., there are close to 270,000 children currently enrolled; in Canada approximately 9,700. There are approximately 2,200 supplementary schools in North America, primarily serving elementary grades. The vast majority of them are under the auspices of either Reform or Conservative synagogues, with a smaller number under Orthodox or communal auspices. The target population could grow by several hundred thousand.

#### **What are the desired outcomes of this option?**

1. To improve the quality of these programs by providing more highly-trained personnel, better support for teachers, better consistency in use of curriculum, and more support from families, congregations and communities.
2. To enhance the children's and families' educational experience, to better impart knowledge, to encourage more observance and participation, and to create commitment to the Jewish people and to Israel.
3. To encourage students to affiliate Jewishly and continue further study after Bar Mitzvah.
4. To increase the numbers of families who would send their children to these schools for a Jewish education.

### **CRITERIA**

---

#### **Do we know if the outcomes can be achieved?**

We do have some experiential knowledge of what makes a supplementary school more effective and how to improve less effective schools but most of our knowledge is based on widely accepted assumptions. Hard data is limited, with a noted exception being the recent BJE study of New York supplementary schools. No sustained wide-scale effort has been tried to upgrade these schools. We have no hard evidence that outstanding supplementary schools can be developed. But we do know that the conditions experts list as essential for effectiveness (qualified personnel, family involvement, etc.) are currently often lacking.



**Are there alternative ways to achieve these outcomes?**

Some experts have put forward these alternatives to replace supplementary schools:

1. Improved recruiting for day schools;
2. Enhancing outreach directly to Jewish families;
3. Increasing allotments for informal education and summer camps;
4. Initiating Israel programs for younger children.

Each of these alternatives is problematic. Many experts believe there will remain a limited clientele for day schools and that family and informal education work best as extensions of, not replacements for, these schools.

**Do we have the know-how to implement this option?**

With appropriate personnel, family and communal support, we believe we know how to improve the quality and attractiveness of individual supplementary schools. We have limited knowledge of how to change the culture of these schools for the whole population.

**Is the personnel available?**

No, and this lack of qualified available personnel constitutes the major problem.

Currently there is a pool of mostly part-time teachers — some of whom are poorly trained Israeli teachers — and some full-time personnel. Improvement would require recruiting, training, and retention of more qualified full-time personnel (full-time positions would need to be created); creative recruitment of part-time teachers; and more support and career opportunities for both full and part-time personnel. Personnel for model programs could probably be recruited on a small scale if appropriate funding was available.

**Are the materials available?**

On the elementary level, a good deal exists. On the high school level, there is less available.

**Is the physical infrastructure available?**

Yes.

### **Is institutional support available?**

The crucial support by congregations and denominational organizations exists. Federations are now giving minimal support. Important issues are how to help congregations make more effective usage of available educational resources, and to help communities coordinate communal and denominational efforts to improve these schools.

### **Is the funding available?**

For current operations, yes; but not for serious efforts of improvement.

### **Is the political support available?**

To a limited extent. The poor reputation of supplementary schools has made it difficult to rally support for a sustained effort to improve their quality and appeal. There is the danger of a self-fulfilling prophecy of low expectations and poor performance.

### **Is the option timely?**

Most observers agree the supplementary schools are in crisis and need to be either improved or replaced. This option is timely for those who believe in the future of this institution, but not for those who doubt its ability to be rehabilitated.

### **What needs does this option answer?**

1. In the U.S.A., 70% of the children enrolled in Jewish schools attend supplementary schools. They need a better educational experience.
2. Most non-Orthodox synagogues spend a considerable portion of their budgets on these schools and deserve more for their money.
3. The many Jewish families with children enrolled in these schools need better quality help from these schools to help sustain their children's Jewish identity.

### **What benefits could be anticipated?**

1. Better quality schools could provide students with more Jewish knowledge, firmer Jewish values and deeper Jewish commitments.
2. Better quality schools could attract and hold more students for more years.
3. Improved supplementary education could be a gateway for greater interest in informal, family and adult education as well as programs in Israel.

**What would the cost be?**

High. Without a serious effort to improve the personnel no sustained improvement is possible.

**How long would it take to implement?**

Pilot projects for developing model programs could be implemented in 3-5 years. More systematic improvements could require 5-7 years.

**How important is this to the field?**

It is not a necessary condition. Some experts rank this as among the most important programmatic options because it reaches the largest number of families. Others believe the outcomes will be hard to achieve and that the supplementary school is a high-risk, poor investment.



## **OPTION #10 – TO DEVELOP AND IMPROVE THE DAY SCHOOL (ELEMENTARY AND HIGH SCHOOL)**

### **DESCRIPTION**

---

#### **What is the target population?**

The population is all Jewish families with children of school age who are enrolled or could become interested in day school education. In 1982 110,000 students attended day schools in the U.S.A.; 16,000 in Canada. The largest concentration is in the lower elementary grades. Of the 586 day schools in North America, 462 are Orthodox, 62 are Conservative, 44 are communal, 9 are Reform, 4 are secular.

#### **What are the desired outcomes of this option?**

1. Improve the quality of day school education through support for personnel training and professional growth, model programs, curriculum development, integration of different areas of learning and increased family involvement.
2. Produce graduates with high levels of Jewish commitment and in-depth Judaic knowledge who could form a core of future Jewish leadership.
3. Improve the possibility of more families throughout the community choosing day school education for their children by increasing the total number of day schools and qualified personnel and by offering, when needed, more opportunities for tuition reduction.
4. Increase the possibility of many more children continuing their day school education through high school.

### **CRITERIA**

---

#### **Do we know if the outcomes can be achieved?**

We have a good deal of experience with day school education and much informed opinion about its potential effectiveness. We assume that by creating a more total Jewish ambience, devoting more hours to Judaic content, and commanding a more serious level of commitment, a day school education produces more knowledgeable and committed Jews. But we do not yet have hard data to support these assumptions. Nor do we know how widespread day school education could become in the United States or, outside of the Orthodox community, what it would take to gain more support for day high school education.

### **Are there alternative ways to achieve these outcomes?**

Excellent supplementary school, informal education and Israel programs may be alternatives to day school.

Many observers believe these are not realistic alternatives and that day school (especially when complemented by informal programs, family education and Israel programs) is the most effective form of Jewish education available.

### **Do we have the know-how to implement this option?**

There are impressive examples of successful day schools, but at present we have not come up with an approach to recruiting, training and maintaining the needed personnel.

### **Is the personnel available?**

Not enough for current needs and certainly not for potential future needs. In many cases today day schools are forced to rely on Israeli teachers for some subjects. Many observers feel that a number of steps could be taken to improve the personnel picture. These include: more active recruitment, more training opportunities, increased salaries and benefits, better in-service and staff development opportunities. There are needs for school principals and master teachers and other professional teachers.

### **Are the materials available?**

Only to a limited extent. There is a general lack of first-rate curriculum at all levels for teaching Judaic subjects.

### **Is the physical infrastructure available?**

Day schools face four challenges in relation to physical structures.

1. New schools need to find initial space in which to house the school.
2. Expanding schools need to find more adequate larger quarters.
3. All schools face high cost of maintenance, repair and renovation.
4. Many schools wish to improve quality of educational facilities such as libraries, laboratories, gymnasias and classrooms.

There are constant needs for funds in relation to all of the above.

### **Is institutional support available?**

In the Orthodox community, definitely yes. In the Conservative movement, mostly yes. In the Reform movement, it is newer, but gaining support. There is growing support in the federation world.

### **Is the funding available?**

Day schools rely on the following sources for funding: tuition, communal funds, governmental funds and local fundraising. Tuition fees cover between 40 and 90 percent of operational costs depending on numbers of students, on scholarships and the extent of the scholarships (which may range from 10 to 100%). Capital costs come from communal funds or local fundraising. Many day schools struggle to meet current budgets, without having adequate funding to raise teacher salaries and benefits, expand facilities or increase scholarships.

### **Is the political support available?**

Certainly in the Orthodox community. Otherwise, the support is increasing, but is by no means universal. Opposition, though, has greatly decreased.

### **Is the option timely?**

Yes. Judging by a 100% increase in enrollment between 1962 and 1982, and continued growth across ideological lines, day school education is timely.

### **What needs does this option answer?**

1. The need to provide students with a more complete setting to study Jewish tradition in depth and develop Jewish commitments.
2. The need to provide viable Jewish alternatives to what some parents perceive as failing public and supplementary schools.
3. The need to provide some families with opportunities for more Jewish involvement.
4. The need to provide educators with full-time work and consistently serious teaching and advancement opportunities.

### **What benefits could be anticipated?**

1. Larger numbers of Jewish students would be involved in more intensive Jewish study.
2. Quality of Jewish knowledge and commitment could be elevated across the community.



3. Could create a larger pool for future lay and professional leadership in the community.
4. Could intensify Jewish identification for the family of children attending.

**What would the cost be?**

Given the needs for personnel (including improved salaries and benefits and enhanced opportunities for recruitment, training and professional development), physical structure, curriculum development, scholarship funds and outreach efforts, the costs could be high.

