



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
6

13 December 1988 Meeting. Minutes, January 1989.

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

Seymour Fox

TO: Annette Hochstein

NAME

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

FROM: Arthur J. Naparstek

NAME

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

DATE: January 9, 1989

REPLYING TO

YOUR MEMO OF: _____

SUBJECT: Draft of Minutes from 12/13 Commission Meeting

Attached is a rough draft of the minutes from the 12/13 Commission meeting, prepared by David Ariel and Ginny Levi. It is not in final form, and may contain some typographical errors. But in the interest of saving time, I am sending them to you as they are.

I look forward to discussing the draft with you during our meeting tomorrow (Tuesday) at 10:00 a.m.

IN-TER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

NORTH AMERICAN COMMISSION, ETC.
HEADING MATERIAL

I. Introductory Remarks by Chairman, Morton Mandel:

A. Mr. Mandel convened the meeting at 10:15 A.M. He noted that the attendance for the meeting indicated the importance of the subject to the Commissioners. He welcomed three new Commission members (Ronald Appleby, Joseph Gruess and Lionel Shipper).

Mr. Mandel reviewed several key points about the Commission process: It is a partnership between a private family foundation, JESNA, JWB, CJF and among key lay and professional leaders of the Jewish community in North America. He reiterated his resolve that the Commission will belong to the Commissioners. He also noted that all Commissioners share his commitment to realizing the goals of the Commission.

B. The Chairman then reviewed developments since the beginning of the Commission:

1. The results of interviews conducted by Commission staff with Commissioners determined the agenda for the August first meeting. The Commissioners determined the major areas in Jewish education which the Commission will explore.

2. The Commissioners defined Jewish education in its broadest sense to include formal and informal education among all age groups and in a broad range of settings.

3. The first meeting and subsequent interviews with the Commissioners emphasized the need to sharpen and narrow the focus of the Commission's agenda by selecting areas of intervention in which systemic and fundamental change is possible and can be realistically achieved. The goal of the Commission is to have a major impact upon the field of Jewish education, to create a process which can facilitate further change beyond the life of the Commission and to fund new opportunities through partnerships of public and private Jewish sources. The Commission is expected to reach its conclusion in the spring of 1990.

4. After the first meeting, the staff was charged with the responsibility to respect the interests of the individual Commissioners, to be as inclusive as possible of the interests of all Commissioners, to help define and coalesce the wishes of the Commission as a whole and to keep the policy options open for the Commissioners to decide.

5. The Mandel family has made a substantial financial commitment to invest strategically in Jewish education. For example, the Cleveland Commission on Jewish Continuity, a model of a broad-based effort to move Jewish education higher on the community's agenda, involved a partnership between the federation, the congregations, schools, agencies, other educational institutions and private or family foundations. The Cleveland Commission recommended a broad plan for change and improvement and a major increase in funding through campaign and foundation sources. There are nine similar community efforts underway in North America today.

C. Mr. Mandel then reviewed the agenda and the background materials prepared for the Commissioners. He complimented the staff on the preparation of the "options papers." The materials were prepared by the staff in consultation with Senior Policy Advisers, outside experts and Commissioners.

II. Presentation by Annette Hochstein, Research Consultant to the Commission:

A. Ms. Hochstein reviewed the research method and analysis conducted by Commission staff in preparing the options papers, the key challenges to the Commission, and the results of the research and analysis.

B. After the first meeting, the need to narrow the focus and scope of the Commission became apparent if there is to be a major impact on the field of Jewish education. The staff then prepared materials which explored the ideas raised by the Commissioners. These materials would then serve as the basis for Commissioners' determinations.

C. Ms. Hochstein then reviewed the principles which guided the research:

1. Commissioners suggestions were formulated into 26 options for improving Jewish education.

2. Extensive communication about these options were conducted among Commissioners, staff, policy advisors and outside experts from the field and academia.

3. Consideration was given to what is involved in an "option" for improving Jewish education. These elements include: [a] the personnel needed to implement the option; [b] the clients served in this area; [c] the settings where this option is implemented; [d] the curriculum and educational content; and [e] the community environment, lay support, structures and funding available to realize this option.

JAN - 9-89 MON 14:28 COLLEGE JEWISH STUDIES 3 P. 64

4. Each of the 26 options was explored in light of the 5 categories of analyzing an option.

5. Criteria were developed for determining which options were most important because many more options were identified than could be considered within the scope of the Commission. These criteria included:

- [a] feasibility;
- [b] benefits which would accrue;
- [c] cost;
- [d] time required for implementation; and
- [e] importance.

6. A distinction was made between "necessary" and "sufficient" options. An option is necessary if it is indispensable to implementing the other options. The necessary options are those which are preconditions which enable other options to be implemented. An option is sufficient if it must be present for improvement in that area to occur but is not the only or indispensable element. The latter options might also be considered "programmatic."

7. Each option was analyzed according to the five elements, the five criteria and the categories of "necessity" or "sufficiency" [that is whether it is a "precondition" or a "programmatic" option]. Option papers were drafted which explored each option accordingly. These documents are preliminary and require further refinement. They reflect the current state of knowledge and opinion about options in Jewish education and provide a basis for setting Commission priorities.

8. The differentiation between preconditions and programmatic options proved useful. The preconditions or enabling options are necessary to implement the programmatic options. Each programmatic option is important; there is no objective basis for selecting which among them is more important. Therefore, it appears that the preconditions/enabling options should be treated prior to, and in order to facilitate, the programmatic options.

9. Three enabling options emerged:

[a] Personnel: the development of a sufficient cadre of trained educational leaders who are able to implement the programmatic options;

[b] Community: the creation of a community climate which supports the enterprise and develops structures and funding appropriate to the goals; and

[c] Leadership: the involvement of high-level leadership which can foster a climate of change and accomplishment.

[Options [b] and [c] were combined in one option paper referred to as "community/funding/leadership".]

10. The conclusion of the research process is that the two enabling options (Personnel and Community/Funding/Leadership) are necessary preconditions for the implementation of any of the programmatic options.

III. Discussion

Discussion about the research method, analysis and option papers continued until the adjournment for lunch.

Support was generally expressed for the method of first looking at enabling options in view of the fact that all programmatic initiatives come back to the underlying issues of personnel and community/funding/leadership . Some Commissioners felt that the broad, overarching concerns for personnel and community should be narrowed according to focused programmatic areas. Those areas of greatest programmatic importance should help define which areas of personnel need the greatest attention. This would imply a need to prioritize programmatic options as a guide to focusing the enabling option for personnel. Several commissioners felt that the programmatic options are of greater immediacy and importance.

Regarding personnel as a priority, it was noted that there is not sufficient knowledge about what it means to train personnel in Jewish education. It was noted that other professions approached the issue of training through demonstration projects, developing one institution well so that others would follow. There may also be effective models in place today which should be analyzed and replicated. Research on case studies of successes or failures in this area should inform the option papers on the enabling conditions. An emphasis on professionalization of personnel and the importance of personnel for elementary education were emphasized.

Regarding community/leadership as a priority, the need for a Jewishly-educated lay leadership and the importance of the role of leaders in changing the climate for Jewish education were raised. Concern about the infrastructure and institutions providing Jewish education was raised. There was disagreement over whether there needs to be a unified vision or interdenominational ideology uniting the different strains of Jewish life as an ingredient for change.

The issue of research and evaluation was discussed. Some argued for the value of research and analyses of successes and failures as necessary to the process. Another stated that research is not a major issue due to the critical condition of the education enterprise. Others recommended that evaluation criteria be added to the options papers. A paper articulating a vision of the future of Jewish education was urged. Other models for the Commission work were mentioned. These included commissioning one or more experts from within or outside Jewish education to develop a prospectus for the future.

Mr. Mandel noted that while the enabling conditions may have the greatest impact, the programmatic options are important. He expressed the hope that the Commission will ultimately move to the programmatic options so that individual Commissioners and funding sources can pursue these with success.

- After lunch, Mr. Mandel summarized the earlier discussion. He observed that there was agreement about first exploring the preconditions/enabling conditions even as serious questions were raised about remaining close to a programmatic focus. He indicated that the Commission would, therefore, first explore the issues of Personnel and Community/Funding/Leadership.

He noted the need to maintain a pluralistic vision of the goals of Jewish education and acknowledged the importance of the programmatic emphasis. He stressed the need to know what works by publicizing case studies of best practice models even as Jewish education is examined critically.

In response to a question, the Chairman indicated that there will be ample room for Commissioners to pursue the areas of their own concern even as the Commission first explores the two enabling options.