**How long would it take to implement?**

Some steps, such as curriculum development and personnel recruitment, could have first steps of implementation taken within 3-5 years. How long it would take to increase funding would depend on the response of the community to these needs.

**How important is this to the field?**

Some experts argue it is the most important programmatic option because it has the highest yield. Others wonder if day schools will ever be attractive to more than a limited percentage of non-Orthodox Jews.

## **OPTION #11 – TO DEVELOP INFORMAL EDUCATION**

### **DESCRIPTION**

---

The scope of informal education is vast, extending from toddlers to senior citizens, from swimming with Mom to studying Torah with a resident scholar. For the purposes of this paper, it will be limited to three domains – JCCs, summer camp and youth work – and will not include programs for early childhood (option #16) or programs for the retired and the elderly (option #8).

#### **What is the target population?**

The 200 JCCs in North America target all Jews as their potential population. The 70 residential summer camps under Jewish communal auspices are primarily for children of school age (annual population estimated at 52,000) but also are expanding to service adults on retreats and family programs as well as train college students who work on their staff. Ten major youth organizations primarily serve high school students but also extend downward to junior high and upward to college students (with 100,000 participants).

#### **What are the desired outcomes of this option?**

1. To create an experiential field within which Jews of varying ages and backgrounds can encounter and participate in a living Jewish environment and experience a deeper identification as Jews.
2. To create a multiplicity of opportunities for Jews to learn more about their Jewishness through informal means including interest activities, cultural programs, small groups, classes and retreats.
3. To create contexts in which Jews can freely associate with one another and forge more lasting communal and friendship bonds.
4. To create a sense of community by sponsoring major cultural events in which many elements of the community can come together and constitute themselves as “klal yisrael.”

### **CRITERIA**

---

#### **Do we know if the outcomes can be achieved?**

There are some studies which suggest that participation in informal Jewish activities – especially camps, youth movements and Israel programs – has a significant impact



on people's subsequent Jewish identity. Much of what we know of outcomes, however, is based on informed assumptions.

**Are there alternative ways to achieve these outcomes?**

Only trips to Israel are seen as having the same affective and experiential impact as these informal educational programs, and they generally do not begin at as early an age. Most experts do not see formal education as an alternative to informal education, but rather as each complementing the other.

**Do we have the know-how to implement this option?**

Yes, to a great extent. Jewish camping and youth movements are well-established and given the right conditions can be run with great effectiveness. The JCC staffs have been learning to introduce Jewish content and experiences into their programs and have done so with increasing effectiveness.

**Is the personnel available?**

In camping and youth movements the recruiting and maintaining of appropriately effective staff is a constant struggle. In the JCC world there are also shortages, but the main issue is the Jewish training of staff; there are definite shortages in personnel with strong Jewish backgrounds.

**Are the materials available?**

Yes, to an extent. Informal education requires a "curriculum of learning" as does formal education. Over the years a "curriculum in potential" has developed in the form of many successful programs and materials that have been produced. However, there is need for actual curriculum that orders programs and materials and offers direction for their use. National access and coordination is still in need of improvement. In camping and youth movements there are few opportunities for professionals in the field to meet together on the use of materials.

**Is the physical infrastructure available?**

To a great extent, yes. In camping, however, there is the need to explore whether certain areas of North America are underserved. Also, the potential use of camps as year-round resources for informal and family education would require upgrading of facilities. Maintenance and improvement of summer facilities remain a budgetary concern as well.

**Is institutional support available?**

Yes. The JCC world has become supportive of viewing informal education as an essential part of Jewish education. The denominations each support a youth movement as

do other national organizations like Bnai Brith and Hadassah. The JCC world has an extensive network of residential and day camps. The Reform and Conservative movements each officially sponsors a network of summer camps. In the Orthodox world there is also much support for camping.

**Is the funding available?**

Yes. However, youth movements' reliance on national and local support often leaves them with minimal-level budgeting. Camps can rely on tuition up to a point, but as tuitions rise, the numbers of families who can afford camp drops. There is a large need in camps and youth movements for scholarship funds. Starting new camps would require a large influx of funds, estimated at \$3 million per residential camp. Winterizing a camp would cost \$500,000.

**Is the political support available?**

Yes. However, there is less clear support for upgrading and expanding the mandate of camping and youth work.

**Is the option timely?**

Yes. Especially in the JCC world there is much recent movement to upgrade the Jewish quality of informal education. In camping there is recent movement to include more programming for families and adults.

**What needs does this option answer?**

1. The need of individuals of all ages to express their Jewishness through a variety of informal modalities.
2. The need of individuals of all ages and families to enter a Jewish environment in which they can be at home with their Jewishness and their fellow Jews.
3. The need of individuals of all ages to learn more about their Jewishness and themselves as Jews.
4. The need of the community to have opportunities to constitute itself as a community (without having to respond to a crisis).

**What benefits could be anticipated?**

1. Jews learning a richer, more textured sense of self as a Jew.
2. Reinforcement of and expansion upon the Jewish learning done in formal settings through enactment in less formal settings.

3. Reinforcement of communal bonds through effective connections developed by people commonly engaged in informal activity.

4. Attracting to the Jewish community individuals and families who feel less comfortable in the more formal environments of schools and congregations, and helping them feel more fully integrated.

**What would the cost be?**

The main costs involve staff recruitment, training and retention. On all levels, informal education requires a core of well-trained professionals who will devote their careers to this work. In addition, the work is labor-intensive and requires the constant search for new staff due to high turnover. Higher salaries and benefits, and more opportunities for professional growth and advancement are especially important in youth work and camping. JCCs need on-going funding for the Jewish education of their staff.

**How long would it take to implement?**

The Jewish training of staff is already going on. The professional upgrading of camp and youth movement staff could begin to be implemented in a short period. The training of a more permanent professional top staff would require a 5-10 year effort.

**How important is this to the field?**

While not a necessary condition, informal education is considered very important as a complement to existing forms of formal education and as a door through which non-affiliated Jews can more easily enter. Some argue that it enlivens the whole field of Jewish education.

## **OPTION #12 – TO DEVELOP ISRAEL EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS**

### **DESCRIPTION**

---

To increase participation in quality educational programs in Israel (short, medium and long-term), of various kinds (formal and informal) and for all appropriate age groups. This option relates to educational programs and not to general tourism.

#### **What is the target population?**

The Jewish population of North America. In most recent years, more than 25,000 young people from North America have participated in educational programs in Israel. About 35% of the whole Jewish population of North America has visited Israel, in a variety of settings (mostly tourism). Market studies indicate that many of those who have never visited the country would do so under certain conditions within the framework of educational programs and that many of those who have visited would return for such programs.

#### **What are the desired outcomes of this option?**

1. Intensify the participants' Jewish identity, emotional involvement with the Jewish people and Israel, and sense of belonging.
2. Acquaint the participants with the establishment of the Jewish state as a major creative Jewish accomplishment and enhance their understanding of Zionism.
3. Impart knowledge about the Jewish past and present and acquaint participants with the sites of Judaism.
4. Increase the sense of responsibility for, and desire to participate in, the existence of the State of Israel.
5. Increase understanding and concern for the present and future of the Jewish people.
6. Increase knowledge about Israel.

### **CRITERIA**

---

#### **Do we know if the outcomes can be achieved?**

We have limited empirical data on the impact of programs in Israel. However, the major assumptions (by experts, educators and decision-makers) agree with this data and claim that Israel speaks powerfully to its Jewish visitors and has significant impact

on Jewish identity. Numerous educators and parents believe that a good program in Israel has greater impact than many other educational activities.

**Are there alternative ways to achieve these outcomes?**

American Jews can be taught about Israel in schools or in informal educational settings, through courses, books, films, lectures, celebration of Yom Ha'atzmaut (Israel's independence day), etc.

**Do we have the know-how to implement this option?**

Yes. However, qualitative improvement is needed, as research shows that high quality programs (thoughtfully planned and well staffed) have a greater impact. Innovations are needed to address population groups whose needs and demands are not currently met (e.g. college students, families).

We need to learn more about the marketing of programs, the preparation of participants and follow-up activities after their return.

**Is the personnel available?**

Yes. Preliminary studies show that the personnel – counsellors, teachers, guides, planners, administrators – can be recruited, but they need specialized short-term training. Significant growth would require the recruitment and training of additional personnel.

**Are the materials available?**

Yes, materials for use during programs do exist. However there is a lack of materials to prepare participants for programs or to follow-up. As new programs are developed, appropriate accompanying materials may have to be developed.

**Is the physical infrastructure available?**

Yes. Studies indicate that carefully planned use of existing facilities (youth villages, youth hostels, field schools, hotels, university dormitories, etc.) could accommodate significant increases in participation. There are bottlenecks in Jerusalem and in Eilat during the winter and summer vacation times. The need for better use of existing facilities or for additional facilities should be assessed.

**Is institutional support available?**

Yes.

**Is the funding available?**

Some funding is available – primarily from JAFI-WZO sources and increasingly from denominations, federations and local sources. However, cost remains a significant obstacle to participation in programs. Increased scholarship funds are likely to facilitate increased participation.

**Is the political support available?**

Yes.