IV. Mr. Mandel then introduced Dr. Seymour Fox, Consultant to the Commission, to review the option paper on personnel.

Dr. Fox explained that the challenge raised by the morning discussion is to keep the concern for a programmatic emphasis as the standard for exploring the enabling options. The solution to the problem of personnel in Jewish education requires that the critical issues of recruitment, training, retention and profession-building be addressed in an integrated approach. He pointed to the lack of sustained or thoughtful efforts at recruitment. Regarding training, he noted that several new ideas have been proposed but these are limited by funding and the shortage of education faculty. For example, while there are more than 1,000 professors of Judaica in North America, there are no more than 20 professors of Jewish education. He suggested that new and responsible program initiatives should not wait for further research studies. In the area of retention, the issues of salary and status are important. To these must be added the issues of burnout, empowerment [teachers having a role in schools' decision-making] and career advancement [including horizontal advancement for teacher specialists]. He posed the suggestion of a series of demonstration centers for personnel development, each doing something different, as a possible approach.

In discussing the scope of the personnel crisis, several views were expressed: While some felt that top management [i.e.: the school director] was the nerve center or critical area which should be addressed first, others felt that teachers were a higher priority. Others cautioned against an either/or approach in favor of finding the right "persons" for a variety of educational roles including professional and avocational teachers, family educators and others. The "lead-teacher" concept, recommended by the Carnegie Commission, might help alleviate the either/or dilemma by filling in the gaps caused by a shortage of school directors. Other ideas including laboratory schools, mentorships, peer coaching and field-based training were suggested. The

JAN 9 '89 14:36 COLLEGE JEWISH STUDIES 6
problem of teacher shortages in smaller communities which do not have the resources of the larger communities should be considered.

Others felt that innovation was not always necessary. Developing and upgrading existing programs is an alternative to innovation.

The following issues concerning professionalization were discussed: The example of the recent growth of Judaic studies as a profession might illustrate what might make Jewish education attractive as a profession. It was suggested that lessons could be drawn from this analogy. Judaic scholars can also benefit this enterprise by bringing their work into Jewish communities through summer institutes and resident scholar programs. Regarding salaries, some felt that higher salaries, benefits and possibilities for professional development were primary. The example of how the shortage of day school teachers led to higher salaries in this area illustrates how progress can be made. Others, citing the experience of communities such as Toronto, indicated that higher salaries alone, without improved recruitment, are not sufficient. Others felt that salaries for teachers will never reach the levels of other professions and, so, the field will always be at some disadvantage. More full-time positions were recommended. On the other hand, better use of new technology was suggested to reduce dependence on a large number of teachers.

The suggestions of a national endowment fund for salary enhancement for teachers and a pension or menu-based benefits program for Jewish educators, similar to the TIAA-CREF program for university faculty, were made. It was also suggested that while empowerment of teachers could pose a threat to administrators, it was a goal which could be achieved through the professionalization of the teaching field.

A number of broad issues for the field were discussed: Training programs should reflect the reality of the Jewish community, the nature of the family and the denominational outlook. Such programs should also take into account new definitions of Jewish educators including family education and the need for training in management and human resource development. Programs should consider the implications of eliminating the barriers between formal and informal education and between preschool and elementary school. The role of Israel in training personnel was raised.

V. Mr. Mandel then introduced Mr. Henry Zucker, Consultant to the Mandel Associated Foundations, to discuss the issue of Community/Funding/Leadership.

Mr. Zucker noted that these related issues were synthesized in one option paper: "Community Organization for Jewish Education: Leadership, Finance, Structure". This precondition or enabling option is significant in a number of areas: Greater involvement of high level lay leadership is indispensable to changing the climate in the Jewish community towards support for Jewish education. Since funding drives the system of Jewish education, innovation depends on a major increase

in funding. Mr. Zucker referred to the growth of Jewish community endowment funds and family foundations as possible sources for new funding. He also noted that the structure and networks of Jewish educational institutions and agencies could be reexamined in light of the new situation. This reflects a desire throughout the Jewish community to do more in Jewish education and to get better value for the money spent.

The issue of the community climate was discussed from several points of view. Some felt that Jewish learning should be a criterion for leadership. Examples of growth in Jewish leadership education were cited as support for the view that adult Jewish education is instrumental in improving community support for the enterprise. Jewish studies professors and Jewish educators were cited as resources in this area. Others felt that the dissonance between what parents believe and what the schools teach must be addressed. Others noted the lack of grand visions in the manner of Franz Rosenzweig and Martin Buber within Jewish education. Another noted that while identity is an important, measurable and substantive learning should also be goals.

The issue of whether better funding is the primary impetus to progress was discussed. One commissioner related that the large expenditure of funds for Jewish education in Toronto was not sufficient to enable the community reach its goals. Another commissioner questioned whether Toronto's experience is illustrative. He suggested that while Toronto invested more in Jewish education, it did not pay teachers as much as in general education. Other factors or variables might have been at work.

VI. Mr. Mandel thanked Dr. Fox, Mr. Zucker and the Commissioners for their contributions.

He announced that the next meeting will be held June 14, 1989, at UJA/Federation in New York.

The Chairman made the following comments about procedure: The consensus which emerged throughout the meeting supports the approach of exploring the enabling options of Personnel and Community/Funding/Leadership. The Commission is committed to exploring the enabling options without predetermining the outcome. The suggestions of the Commissioners will be considered thoroughly in how to proceed. There have been a variety of suggestions for shaping the next stage in the Commission's work including task forces or other small working groups of Commissioners and other individuals. At the same time, it is important to preserve the ability of the full Commission to reach its decisions. These issues will guide the work of the Commission in the next six months. The Commission staff will remain in close contact with the Commissioners in formulating the next steps.

VII. Rabbi Ismar Schorsch delivered a D'var Torah.

- This stressed that Jewish education strengthens the will of the Jewish people to survive, that the school is the vehicle for Jewish survival, and that the convergence of Jewish intellectual and financial power, evident on this Commission, demonstrates the Jewish will to survive.

Mr. Mandel adjourned the meeting at 4:00 pm.

David S. Ariel

DSA:MINUTES.DOC

NORTH AMERICAN COMMISSION, ETC.
HEADING MATERIAL

I. Introductory Remarks by Chairman, Morton Mandel:

A. Mr. Mandel convened the meeting at 10:15 A.M. He noted that the attendance for the meeting indicated the importance of the subject to the Commissioners. He welcomed three new Commission members (Ronald Appleby, Joseph Gr~~u~~ss and Lionel Shipper).

Mr. Mandel reviewed several key points about the Commission process: It is a partnership between a private family foundation, JESNA, JWB, CJF and among key lay and professional leaders of the Jewish community in North America. He reiterated his resolve that the Commission will belong to the Commissioners. He also noted that all Commissioners share his commitment to realizing the goals of the Commission.

B. The Chairman then reviewed developments since the beginning of the Commission:

1. The results of interviews conducted by Commission staff with Commissioners determined the agenda for the August first meeting. The Commissioners determined the major areas in Jewish education which the Commission will explore.

2. The Commissioners defined Jewish education in its broadest sense to include formal and informal education among all age groups and in a broad range of settings.

3. The first meeting and subsequent interviews with the Commissioners emphasized the need to sharpen and narrow the focus of the Commission's agenda by selecting areas of intervention in which systemic and fundamental change is possible and can be realistically achieved. The goal of the Commission is to have a major impact upon the field of Jewish education, to create a process which can facilitate further change beyond the life of the Commission and to fund new opportunities through partnerships of public and private Jewish sources. The Commission is expected to reach its conclusion in the spring of 1990.

4. After the first meeting, the staff was charged with the responsibility to respect the interests of the individual Commissioners, to be as inclusive as possible of the interests of all Commissioners, to help define and coalesce the wishes of the Commission as a whole and to keep the policy options open for the Commissioners to decide.

5. The Mandel family has made a substantial financial commitment to invest strategically in Jewish education. For example, the Cleveland Commission on Jewish Continuity, a model of a broad-based effort to move Jewish education higher on the community's agenda, involved a partnership between the federation, the congregations, schools, agencies, other educational institutions and private or family foundations. The Cleveland Commission recommended a broad plan for change and improvement and a major increase in funding through campaign and foundation sources. There are nine similar community efforts underway in North America today.

C. Mr. Mandel then reviewed the agenda and the background materials prepared for the Commissioners. He complimented the staff on the preparation of the "options papers." The materials were prepared by the staff in consultation with Senior Policy Advisers, outside experts and Commissioners.

II. Presentation by Annette Hochstein, Research Consultant to the Commission:

A. Ms. Hochstein reviewed the research method and analysis conducted by Commission staff in preparing the options papers, the key challenges to the Commission, and the results of the research and analysis.

B. After the first meeting, the need to narrow the focus and scope of the Commission became apparent if there is to be a major impact on the field of Jewish education. The staff then prepared materials which explored the ideas raised by the Commissioners. These materials would ~~then~~ serve as the basis for Commissioners' determinations.