**Is the option timely?**

Yes.

**What needs does this option answer?**

1. Intensification and enrichment of other educational programs.
2. Outreach.
3. Rehabilitation of negative impact from poor educational experiences. Programs have the advantage of being mostly successful experiences in the eyes of participants – unlike other educational experiences.

**What benefits could be anticipated?**

1. Increase in the number of participants from 25,000 per year (13-30 year olds in organized programs) to two or three times that number.
2. Qualitative improvements in programs.
3. Intensified involvement in Jewish activities and studies upon return.

**What would the cost be?**

Initial research leads us to conclude that among different types of programs the average per capita subsidy is of \$500-\$1,000. For 10,000 additional participants, this could mean \$5,000,000-\$10,000,000 per year. For 25,000 (doubling the present numbers) this could mean \$12,500,000-\$25,000,000 per year.

**How long would it take to implement?**

The number of participants could be doubled almost immediately. Significant increases could be achieved within 3-5 years. Qualitative improvements could be gradually achieved.

**How important is this to the field?**

It is not a necessary condition.

## **OPTION #13 – TO DEVELOP INTEGRATED PROGRAMS OF FORMAL AND INFORMAL EDUCATION**

### **DESCRIPTION**

---

Though we tend to think of formal education (such as schools) and informal education (such as camps, youth groups) as separate domains, there have been efforts to integrate the two. The effort may come in an informal setting with the inclusion of formal learning opportunities or in a formal setting with the inclusion of informal learning opportunities. A third possibility is for two institutions – one formal and one informal – to work together to coordinate their activities so that the participants (students) would be exposed to similar materials on themes in both settings. All these efforts work from these assumptions: (1) formal and informal education complement one another; (2) Jewishness needs to be taught using both types of learning; (3) participants' learning greatly improves when these approaches are brought together in one programmatic package, creating a synergistic effect.

#### **What is the target population?**

The population is all Jews who participate in Jewish education and could profit from this integrative approach.

#### **What are the desired outcomes of this option?**

1. Increasing effectiveness of both types of programs by having the cognitive component of formal education reinforced and amplified by the affective component of informal education and visa versa.
2. Students' learning how the two aspects of Jewish living – study and deed – fit together and reinforce one another.
3. Increasing coordination between educational institutions who often conceive of their missions as being distinct from one another.

### **CRITERIA**

---

#### **Do we know if these outcomes can be achieved?**

We have the informed opinion of the educators who have attempted this integration that it is likely that these outcomes can be achieved. The number of serious attempts at integration are few and we have no hard data on the effectiveness of these attempts.



**Are there alternative ways to achieve these outcomes?**

Presently, in most cases in which students participate in both formal and informal Jewish settings, the co-ordination of realms is left to chance or to the students' own abilities to integrate these diverse experiences. It is generally agreed that this lack of coordination fails to realize the full potential of either formal or informal education.

**Do we have the know-how to implement the option?**

There are educators who are prepared to experiment in this area and have suggested interesting programs. There is as yet no established model for dissemination or, even, a clear way of training educators for integration.

**Is the personnel available?**

No, except for a small number of educators. Training educators to function well in both formal and informal settings and to build integrative programs is difficult.

**Are the materials available?**

No materials have been specifically prepared for integrating education in the formal and informal settings, but there are existing materials that can be applied to the integration. There are some emerging curricula, e.g. for Shabbat retreats, that attempt the integration.

**Is the physical infrastructure available?**

Usually, yes. Integrative programs often use camp and retreat sites but in some communities they are not available on a year-round basis. A program that would fully integrate formal and informal education would probably require the linking of institutions such as schools and JCCs.

**Is institutional support available?**

This subject has not yet been directly and systematically addressed by the institutions in the community. Greatest support for it is found in informal settings where JCCs, camps and youth organizations are working to integrate formal learning opportunities into their programs. There is an increasing realization by supplementary schools that their students could benefit from school-sponsored informal activities. Day schools often look for such opportunities for their students too, though not usually through school sponsorship.

**Is the funding available?**

To a very limited extent. The integration is costly and usually families are asked to pay for some of the operating costs. For the training of staff, preparation of materials and coordination or institutions there is little funding available.

**Is the political support available?**

There is realization of its importance, but it is not a high priority on most community agendas.

**Is the option timely?**

Yes.

**What needs does this option answer?**

1. Students' need to experience a link between what is learned in a formal setting and what is learned in informal settings especially when homes do not provide the links.
2. Educators' need to find efficient ways to bring to life what is taught in the classroom and to give intellectual depth to what is experienced in a camp or on a retreat.
3. The community's need to have different educational organizations coordinate efforts and become more efficient.

**What benefits could be anticipated?**

1. What is taught in classes could be reinforced and better understood by its being experienced in a live setting.
2. What is experienced in a camp, etc. could have more meaning if it were more clearly connected to a set of ideas and a field of information.
3. More students might choose to continue their Jewish education beyond bar mitzvah if their learning opportunities become more experiential and personally meaningful.
4. More full-time jobs for educators could become available if formal and informal education were combined into a single job description.

**What would the cost be?**

Setting up model programs — which would include some small-scale staff training, material production and scholarships to offset added costs to families — could be done

at a low cost. More extensive dissemination would require more staff training and re-training.

**How long would it take to implement?**

Model programs could be established in 1-2 years. Large-scale is a 3-5 year project.

**How important is this to the field?**

It is not a necessary condition, but an option that could maximize educational impact and efficiency.

## OPTION #15 – TO DEVELOP CURRICULUM AND METHODS

### DESCRIPTION

---

A. Curriculum is an option that is particularly complex because it is so wide-ranging. We could consider, for example, the *setting or form* of Jewish education, either formal or informal. That is, we could look at day schools or supplementary schools, camps or community centers, youth groups or trips to Israel and in all those cases try to determine the nature and effectiveness of the curriculum being used. In a similar way we could look at any *population* for Jewish education and try to examine the curriculum being used for that age group. That is, the curriculum currently available for 10 year olds and the curriculum currently available for 3 year olds or adults could each be evaluated separately. And, finally, curriculum could be discussed in relation to *subject matters*. The amount and quality of curriculum currently available in the area of, for example, teaching Jewish holidays may differ greatly from curriculum available in the area of teaching Israel or Hebrew.

B. And these areas do not address the issue of *quality and availability*. We can see some materials which are examples of effective curriculum-- they clearly help educators perform their tasks. Other materials are available, but are ineffective; they are designed as curriculum, but do not help the educator. And there is a very important, though often-overlooked, area which we could call "curriculum in potential." These are the available materials or effective programs which could be *turned into* curriculum, but have not yet been perceived as "curriculum". For example, the many Judaica books for adults currently in print could be seen as "curriculum in potential" for adult education; the materials exist, but we don't know how to use them for adult education in a general way (that is, there are individual talented teachers of adults that use such books, but their teaching ideas have not been organized or disseminated in a way that other teachers could use them). Another example of "curriculum in potential" is the effective programming done in camps or community centers, most of which has never been written down and therefore cannot find a wider audience.

C. Finally, none of the above addresses the crucial connection between curriculum as it is conceived and curriculum as it lives. Curriculum plans that have been developed are directly tied to the implementation of curriculum. For example, we seem to have some curriculum of quality available for the teaching of Hebrew in day schools, but we have a lack of qualified personnel to implement that curriculum. In addition we seem to have a lack of personnel who could *train* teachers to use these existing materials. And, in addition, in the important domain of "curriculum in potential," we may not have the talented or trained personnel who could do the job of taking existing ideas, programs or lesson plans and *transferring* them into curriculum. We could also consider the institutions that should develop curriculum. Should this come as a "top-down" process through boards of Jewish education, research centers and curriculum

publishers or should this emanate from local institutions or from the individual educators themselves?

Finally we could treat curriculum and methods together, for our conception of curriculum requires that we include the methods by which the curriculum is to be taught.

We will try to address the general picture of curriculum and methods in Jewish education, being fully aware that the complexity of the subject does not allow for a simple or detailed analysis.

### **What is the target population?**

All age groups, settings and forms of Jewish education.

### **What are the desired outcomes of this option?**

1. Materials should encompass the various settings and age groups of Jewish education.
2. Materials should be both effective and available.
3. Educators (teachers, informal educators, etc.) should participate in in-service education programs where they can learn how to use curriculum and methods.
4. Personnel should be trained to use, implement (train others) and create materials.

## **CRITERIA**

---

### **Do we know if the outcomes can be achieved?**

We do know a good deal about our abilities to create materials for school age populations and settings; we assume, based on that fact (and perhaps incorrectly), a good deal about our ability to create materials for informal settings and other ages. We know a good deal about training educators to use materials and about working with school environments in introducing new curriculum ideas (i.e. there is considerable research in the general education field, some of which is relevant to Jewish education; and there is considerable practical work, most of which is currently not written up, about the implementation of curriculum in Jewish education) and we know something about training people as curriculum writers and trainers.

### **Are there alternative ways to achieve these outcomes?**

Some have argued that training teachers and helping them become their own "curriculum developers" might be preferable to working on curriculum materials per se or in working in larger institutions in a "top down" fashion. (E.g. Perhaps the local JCC or school or synagogue should be producing its own "materials" and these either may or may not be made available for larger dissemination.) This alternative will require

relieving talented teachers from a good part of their work and making consultants available to help them in the curriculum project.

### **Do we have the know-how to implement this option?**

In some areas, such as formal education, yes. In informal education it is unclear what such curriculum should look like and how it should be produced.

### **Is the personnel available?**

In most areas (including writing, producing and implementing curriculum): no.

But this differs among settings and even among the denominations. E.g. There is a shortage of teachers who could implement Hebrew language curriculum in almost all settings; there is a shortage of youth group leaders who could implement curriculum in almost all settings; in Jewish museums there seem to be excellent personnel for implementation of programs, but little personnel for creating curriculum materials for them to implement; there is a great shortage in the non-orthodox world of day school teachers for rabbinic literature (Talmud, Midrash, etc.); there seem to be adequate numbers in supplementary school settings for teaching Jewish holidays, but not prayer or synagogue skills, etc.

There is a shortage of personnel for creating new materials or for training others in use of materials in almost all settings. At the very top of the training ladder there are some people available in Jewish education academic settings who could train future curriculum writers and planners and there are resources in secular education schools that could be put into play here as well.

### **Are the materials available?**

This entire option is connected to this question and as mentioned above it is almost impossible to address in great detail. But a thumbnail sketch:

1) In the supplementary school arena: a good deal is available both from the national organizations and through "curriculum clearing houses" such as NERC at JESNA and the CAJE curriculum bank and from the commercial publishers (such as Behrman House). Some areas are very strong (Jewish holidays); some areas are very weak (teaching Israel); in some areas materials are available but for various reasons have not been effective (teaching Hebrew).

2) In the day school area: much less is available here in almost all subject areas except Hebrew language. Often "curriculum" in day schools simply means handing out a classical text for the class to study. Very little material of any seriousness, however, is available to help teachers teach rabbinic literature in a graded fashion, for example. Yes, there are materials in modern Hebrew; and there are literature books imported from

Israel, but these tend to present problems in the non-Israeli setting. There may be greater potential for adaptation of materials prepared in Israel.

3) For informal settings: recently some materials are starting to become available in the adult education domain. Otherwise very little in the way of materials exists, but there is potential based on programming experience and successes over many years (in youth groups, camps, JCCs, etc.). Some materials exist for specific localities and may not be relevant beyond that setting (e.g. Jewish museums).

4) Early childhood age: very little is available, although there is potential in using/adapting children's literature.

5) Adult: yes, much material exists (books on history, Israel, translations and commentaries on traditional sources, etc.) for the adult student, but very little has been done as *curriculum per se* (i.e. help for the *teachers* of adults), plus very little written material available beyond this formal domain. That is, materials for programs on adult identity, growth, etc. Even though some programs have been successful little has been preserved to help others implement such programs.

6) Family education: some material is available and some programs have been successful in specific localities but have not been turned into curriculum. However, this whole area suffers from vagueness. The term is used loosely, without definition and the goals for curriculum are unclear. Therefore it is hard at present to evaluate what exists and what can exist.

7) Computer and video materials both appropriate for children and of quality are lacking in almost all subject areas. Some video materials are available for adult education, but the full potential as *curriculum* has not yet been tapped.

**Is the physical infrastructure available?**

Not relevant.

**Is institutional support available?**

Yes.

**Is the funding available?**

Generally, not at present.

**Is the political support available?**

Unclear; depends on setting.

**What would the cost be?**

Wide-range: It would include personnel for researching, writing and developing materials; personnel for training teachers in the use of new materials; and the costs for the actual production, testing and distribution of materials. In areas in which existing materials could serve as the basis of curriculum (e.g. adult education), the cost of producing curriculum would be lower than areas in which few materials exist (e.g. early childhood). There are areas in which there is currently debate over how to achieve our goals (Hebrew language) or even what those goals should be (family education) and planning and research in those areas would also entail additional cost.

**How long would it take to implement?**

This is an ongoing activity and some materials could be created fairly rapidly; others would take much longer. All materials would need revision and continuing update.

**How important is this to the field?**

The qualitative and quantitative improvement of curriculum and methods is important for the field of Jewish education, though not a necessary condition.



## **OPTION #16 – TO DEVELOP EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS**

### **DESCRIPTION**

---

#### **What is the target population?**

From 50,000 to several hundred thousand children, ages 2 to 6 years old (depending especially on the extent to which day care programs are developed).

#### **What are the desired outcomes of this option?**

Early childhood programs should:

1. Provide good emotional and interpersonal experiences for children.
2. Impart appropriate knowledge.
3. Encourage the desire by children and their parents to continue participating in Jewish education through the elementary and high-school years.
4. Involve their families in Jewish education.

#### **Do we know if the outcomes can be achieved?**

Yes. Educators and psychologists have agreed that this is a very significant age for educational intervention, and that many important goals (depending on the nature of the educational program) could be attained e.g., language acquisition (Hebrew). We also know that emotional and cognitive experiences during early childhood could have an important effect on future education, and that parents are more involved with their children at this age.

While we know a good deal about early childhood programs, we do not have hard data on whether parents want *Jewish* education for their children in early childhood. In a few areas we are working with assumptions (e.g., that we could recruit and train the appropriate personnel).

#### **Are there alternative ways to achieve these outcomes?**

There are those who suggest that a fresh look be taken at the whole age group, and not only concentrate on existing programs. This might include more extensive use of the media, books, games, parents and family education. We know less about these alternatives and there is almost no infrastructure for their introduction and implementation.

#### **Do we have the know-how to implement this option?**

We have some and what is missing could probably be acquired.

**Is the personnel available?**

There is a great shortage of qualified well-trained personnel. There are practically no existing training programs in North America for early childhood personnel in Jewish education.

**Are the materials available?**

There is a great shortage of appropriate materials.

**Is the physical infrastructure available?**

Yes.

**Is institutional support available?**

Yes. It will probably be necessary to develop different strategies to increase the support by the different sponsoring agencies, namely, congregations, day schools, JCCs and others.

**Is the funding available?**

For current programs, yes, but not for growth or for the development of staff and materials.

**Is the political support available?**

There is some research that claims that there is a great deal of community support for these programs because of parent interest and general agreement about the potential impact of education for early childhood.

**Is the option timely?**

Yes.

**What needs does this option answer?**

There is evidence that there is a great demand for early childhood programs by both affiliated and less-affiliated parents.

**What benefits could be anticipated?**

1. Increased enrollment in Jewish elementary and high schools (supplementary and day).

2. Increased and more significant programs of family education due to greater ease of recruiting and parents at this time.

3. Greater effectiveness of Jewish schools due to the major motivation of their entering students and the mastery of basic skills and the Hebrew language.

**What would the cost be?**

Salaries are by and large extremely low. We do not know what the cost of expansion — and of raising the quality — upgrading staff, salaries, and preparation of educational materials would involve.

**How long would it take to implement?**

If a decision is taken to work in this area, a plan could be implemented within two years on a small scale. It could then be expanded incrementally.

**How important is this to the field?**

Early childhood education could have a significant impact on the continuing education of children and their families. It is not a necessary condition.

## **OPTION #18 – TO DEVELOP PROGRAMS FOR THE COLLEGE POPULATION**

### **DESCRIPTION**

---

#### **What is the target population?**

The population is the estimated 400,000 Jewish college and university students in North America. Of these, perhaps 100,000 are currently being serviced by Hillel Foundations or other Jewish agencies on campus. Of those not serviced, some choose not to participate though services are available; others are on campuses with no available services.

#### **What kind of programs are currently operating?**

The largest provider of services is the National Hillel Foundation with 100 full foundations and 200 smaller operations. Other organizations also have representation on campus – including UAHC, AIPAC, and UJA. There are activist organizations such as Student Struggle for Soviet Jewry, and houses off-campus such as Chabad House and the bayit project. College students also participate in missions to, and programs in, Israel and organized off-campus study experiences such as the Brandeis-Bardin Institute. There is an extensive network of over 600 on-campus Judaica programs in North America. Some are degree-granting departments with multiple course offerings while others may offer only a small number of individual courses.

#### **What are the desired outcomes of this option?**

1. Increase opportunities for college students to identify as Jews, meet other Jews, learn more about Judaism and the Jewish community and develop an adult identity as a Jew.
2. To provide students with opportunities to view the Jewish community as pluralistic and multi-faceted and to learn to live and cooperate with Jews of diverse backgrounds, interests and ideologies.
3. To upgrade and expand the capacity of existing programs to provide for the Jewish needs of students by providing more and better trained personnel and funds for more extensive programming.
4. To make available services on the many campuses where no Jewish services currently exist.

## **CRITERIA**

---

### **Do we know if the outcomes can be achieved?**

We have the informed opinion of several generations of Hillel directors and other professionals on campus as to what works best on campuses to achieve these outcomes. We have little hard data in this area.