C. Ms. Hochstein then reviewed the principles which guided the research:

1. Commissioners' suggestions were formulated into 26 options for improving Jewish education.

2. Extensive communication about these options ~~were~~^{were} conducted among Commissioners, staff, policy advisors and outside experts from the field and academia.

3. Consideration was given to what is involved in an "option" for improving Jewish education. These elements include: [a] the personnel needed to implement the option; [b] the clients served in this area; [c] the settings where this option is implemented; [d] the curriculum and educational content; and [e] the community environment, lay support, structures and funding available to realize this option.

4. Each of the 26 options was explored in light of the 5 categories of *for* analyzing an option.

5. Criteria were developed for determining which options were most important because many more options were identified than could be considered within the scope of the Commission. These criteria included:

- [a] feasibility;
- [b] benefits which would accrue;
- [c] cost;
- [d] time required for implementation; and
- [e] importance.

6. A distinction was made between "necessary" and "sufficient" options. An option is necessary if it is indispensable to implementing the other options. The necessary options are those which are preconditions which enable other options to be implemented. An option is sufficient if it must be present for improvement in that area to occur but is not the only or indispensable element. The latter options might also be considered "programmatic."

7. Each option was analyzed according to the five elements, the five criteria and the categories of "necessity" or "sufficiency" [that is whether it is a "precondition" or a "programmatic" option]. Option papers were drafted which explored each option accordingly. These documents are preliminary and require further refinement. They reflect the current state of knowledge and opinion about options in Jewish education and provide a basis for setting Commission priorities.

8. The differentiation between preconditions and programmatic options proved useful. The preconditions or "enabling options" are necessary to implement the programmatic options. Each programmatic option is important; there is no objective basis for selecting which among them is more important. Therefore, it appears that the preconditions/enabling options should be treated prior to, and in order to facilitate, the programmatic options.

9. Three enabling options emerged:

[a] Personnel: the development of a sufficient cadre of trained, educational leaders who are able to implement the programmatic options;

[b] Community: the creation of a community climate which supports the enterprise and develops structures and funding appropriate to the goals; and

[c] Leadership: the involvement of high-level leadership which can foster a climate of change and accomplishment.

[Options [b] and [c] were combined in one option paper referred to as "community/funding/leadership".]

10. The conclusion of the research process is that the two enabling options (Personnel and Community/Funding/Leadership) are necessary preconditions for the implementation of any of the programmatic options.

III. Discussion

Discussion about the research method, analysis and option papers continued until the adjournment for lunch.

Support was generally expressed for the method of first looking at enabling options in view of the fact that all programmatic initiatives come back to the underlying issues of personnel and community/funding/leadership. Some Commissioners felt that the broad, overarching concerns for personnel and community should be narrowed according to focused programmatic areas. Those areas of greatest programmatic importance should help define which areas of personnel need the greatest attention. This would imply a need to prioritize programmatic options as a guide to focusing the enabling option for personnel. Several commissioners felt that the programmatic options are of greater immediacy and importance.

Regarding personnel as a priority, it was noted that there is not sufficient knowledge about what it means to train personnel in Jewish education. It was noted that other professions approached the issue of training through demonstration projects, developing one institution well so that others would follow. There may also be effective models in place today which should be analyzed and replicated. Research on case studies of successes or failures in this area should inform the option papers on the enabling conditions. An emphasis on professionalization of personnel and the importance of personnel for elementary education were emphasized.

Regarding community/leadership as a priority, the need for a Jewishly-educated lay leadership and the importance of the role of leaders in changing the climate for Jewish education were raised. Concern about the infrastructure and institutions providing Jewish education was raised. There was disagreement over whether there needs to be a unified vision or interdenominational ideology uniting the different strains of Jewish life as an ingredient for change.

The issue of research and evaluation was discussed. Some ^{Commissioners} argued for the value of research and analyses of successes and failures as necessary to the process. Another stated that research is not a major issue due to the critical condition of the education enterprise. Others recommended that evaluation criteria be added to the options papers. A paper articulating a vision of the future of Jewish education was urged. Other models for the Commission work were mentioned. These included commissioning one or more experts from within or outside Jewish education to develop a prospectus for the future.

Mr. Mandel noted that while the enabling conditions may have the greatest impact, the programmatic options are important. He expressed the hope that the Commission will ultimately move to the programmatic options so that individual Commissioners and funding sources can pursue these with success.