### **Are there alternative ways to achieve these outcomes?**

Some suggest a fresh look at the entire college population. Their alternatives include:

1. Much more extensive use of subsidized Israel programs.
2. Extended use of media and arts for on-campus programs and at-home use.
3. More effective use of retreat centers, conferences and summer institutes.
4. More direct servicing by local synagogues, JCCs, federations in home communities and on campus.
5. Better financing of student-run activities and religious groups on campus.

### **Do we have the know-how to implement this option?**

We know something about what it takes to run successful programs and start new ones on campus. We know less about alternative possibilities and how to effectively reach the population not currently serviced by existing programs.

### **Is the personnel available?**

To some extent. Personnel is drawn largely from three sources: rabbis, social or communal workers and professors on campus. Attracting and maintaining full-time professional personnel on the current level requires added funding and training facilities. Attracting, training and retaining full and part-time personnel on a level that would more adequately meet the needs of this population would require a major effort.

### **Are the materials available?**

Yes. There are well-established programs for use with this population. Dissemination of these programs for wider use is often lacking. Availability of new programs — such as more extensive use of media — is limited and needs fuller development.

### **Is the physical infrastructure available?**

While college programming can draw on the physical facilities on the campus, there is much to be improved upon, especially in model programs. In some cases, the acquisition of a Hillel building made a dramatic difference in increasing outreach to students and quality of programs. Alternative off-campus options would sometimes envision acquiring new facilities for possible institutes, conferences and retreats.

### **Is institutional support available?**

Yes. While Bnai Brith is not able to carry alone the burden of full support, local federations and other national groups have lent support. Lacking is support for campuses not located near a Jewish community.

### **Is the funding available?**

Currently funding comes from three sources: national organizations, local federations and indigenous fund-raising. Funding is often at minimal levels and badly needs upgrading. Expansion of programs would certainly entail added funding.

### **Is the political support available?**

Yes, for continued presence on campus; less so for significant upgrading and expansion.

### **Is the option timely?**

As Jewish youth continue to be on campus and face assimilatory pressures, the option is timely.

### **What needs does this option answer?**

1. The students' need for affiliation, growth and acquisition of Jewish knowledge.
2. Parents' need to know their children will continue to experience a Jewish presence when away from home.
3. The community's need for continuity, for not losing its members at this vulnerable time to assimilation and intermarriage.
4. The community's need to have a source of young adults who will think of making a lay or professional commitment to working in the Jewish community.

**What benefits could be anticipated?**

1. A more affiliated, better Jewishly educated young adult population.
2. A population with a greater appreciation for the pluralistic nature of the Jewish community.
3. Minimal services provided to thousands of students who currently are without; more substantial services to thousands who are currently underserved.

**What would the cost be?**

To use Hillel as an example, starting a new Hillel foundation, run at almost minimal level, costs \$50,000 per year. Upgrading a functioning Hillel foundation to the level of a model program requires \$500,000 per year. There are on-going costs for personnel training and development, as well as moderate costs for improving level of programming. Alternative programs add another level of expense. We do not have data on the cost of introducing programs or courses in Judaica on the college campus.

**How long would it take to implement?**

Planning for alternatives and beginning new models requires a 2-3 year period. Upgrading existing programs requires about the same time period. Upgrading the quality of needed personnel could take longer, 5-7 years.

**How important is this to the field?**

Some experts believe the college campus is a crucial battlefield for Jewish education. Others believe college is not an optimal opportunity for reaching young Jews given the nature of the college experience. It is not a necessary condition.

## **OPTION #19 – TO ENHANCE THE USE OF MEDIA AND TECHNOLOGY FOR JEWISH EDUCATION**

### **DESCRIPTION**

---

Media is a broad term that refers to a host of possible means for communicating information to an audience. In this paper we will concentrate on three forms of *visual* media - television, films and videos - and consider their potential uses for Jewish education. Two broad types of uses will be considered: media for home viewing in a family context and media as a means of instruction in a more formal learning environment. In the first we would think of television programs and videos which people would watch in their homes. In the second of using films and videos as part of instructional packages which educators would present in any number of contexts. While these limitations leave out many options which are currently in use (e.g. computer programming), they will allow us some clarity on the complex issues involved in introducing any of the new media into the world of Jewish education.

#### **What is the target population?**

The target population is: (1) any Jewish viewer of television and/or user of home videos; (2) any group of participants in a Jewish educational program that could incorporate these media as part of the program.

The first is the broader of the two populations because it includes not only Jews who affiliate with the community and participate in Jewish educational programs, but also non-affiliated Jews who might watch a Jewish program on television or a video that deals with Jewish content. Secondly, but not insignificantly, this category extends also to non-Jews who might watch the same television programs or videos.

#### **What are the desired outcomes of this option?**

1. To increase exposure to and knowledge of Jewish culture and tradition by providing viewers with programming on a wide variety of Jewish themes – from the holidays to history, calligraphy to cooking.
2. To make Jewish instruction and programming more effective by providing alternative, enlivening means of presenting materials to students and participants.
3. To bring Jewish materials more directly into homes and family life.

### **CRITERIA**

---

#### **Do we know if the outcomes can be achieved?**

We know that high quality Jewish programming on public broadcast television can attract mass audiences, that local programming on cable television can attract smaller,



but consistent audiences and that Jewish film festivals can be popular with college and adult audiences. We know little about the integration of these media into Jewish instruction and programming, and little about the impact of home viewing on Jewish family life.

### **Are there alternative ways to achieve these outcomes?**

Use of these media is thought of as the alternatives to the more traditional means of Jewish education. Experts, however, often point out that the traditional education and media can be seen as complementary to one another in the sense that a good media presentation can augment a classroom discussion; viewing a video drama might stimulate interest in reading more on that subject; or seeing a television documentary on Israel might lead to more involvement in Israel-related activities.

### **Do we have the know-how to implement this option?**

We are only beginning to learn how to use these media for best advantage in Jewish education. While more local communities are learning to use cable television for Jewish programming and are developing media centers to advise on the use of media in schools, JCC's, etc., we still have little know-how in training educators to incorporate media as an integral part of their educational instruction.

### **Is the personnel available?**

There are a wide variety of personnel to be considered, from those who produce the programs or films to those who distribute them to those who present them to groups of learners. On all levels there are more personnel available now - in Israel and in North America - than were available even in the recent past (e.g., media consultants in 24 local communities). However, there are vast gaps in the personnel that would be needed if this option were to be more fully implemented; from writers of materials for educational programs to teacher trainers in the use of media to teachers and curriculum writers who have the time and inclination to learn the skills of incorporating these media into educational instruction.

### **Are the materials available?**

Not to a great extent. There are many very valuable Jewish resources in film and television in Israel and North America that need to be made more commonly available for educational use. There is a great need to create appropriate, quality Jewish programs for the variety of subjects that make up the curriculum of Jewish learning. Even when high-quality media materials are available, their use in an educational setting is only as valuable as the way they are presented and incorporated into a coherent instructional package. We lack instructional packages for use in a variety of educational settings.

### **Is the physical infrastructure available?**

While almost all homes have televisions and most have VCRs, most Jewish educational institutions are sorely lacking in proper facilities and equipment for satisfactory use of these media. How many day or supplementary schools have libraries with good viewing facilities or equipment? How many synagogues or camps are equipped to show quality films or videos?

### **Is the institutional support available?**

While more communities are supporting the cause of cable television, there is not yet comparable support for production of high-level programming for public broadcast television or for development of films or videos for instructional use. Some experts have called for a national educational service that would foster the creation and distribution of high-quality media materials, first for broadcast television and then for re-use on local cable television and in videos created for home or institutional use.

### **Is the funding available?**

No. The production and distribution of high-quality materials are extremely expensive, and with the exception of a few major projects which received foundation support, there are no regular funding sources currently available to carry the expense.

### **Is the political support available?**

As we all become increasingly aware of how the visual media are shaping our general culture and have become a powerful force in the Christian community, the political support seems to be building.

### **Is the option timely?**

Yes.

### **What needs does this option answer?**

1. The need of all Jews to see themselves and their culture well- represented in the media that increasingly shape our society.
2. The need of students on all levels of Jewish education to see the concepts and symbols of Judaism visually represented in ways that expand their understanding of them.
3. The need of educators to have more effective means of capturing the interests of a visually-oriented generation of students.

4. The need of the community to present itself and its interests as powerfully as possible on media that grant broad exposure.

#### **What benefits could be anticipated?**

1. Existing programs in Jewish education could become more effective by increasing interest and involvement of students and families through use of media.

2. Jews who do not participate in educational programs could be exposed in their homes to Jewish content and ideas and possibly be attracted to seek greater communal involvement.

3. More and different people who would not ordinarily be involved as personnel in Jewish education might become resources for Jewish education (academics, statesmen, leaders in industry and business, etc.)

4. Jews and the general public might better understand the religious, cultural and political stances that are vital to Jewish survival via exposure and analysis on these media.

#### **What would the cost be?**

While use of local cable television comes at a low cost, once the community becomes invested in producing high-quality programming and materials, the costs would rise dramatically. There would also be costs (more moderate) for media equipment and facilities, for curriculum development and teacher training.

#### **How long would it take to implement?**

Gaining access to local cable television can be done in a relatively short time. Planning for a major broadcast from start to finish takes several years. Creating adequate facilities for viewing, developing curricular materials and teacher training programs could be undertaken in pilot projects in 1-2 years and be expanded more fully in 3-5 years using currently available media materials.

#### **How important is this to the field?**

While this is not a necessary condition, there are experts who believe that this option is very important to the future of the field because of its potential for both wide exposure and appeal to a generation of students raised on television and the other visual media.

## **OPTION #20 – TO DEAL WITH THE SHORTAGE OF QUALIFIED PERSONNEL FOR JEWISH EDUCATION**

### **DESCRIPTION**

---

To recruit, train and retain sufficient numbers of well qualified, dedicated professionals for all levels and settings of Jewish education. This will require developing the profession of Jewish education.

#### **What is the target population?**

The over 30,000 educators working in formal settings; the professionals working in informal education, early childhood, family education, adult education, and special areas such as curriculum and the media; and the potential educators that could be recruited to fill the needs of growth and development.

#### **What are the desired outcomes of this option?**

1. To recruit sufficient numbers of qualified, dedicated personnel for the many settings and clients of Jewish education.
2. To educate personnel in appropriate institutions and settings and to continue with on-the-job education.
3. To retain qualified and dedicated personnel by empowering them to develop the kind of education to which they are committed.
4. To make available the appropriate salaries and benefits so that educators can enjoy a respectable standard of living.
5. To create status for the profession of Jewish education so that appropriate candidates will be attracted.
6. To introduce and develop other elements that characterize a profession, e.g. a ladder of advancement, collegiality, certification, a body of knowledge and a code of ethics.

### **CRITERIA**

---

#### **Do we know if the outcomes can be achieved?**

There has been very little research done in this area but we are working with some assumptions. Initial efforts to recruit and train outstanding candidates for senior positions have been encouraging.

There have been very few thoughtfully planned approaches to the recruitment of teachers and the training of educators for informal settings. There are those who as-

sume that if educators are empowered, if they can truly effect education and are granted appropriate salaries and status, it would be possible to tap the nascent idealism of many young people and convince them to enter the field of Jewish education. Potential areas for recruitment include fields such as general education, Jewish studies and social work. Outstanding educators have been trained at the graduate schools of education.

Though the training programs (pre-service and in-service) require development, there is a good deal of knowledge available as to how to educate educators.

It is assumed that the profession can only be developed when there is significant community support for Jewish education.

**Are there alternative ways to achieve these outcomes?**

There are no alternatives. Some of the problems might be ameliorated by creative and sophisticated use of paraprofessionals and the media.

**Do we have the know-how to implement this option?**

There are some encouraging beginnings and interesting proposals that require sufficient funding in order to be undertaken.

**Is the personnel available?**

In one sense this criteria is not relevant because the proposed outcome of this option is to recruit and train sufficient personnel for the field of Jewish education. However, there is a need for the personnel to educate educators in the various settings (pre- and in-service). There is a great shortage of professors of Jewish education and teacher trainers. For this purpose it may be possible to recruit some of the faculty from the programs of Jewish studies at universities and Jewish academics from the field of general education.

**Are the materials available?**

Some materials are available; others could be prepared as programs are developed.

**Is the physical infrastructure available?**

At present, yes. As training programs are developed and new ones established there may be a need for additional buildings.

**Is institutional support available?**

There are encouraging first signs that the institutions of higher Jewish learning, colleges of Jewish studies, local federations and some foundations are placing this issue high on their list of priorities.

**Is the funding available?**

There are minimal funds available today. However, it is assumed that if this became a priority for the communal and private sector, sufficient funding would be made available.

**Is the political support available?**

Yes, those who are concerned with Jewish education recognize the serious shortage of appropriate personnel.

**Is the option timely?**

Yes.

**What needs does this option answer?**

Every area of Jewish education requires large numbers of high quality educators.

**What benefits could be anticipated?**

If there were sufficient high quality personnel available for the many settings of Jewish education, they would improve quality, introduce innovative and more effective programs, and most likely, increase the numbers of participants in educational programs.

**What would the cost be?**

Implementing this option will be very expensive. There has been no study or analysis made of the appropriate salary range needed to attract and retain personnel. There is little information about what the cost would be for building the profession, including adding the many positions that are needed such as faculty for the training of educators, developers of educational materials, etc.

**How long would it take to implement?**

Thoughtful experiments could be introduced within a two-year period. This will be an ongoing activity and it can accelerate depending on the commitment of the Jewish community and available funding.

**How important is this to the field?**

To deal with the shortage of qualified personnel for Jewish education is a pre-condition for any significant impact in Jewish education. Experts agree that the educator is

the single most important factor in the process of education. The educator is crucial to the improvement of existing programs, the recruitment of additional clients for education, as well as the introduction of innovative ideas and programs.

It is claimed that outstanding community leaders will become involved in the cause of Jewish education if they believe they can develop a partnership with devoted, qualified personnel.

**OPTION #21 – TO DEAL WITH THE COMMUNITY – ITS LEADERSHIP AND ITS STRUCTURES – AS MAJOR AGENTS FOR CHANGE IN ANY AREA; and**

**OPTION #26 – TO GENERATE SIGNIFICANT ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR JEWISH EDUCATION**

**DESCRIPTION**

---

These two options are closely related and should be treated as a single option.

**What is the target population?**

The target population is the lay and professional leaders who contribute to creating the climate for Jewish education, such as scholars, rabbis, heads of institutions of higher learning, denomination and day school leaders, and the leaders of the American Jewish community who relate to the planning for and financing of Jewish education. The chief organization targets are the local congregations and organizations which are leaders in Jewish education, and local Jewish community federations, particularly in the large and intermediate cities, major Jewish-sponsored foundations, and the national CJF, JWB and JESNA.

**What are the desired outcomes of this option?**

The Commission is committed to being proactive in the effort to improve Jewish education. Specifically, it should attract the highest level of community leadership in order to create a climate which will offer educators greater professional substance, fulfillment and status, and which will attract maximum community support. It should encourage a substantial increase in federation and foundation funding for Jewish education. It should encourage community-wide planning to promote maximum cooperation and coordination between formal and informal Jewish education.

**CRITERIA**

---

**Do we know if the outcomes can be achieved?**

We believe that there can be major achievements, because of the widespread concern for Jewish continuity and the improved climate for Jewish education; the impetus for forward movement which will be generated by the Commission and by local committees on Jewish education; and the availability of substantially increased community financial resources which could be made available for this purpose.



**Are there alternative ways to achieve these outcomes?**

The alternative to an aggressive program now would likely be much slower improvement. The purpose of pursuing the community and financing options is to speed up the desired improvements in Jewish education.

**Do we have the know-how to implement this option?**

We know how to organize the community to carry out the purposes of this option. There are good opportunities for collaborative action and there are organizations through which our message can be transmitted and actions taken.

**Is the personnel available?**

The necessary personnel is available in the lay and professional leadership of the Commission, of the federation movement, of the Jewish sponsored foundations, and of the CJF, JESNA and JWB, and in the leadership of organizations currently engaged in formal and informal Jewish education.

**Are the materials available?**

This question is not applicable.

**Is the physical infrastructure available?**

Not applicable.

**Is institutional support available?**

Yes, in the Jewish community federations, the Jewish-sponsored foundations, the national Jewish agencies, and the agencies engaged in Jewish education.

**Is the funding available?**

The obvious purpose of this option is to see that the necessary funding become available. Funding is potentially available in the form of federation and foundation endowments, and possibly in re-allocation of annual federation budgets.

**Is the political support available?**

Jewish leaders understand that the continuity of the Jewish people and of the Jewish community of North America depends greatly upon major improvement in Jewish education. This sentiment should lead to recognition of the need for substantially greater support for Jewish education. Some persons believe that adequate political support is not yet available, and this may be true in some communities.

**Is the option timely?**

This is the best time in our generation to pursue this option. There is widespread concern for constructive Jewish continuity and the preservation of the Jewish value system. In the past year or two, there have emerged comprehensive committees to plan for improved Jewish education in at least nine communities, committees which could be vehicles through which to follow up on the Commission's findings and recommendations.

**What needs does this option answer?**

This option is basic to carrying out the whole purpose of the Commission to ensure Jewish continuity through a vastly improved system of Jewish education.

**What benefits could be anticipated?**

A general and major improvement in the Jewish education product of the Jewish community.

**What would the cost be?**

It is very difficult to give a specific figure. However, it is clear that the cost will be high, perhaps on the order of doubling the community's investment in Jewish education rather than modest increases.

**How long would it take to implement?**

Some of the improvements can be accomplished within a few years after the Commission reports. Substantial improvement should be realized in a 5-10 year period.

**How important is this to the field?**

It is crucial to the purpose of the Commission. Without a commitment by community leadership and greatly increased financing, the recommendations of the Commission will be simply one more study of Jewish education which makes good reading but has little result. On the other hand, real community leadership commitment and substantially increased financing can make a major impact on the Jewish education product and on its positive influence for Jewish continuity.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In addition to the commissioners who graciously gave of their time and expertise through interviews or written correspondence, the following people have assisted in various aspects of the preparation of these materials.