After lunch, Mr. Mandel summarized the earlier discussion. He observed that there was agreement about first exploring the preconditions/^{through} enabling conditions even as serious questions were raised about remaining close to a programmatic focus. He indicated that the Commission would, therefore, first explore the issues of Personnel and Community/Funding/Leadership.

He noted the need to maintain a pluralistic vision of the goals of Jewish education and acknowledged the importance of the programmatic emphasis. He stressed the need to know what works by publicizing case studies of best practice models even as Jewish education is examined critically.

In response to a question, the Chairman indicated that there will be ample room for Commissioners to pursue ^{time} the areas of their own concern even as the Commission first explores the two enabling options.
while

IV. Mr. Mandel then introduced Dr. Seymour Fox, Consultant to the Commission, to review the option paper on personnel.

Dr. Fox explained that the challenge raised by the morning discussion is to keep the concern for a programmatic emphasis as the standard for exploring the enabling options. The solution to the problem of personnel in Jewish education requires that the critical issues of recruitment, training, retention and profession-building be addressed in an integrated approach. He pointed to the lack of sustained or thoughtful efforts at recruitment. Regarding training, he noted that several new ideas have been proposed but these are limited by funding and the shortage of education faculty. For example, while there are more than 1,000 professors of Judaics in North America, there are no more than 20 professors of Jewish education. He suggested that new and responsible program initiatives should not wait for further research studies. In the area of retention, the issues of salary and status are important. To these must be added the issues of burnout, empowerment [teachers having a role in schools' decision-making] and career advancement [including horizontal advancement for teacher specialists]. He posed the suggestion of a series of demonstration centers for personnel development, each doing something different, as a possible approach.
by Commissioners with a different focus,

In discussing the scope of the personnel crisis, several views were expressed: While some felt that top management [i.e.: the school director] was the nerve center or critical area which should be addressed first, others felt that teachers were a higher priority. Others cautioned against an either/or approach in favor of finding the right "persons" for a variety of educational roles including professional and avocational teachers, family educators and others. The "lead-teacher" concept, recommended by the Carnegie Commission, might help alleviate the either/or dilemma by filling in the gaps caused by a shortage of school directors. Other ^{suggestions} ideas including laboratory schools, mentorships, peer coaching and field-based training were suggested. The

Another problem to be considered is

JAN 14 1985 COLLEGE JEWISH STUDIES 6
problem of teacher shortages in smaller communities which do not have *less*
the resources of *than* the larger communities, should be considered.

Others felt that innovation was not always necessary. Developing and upgrading existing programs is an alternative to innovation.

The following issues concerning professionalization were discussed: The example of the recent growth of Judaic studies as a profession might illustrate what might make Jewish education attractive as a profession. It was suggested that lessons could be drawn from this analogy. Judaic scholars can also benefit this enterprise by bringing their work into Jewish communities through summer institutes and resident scholar programs. Regarding salaries, some felt that higher salaries, benefits and possibilities for professional development were primary. The example of how the shortage of day school teachers led to higher salaries in this area illustrates how progress can be made. Others, citing the experience of communities such as Toronto, indicated that higher salaries alone, without improved recruitment, are not sufficient. Others felt that salaries for teachers will never reach the levels of other professions and, *so, the field will always be at some* disadvantage. More full-time positions were recommended. On the other hand, better use of new technology was suggested to reduce dependence on a large number of teachers.

The suggestions of a national endowment fund for salary enhancement for teachers and a pension or menu-based benefits program for Jewish educators, similar to the TIAA-CREF program for university faculty, were made. It was also suggested that while empowerment of teachers could pose a threat to administrators, it was a goal which could be achieved through the professionalization of the teaching field.

A number of broad issues for the field were discussed: Training programs should reflect the reality of the Jewish community, the nature of the family and the denominational outlook. Such programs should also take into account new definitions of Jewish educators including family education and the need for training in management and human resource development. Programs should consider the implications of eliminating the barriers between formal and informal education and between preschool and elementary school. The role of Israel in training personnel was raised.

V. Mr. Mandel then introduced Mr. Henry Zucker, Consultant to the Mandel Associated Foundations, to discuss the issue of Community/Funding/Leadership.

Mr. Zucker noted that these related issues were synthesized in one option paper: "Community Organization for Jewish Education: Leadership, Finance, Structure". This precondition or enabling option is significant in a number of areas: Greater involvement of high level lay leadership is indispensable to changing the climate in the Jewish community towards support for Jewish education. Since funding drives the system of Jewish education, innovation depends on a major increase

in funding. Mr. Zucker referred to the growth of Jewish community endowment funds and family foundations as possible sources for new funding. He also noted that the structure and networks of Jewish educational institutions and agencies could be reexamined in light of the new situation. This reflects a desire throughout the Jewish community to do more in Jewish education and to get better value for the money spent.

Commissioners discussed
The issue of the community climate ~~was discussed~~ from several ^{view} points of view. Some felt that Jewish learning should be a criterion for leadership. Examples of growth in Jewish leadership education were cited as support for the view that adult Jewish education is instrumental in improving community support for the enterprise. Jewish studies professors and Jewish educators were cited as resources in this area. Others felt that the dissonance between what parents believe and what the schools teach must be addressed. Others noted the lack of grand visions in the manner of Franz Rosenzweig and Martin Buber within Jewish education. Another noted that while identity is ~~an~~ important, measurable and substantive learning should also be goals. *factor? something is missing*

The issue of whether better funding is the primary impetus to progress was discussed. One commissioner related that the large expenditure of funds for Jewish education in Toronto was not sufficient to enable the community reach its goals. Another commissioner questioned whether Toronto's experience is illustrative. He suggested that while Toronto invested more in Jewish education, it did not pay teachers as much as in general education. Other factors or variables might have been at work.

VI. Mr. Mandel thanked Dr. Fox, Mr. Zucker and the Commissioners for their contributions.

Commissioner
He announced that the next meeting will be held June 14, 1989, at UJA/Federation in New York.

The Chairman made the following comments about procedure: The consensus which emerged throughout the meeting supports the approach of exploring the enabling options of Personnel and Community/Funding/Leadership. The Commission is committed to exploring the enabling options without predetermining the outcome. The suggestions of the Commissioners will be considered thoroughly in how to proceed. There have been a variety of suggestions for shaping the next stage in the Commission's work including task forces or other small working groups of Commissioners and other individuals. At the same time, it is important to preserve the ability of the full Commission to reach its decisions. These issues will guide the work of the Commission in the next six months. The Commission staff will remain in close contact with the Commissioners in formulating the next steps.

VII. Rabbi Ismar Schorsch delivered a D'var Torah.

This stressed that Jewish education strengthens the will of the Jewish people to survive, that the school is the vehicle for Jewish survival, and that the convergence of Jewish intellectual and financial power, evident on this Commission, demonstrates the Jewish will to survive.

Mr. Mandel adjourned the meeting at 4:00 pm.

David S. Ariel

DSA:MINUTES.DOC

THE COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION
IN NORTH AMERICA

SECOND MEETING - December 13, 1988

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION 10 MINUTES

A. THANK COMMISSIONERS FOR ATTENDING

B. WELCOME NEW COMMISSIONERS AND THOSE WHO HAVE NOT
ATTENDED AUGUST 1 MEETING.

NEW COMMISSIONERS: RON APPLEBY

JOSEPH GRUSS

LIONEL SCHIPPER

C. I LOOK FORWARD WITH GREAT ANTICIPATION TO THIS - OUR
SECOND MEETING. I KNOW WE ARE ALL PARTICIPATING IN
THIS COMMISSION BECAUSE WE BELIEVE WE CAN INTRODUCE A
NEW VIBRANCY INTO JEWISH EDUCATION. THAT WE CAN FIND
THE WAYS AND MEANS FOR JEWISH EDUCATION TO HELP REVERSE
THE TRENDLINES AND PLAY ITS ROLE IN BUILDING A MEANING-
FUL JEWISH CONTINUITY.

A COMMISSION THAT IS A PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN THE COMMUNAL
AND PRIVATE SECTORS, A PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN THE MANDEL
ASSOCIATED FOUNDATIONS, JESNA, JWB AND IN COLLABORATION
WITH CJF.

LET ME AGAIN EMPHASIZE THAT NOW THAT THIS COMMISSION HAS BEEN CONVENED, IT BELONGS TO ITS MEMBERS WHO WILL DIRECT AND GUIDE IT.

II. REVIEW OF DEVELOPMENTS SINCE THE LAST MEETING

A. GREAT DEAL OF COMMUNICATION - RICH IN CONTENT - IN ESSENCE THE MEETING HAS CONTINUED THROUGH THE MAIL, BY TELEPHONE AND INTERVIEWS.