Dr. Robert Abramson	Rabbi Richard Israel
Prof. Walter Ackerman	Dr. Leora Isaacs
Prof. Hannan Alexander	Mr. Jonathan Kestenbaum
Rabbi Alan Arian	Prof. Joseph Lukinsky
Mr. Michael Brooks	Dr. Zeev Mankowitz
Dr. Barry Chazan	Dr. Nehama Moshieff
Prof. Burton Cohen	Mr. Menachem Revivi
Prof. Steven M. Cohen	Dr. David Resnick
Prof. James Coleman	Ms. Sharon Rivo
Prof. Aryeh Davidson	Mr. Leonard Rubin
Rabbi Lavey Derby	Rabbi William Rudolph
Dr. Miriam Feinberg	Prof. Israel Scheffler
Rabbi Edward Feld	Mr. Don Scher
Mr. Sol Greenfield	Mr. Barry Shrage
Prof. Samuel Heilman	Prof. Lee Shulman
Ms. Debbie Hirschman	Mr. Allan Teperow
Mr. Alan Hoffmann	Dr. Moshe Waldoks
Dr. Barry Holtz	Ms. Susan Wall
Prof. Michael Inbar	Dr. Ron Wolfson
Mr. Avraham Infeld	Staff of the Center for Modern Jewish Studies, Brandies University

MINUTES  
COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA  
AUGUST 1, 1988  
AT UJA/FEDERATION OF JEWISH PHILANTHROPIES  
NEW YORK CITY  
10:30 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.

Attendance

Commissioners: Morton L. Mandel, Chairman, Mona Ackerman, Mandell Berman, Jack Bieler, Charles Bronfman, John Colman, Maurice Corson, Lester Crown, David Dubin, Joshua Elkin, Eli Evans, Max Fisher, Robert Hiller, David Hirschhorn, Ludwig Jesselson, Henry Koschitzky, Mark Lainer, Norman Lamm, Seymour Martin Lipset, Haskel Lookstein, Robert Loup, Florence Melton, Donald Mintz, Lester Pollack, Charles Ratner, Esther Leah Ritz, Harriet Rosenthal, Alvin Schiff, Ismar Schorsch, Daniel Shapiro, Peggy Tishman, Isadore Twersky, Bennett Yanowitz

Policy Advisors and Staff: David Ariel, Perry Davis, Seymour Fox, Annette Hochstein, Stephen Hoffman, Virginia Levi, Arthur Naparstek, Joseph Reimer, Arthur Rotman, Carmi Schwartz, Henry Zucker

Guest: Stephen Solender

Not Present: David Arnow, Stuart Eizenstat, Irwin Field, Alfred Gottschalk, Arthur Green, Irving Greenberg, Carol Ingall, Sara Lee, Matthew Maryles, Harold Schulweis, Isaiah Zeldin

---

I. Introductory Remarks

Mr. Mandel called the meeting to order at 10:30. He thanked UJA/Federation of Jewish Philanthropies for its hospitality and introduced the organization's President and Commission member Peggy Tishman. Mrs. Tishman welcomed the commissioners and indicated her pride at having the UJA/Federation host this opening meeting. She indicated that the 130 agencies encompassed by UJA/Federation included many whose principal goal is Jewish identity and education. Likewise the thousands of volunteers in the UJA/Federation network often devote many of their working hours to the cause of Jewish education and outreach, be it via educational or social service projects. Mrs. Tishman offered her best wishes for a productive meeting and expressed her belief that all were embarking on a most worthwhile initiative.

Mr. Mandel explained that the Commission is composed of 44 members who are drawn from the highest ranks of lay, scholarly and professional leadership in North America. It includes leaders of organizations and foundations, scholars, educators, rabbis and heads of institutions of higher learning. It is genuinely pluralistic in its composition and represents a variety of outlooks in the Jewish community today. It represents the opportunity to join together the communal and private sector that is concerned with a meaningful Jewish continuity.

The formation of the Commission represents a partnership between the Mandel Associated Foundations, the Jewish Education Service of North America (JESNA) and JWB in cooperation with the Council of Jewish Federations (CJF). Now that it has been convened, the Commission truly belongs to its members who will direct and guide it.

The chairman indicated his hope that the Commission will bring about a significant change in how the Jewish communal enterprise conducts itself in the field of Jewish education and, consequently, will help reverse the negative trend of diminishing Jewish involvement and commitment. He suggested that the outcome of the Commission could be specific policy guidelines which will be of help to various funding sources including federations and foundations in allocating resources to Jewish education. These recommendations are intended to be practical, replicable and have a great likelihood of success and impact throughout the field. He stressed that the priorities would be determined by the commissioners and expressed hope that different funding sources would agree to support various projects recommended by the Commission. He stated his expectation that the duration of the Commission would be 18-24 months and would involve 4-5 meetings of the full Commission. There may be additional smaller working groups to facilitate the greatest possible interaction among Commissioners.

Mr. Mandel described the preparation for this meeting which included a set of interviews conducted individually with almost every commissioner. The Commission thus begins with a sense of "what's on peoples' minds." While there was no absolute consensus on any one key element, six central topics did emerge:

- A. The People Who Educate: There is a clear need for many more qualified, well-trained and motivated professionals in formal and informal education with appropriate salary, status and empowerment and a clear path for career advancement. There were divergent views, however, on the proper approach to the training of educators.
- B. The Clients of Education: Who are they? What do they want and need? The interviews brought to the fore a concern about our lack of data in this area. A significant number of commissioners stressed the needs and opportunities of early-childhood, secondary school, college, singles, family and adult education.
- C. The Setting of Education: Commissioners noted the importance of informal education and suggested integration of formal and informal settings. There were differing views about the role of the supplementary school and the centrality of the day school. The need for more resources past bar and bat mitzvah--as enrollments fall off sharply--was raised.

- D. The Methods of Education: New forms of teaching and technology should be introduced. This could be especially effective at the family level.
- E. The Economics of Education: Some commissioners spoke of the high cost of meaningful reform. Others mentioned the need for "venture capital."
- F. The Community: Leadership and Structures: There is a need to recruit more dedicated lay leaders and to create communal/educational/synagogue networks and consortia. There was divergence on whether existing institutions or new mechanisms merit increased levels of support.

II. Open Commission Discussion: Setting Forth the Issues

The following is a distillation and summary by topic area of the open Commission discussion:

- A. Personnel and the profession of Jewish education: The issues of professionalization were considered, including the recruitment, training, retention and advancement of educators as well as the status, salaries and benefits that educators receive. Institutions for educator training were regarded as of primary concern.

It was noted that excellence in Jewish education is the result of the quality of the personnel involved. It was suggested that salary, fringe benefits and status issues are a high priority. Some commissioners felt that improving the salary and status of Jewish educators should be done prior to improving the training and training institutions for educators. If salary and status improve, recruitment for training programs would be easier. However, some suggested that professionalization is not necessarily the solution for the personnel of the supplementary school (e.g. recruiting adult learners as teachers), and idealism should not be overlooked in any recruitment program. Some commissioners emphasized the importance of upgrading the present personnel. Jewish College faculty might serve as role models.

Others noted that the discussion about personnel should consider many other dimensions, including: the complex working conditions of teachers, the capacity of educators to work productively with lay boards, the role of the community in hiring teachers and in encouraging promising high school students to enter the field after college.

- B. Students and other participants/clients in Jewish education programs: There is a clear sense of important market groups including early childhood, high school, college-age, family and adult populations, with relatively little data available about them on which to base sound analysis and judgment.

Commissioners recommended increased attention to several sensitive intervals in the formation of Jewish identity including the pre-school, adolescent and young adult periods.

Commissioners noted that appropriate funding and better research must be devoted to learning more about the attitudes of North American Jewry to Jewish education, that examples of successes and failures in Jewish education should be documented, and that much could be learned by introducing an historical perspective. Examples should be analyzed to explain the reasons for success or failure in Jewish educational endeavors.

- C. The settings in which the enterprise of Jewish education takes place: These include the supplementary school, day school, community centers, youth movements, summer camps, and Israel programs. Each poses unique challenges and opportunities which should be explored.

Regarding day schools, one commissioner expressed concern about the civic and societal implications of encouraging universal enrollment in day schools, while another thought this offered no threat to civic virtue.

In discussing supplementary schools, commissioners noted that many of these schools are weak and need to be reformed. It was suggested that some schools ought to be consolidated into larger units, that the issue of competition between these schools and other afterschool activities must be considered, and that the special needs of smaller Jewish communities must be taken into account.

It was recognized that we cannot afford to overlook any setting that impacts large numbers of Jewish young people. Day schools continue to grow in numbers and support. Trends will lead to a time in the near future when close to 20 percent of all Jewish children in North America will have had a day school experience. In light of the majority participation in supplementary schools, careful attention must be paid to their special problems. The campus experience is particularly significant since 85 percent of our young people attend college.

The centrality of Israel for shaping Jewish identity was emphasized. Israel provides opportunities for bringing young people into the Jewish educational system and for forming new and equal partnerships between Israelis and Americans and person-to-person contacts, for example, through high school twinning programs. The success of year-long study abroad programs in Israel was noted. The problem of the quality of educational programs offered in Israel was raised.

There was extensive discussion regarding services to college youth. Some commissioners felt that Hillel was underfunded and required greater support. Others felt that we should not rely solely on colleges to provide "second chance" Jewish education and that we should place greater emphasis on reaching young adults living in the community.

- D. New methodologies: The role of new technologies including video and computers is still in the early stage of development and application.

The need to explore the use of video in Jewish education was raised in light of the spread of VCRs in many Jewish homes and the success of recent programs including Civilization and the Jews, SHOAH, and Shalom Sesame. Questions about the applicability and effectiveness of this medium within the classroom were raised. It was suggested that this medium is especially effective among pre-schoolers and relatively cost-effective for the size of the audience which can be reached.

- E. The economics of Jewish education: There is a need for factual information about present expenditures for Jewish education in order to explore the relationship between improving existing educational programs and financing the reforms in Jewish education.

- F. The involvement of the community in Jewish education: There is a need to involve high-level leadership in Jewish education and to consider whether existing structures are adequate or new structures are needed.

It was noted that seven North American communities have already established local commissions to explore how to promote Jewish continuity through educational change. The importance of recognizing that a great deal of work is currently being done in the field was also noted.

Commissioners stated that lay leadership development in Jewish education is a high priority, that relations with other organizations should be cultivated (e.g. Conference for the Advancement of Jewish Education [CAJE], Association for Jewish Studies [AJS], and the



National Foundation for Jewish Culture), and that national data on lay leaders involved in Jewish education is needed.

The Commission has an important role to play in elevating the status of the profession of Jewish communal education. It was noted that the center movement, for example, can play an educational support role vis a vis college students and young singles.

A number of commissioners identified issues which are quite relevant but do not fall within a particular category. One commissioner stated that Jewish survival is unquestionably guaranteed, the only issue is who and how many will survive. He went on to note that this Commission needs vision and a clear set of priorities. Our goal should be to "stamp out indifference to Jewish values and expose every Jew to the mystery, drama and romance of Jewish history and civilization."

Another commissioner pointed out that our concerns about Jewish survival rates come at a time of unprecedented success in Jewish scholarship. There are today in Israel and North America more Jewish books and other publications being issued than there were in Europe at the height of the so-called "Golden Age of Polish Jewry." Yet evidently thousands and thousands of Jews are untouched by the drama and ideas of Judaism.

The importance of communications, public relations and marketing to various publics was noted. Another commissioner emphasized that the Commission should guide the priorities and funding policy of the MAF.

The chairman asked the lay leaders of CJF, JESNA and JWB to make comments on the work of the Commission from their organizations' perspectives:

Mr. Mandell Berman

CJF is happy to have assisted in the early stages of this Commission and stands ready to offer added support to make this private/communal partnership succeed. Mr. Berman made specific mention of the resources of the Jewish Data Bank which assembles significant demographic data concerning numerous Jewish communities in North America.

Mr. Berman suggested that the Commission proceed quickly to action-oriented activities and that this occur through an assessment and replication of successful approaches in various communities. He also urged a close tie to grass roots education--particularly as represented by CAJE (Coalition for the Advancement of Jewish Education).

Mr. Donald Mintz

The JWB's Commission to maximize Jewish education in the Jewish community centers was based on the assumption that a variety of formal and informal education and other activities could promote Jewish continuity. JWB pursued this course because it views the furtherance of Jewish life and culture as its ultimate purpose.

Mr. Mintz expressed hope that the Commission would succeed at its mission. The very act of successfully convening such a diverse group was reason enough for optimism.

Mr. Bennett Yanowitz

JESNA is proud to be a co-sponsor of this Commission. As a planning and support group, JESNA is able to help identify successful practices and join in the search for new approaches. Mr. Yanowitz supported the opinion that new funds, greater lay leadership interest and a broad group of stakeholders could take recent gains in the area of Jewish education and bring wide support to the work of the Commission.

III. Overview of Data Related to Jewish Education Offered by Joseph Reimer

Mr. Mandel introduced Dr. Joseph Reimer, a consultant to the Commission and Professor of Jewish Communal Studies at Brandeis University.

Dr. Reimer presented an overview of data related to Jewish education in North America including total population of Jewish children and percentages enrolled in supplementary and day schools as these have changed over the past 20 years, numbers of schools and personnel in the field, numbers of enrollees in informal educational programs and in training programs in Jewish education and salary figures for professionals in the field. These figures are aggregates of national data and do not reflect regional differences. In many cases what is most striking is what we do not know - such as enrollment figures for college programs or adult education.

The enrollment figures indicate that a majority of Jewish children of school age are not enrolled in any formal program. Yet, other demographic studies indicate that when surveyed, Jews report that 60 to 80 percent have participated in some form of Jewish educational programming at some point in their life. We do not know what programs or what points in their lives were indicated.

There is a vast discrepancy between the numbers of positions available in the field of Jewish education and the number of students currently studying in formal programs of Jewish education.

Commissioners requested reexamination of the enrollment figures in educator training programs, a breakdown of supplementary school enrollment by hours of instruction offered by the respective schools, figures for adult education and data on the scope and profile of lay involvement.

IV. Search for Themes Offered by Bennett Yanowitz

A preliminary summary of the Commission proceedings was offered in the early afternoon by Mr. Yanowitz. He noted: The mood of the group is one of optimism mixed with caution. The issue of Jewish continuity is timely and needs significant new support. At the same time priority areas should be selected, for resources dare not be diluted in an attempt to do too much at once.

Personnel needs are at the heart of the problem. Creative outreach programs are needed to tap new sources of educators. Once recruited--the enhancement of the profession (higher salaries as well as the empowerment of educators) will promote retention. On-the-job training and support must supplement the work of established training institutes.

Professional educators must also have the opportunities afforded by career path advancement.

The sentiment of the group is that professionalism and training and growth opportunities are most lacking in supplementary schools--the area of greatest educational contact with young Jews.

He noted no consensus in the area of basic research. Some commissioners considered it a vital task, others said we should focus on successful programs and how to replicate them. Other areas of concern and opportunity included campus and singles populations. The group felt a clear need to employ resources readily available including effective Israel experiences and media technology. Finally, the need to identify new lay leaders was emphasized as well as the need for effective communitywide networks (JCCs, synagogues, Federations, BJE's, schools, camps, etc.).

V. Discussion on Strategies

Different strategies were discussed during the course of the day.

- A. Specific focus: Several commissioners suggested that we choose a limited number of problems or areas and concentrate our efforts on these. For example, we might choose to concentrate on a specific client group, a specific method, a given institutional setting. Such an approach might advocate dealing with personnel, early childhood, the media, the supplementary school.

- B. Comprehensive focus: Other commissioners suggested that we first develop a comprehensive approach to the major issues facing Jewish Education. Such an approach views the Commission as undertaking to begin the improvement of Jewish Education based on a comprehensive plan. This comprehensive plan could be guided by different principles. One might address the problem through client groups by age (e.g. early childhood, elementary school, high school, college students, young adults, family). Another approach might address it through themes (e.g. the institutions that educate, the personnel of education, the methods of education, Israel experiences, etc.). A comprehensive approach would make it possible for different funding agencies and institutions to undertake responsibility or sponsorship for a segment of the plan. In either case, priorities would have to be agreed upon so that the workplan would be feasible.

For both the comprehensive and the specific approach there were commissioners who felt that our efforts should begin and possibly even concentrate on improving what already works. Others felt that a more open, possibly revolutionary approach was called for.

#### VI. Organization of Commission

Mr. Mandel indicated that it was the job of the commissioners to give direction to this new undertaking. He anticipated four or five meetings over the next 18-24 months. The next Commission meeting would take place in New York on December 13, 1988 from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. In advance of that meeting and based on the discussions of this first meeting and follow-up deliberations, a set of options and a Commission workplan would be circulated.

Mr. Mandel noted that a small group of policy advisors will develop the options for the Commission's consideration. Staff and consultants are available to lend support to this process. They will be supervised by Dr. Arthur Naparstek, the Commission Director. However, no final process or substantive decisions will be made without the involvement and consent of the Commission. Some of the work of the Commission might be undertaken through smaller task forces or work groups. Recommendations on next steps will be circulated to commissioners for comments.

Dr. Lamm delivered D'var Torah and the meeting was concluded at 4 p.m.

COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA

AGENDA

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1988

10:00 A.M. TO 4:00 P.M.

UJA FEDERATION OF JEWISH PHILANTHROPIES OF NEW YORK  
130 EAST 50TH STREET  
NEW YORK, NEW YORK

- |                               |                      |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Welcome and Introduction   | Morton L. Mandel     |
| 2. Progress Report            | Annette Hochstein    |
| 3. Discussion                 |                      |
| 4. Lunch                      |                      |
| 5. Continuation of Discussion |                      |
| 6. Future Plans               | Morton L. Mandel     |
| 7. Concluding Comment         | Rabbi Ismar Schorsch |