B. ON AUGUST FIRST OUR AGENDA WAS BASED ON A FIRST ROUND OF INTERVIEWS WITH THE COMMISSIONERS. THESE INTERVIEWS SERVED AS A BASIS FOR SETTING THE AGENDA FOR THAT MEETING AND THE FRAMEWORK FOR THIS MEETING.

YOUR SUGGESTIONS VIEW JEWISH EDUCATION IN THE BROADEST POSSIBLE TERMS: FORMAL EDUCATION, INFORMAL EDUCATION, ALL AGE GROUPS, SETTINGS, AND A RICH VARIETY OF METHODS.

BECAUSE WE WANT OUR COMMISSION TO RECOMMEND PRACTICAL POLICIES AND PROGRAMS THAT CAN BE IMPLEMENTED, WE RECOGNIZED THAT WE HAD TO NARROW OUR FOCUS. WE CANNOT DO EVERYTHING.

- MEMBERS OF COMMISSION LOOKING FOR PROJECTS TO SUPPORT,
ETC...

III. METHOD OF OPERATION

A. FOR THIS MEETING WE UNDERTOOK THIS ASSIGNMENT BY ASKING OUR STAFF TO DEVELOP AN APPROACH, A METHODOLOGY THAT WOULD:

*BE AS INCLUSIVE AS POSSIBLE OF THE INTERESTS OF EVERY COMMISSIONER

*HELP US ARRIVE AT A CONSENSUS,

*KEEP OUR OPTIONS OPEN.

I BELIEVE THAT IN UNDERTAKING THIS ASSIGNMENT THE STAFF HAS RESPECTED THESE POINTS.

B. THE BACKGROUND MATERIALS THAT YOU RECEIVED PRIOR TO THIS MEETING WILL SERVE AS THE BASIS FOR THE FIRST PART OF OUR DISCUSSION. LET ME FIRST REVIEW THE MATERIALS IN FRONT OF YOU.

IV. REVIEW THE BOOK

V. PROGRESS REPORT - ANNETTE HOCHSTEIN

30 MINUTES

VI.

A. I UNDERSTAND THAT IN THE INTERVIEWS WE DISCOVERED THAT MANY OF THE COMMISSIONERS AGREE WITH THE ANALYSIS.

B. IT APPEARS THAT WE ARE DEVELOPING A CONSENSUS THAT - FOR OUR KIND OF COMMISSION - AT THIS TIME THESE THREE OPTIONS (REALLY TWO SINCE WE HAVE COMBINED THE COMMUNITY

OPTION WITH THE OPTION OF INCREASING FUNDING) ARE THE OVERRIDING OPTIONS, ARE THE WAY THAT WE MIGHT BE ABLE TO MAKE OUR GREATEST IMPACT.

C. THIS DOES NOT MEAN THAT WE WILL NOT BE ABLE TO CONSIDER PROGRAMMATIC OPTIONS. WE MAY NEED MORE TIME TO FIND A WAY TO TACKLE SOME OF THEM. I UNDERSTAND THE ANALYSIS TO SAY THAT WE ARE NOT ABLE TO DECIDE NOW. WITH ADDITIONAL TIME I BELIEVE WE CAN FIND A WAY FOR THIS COMMISSION TO DEVELOP AN APPROACH TO THE PROGRAMMATIC OPTIONS AND TO PERHAPS ENCOURAGE THOSE INDIVIDUALS OR INSTITUTIONS THAT ARE WILLING AND ABLE TO MOVE FORWARD IN ONE OR SEVERAL OF THE PROGRAMMATIC AREAS.

D. I DO BELIEVE THOUGH THAT IT IS IMPORTANT FOR US TO MAKE EVERY EFFORT TO DECIDE TODAY ON AN AGENDA, ON THE FIRST ITEMS THAT THIS COMMISSION WILL CONCENTRATE UPON

VII. DISCUSSION

(UNTIL LUNCH BETWEEN 12:30 - 1:00, AND POSSIBLE CONTINUATION AFTER LUNCH).

NOTE: SEE EXHIBIT A TO CHAIRMAN'S NOTES FOR SENSITIVE AREAS.

VIII. LUNCH

ONE HOUR - 12:30 or 1:00

CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION

IX. OUTCOMES

AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE DISCUSSION, EITHER IN THE MORNING
OR AFTER LUNCH, WE HAVE TO ARRIVE AT AGREEMENT ON:

1. THE AGENDA OF THE COMMISSION - PERSONNEL AND COMMUNITY
2. A MECHANISM FOR WORKING ON THIS AGENDA PROSPECTIVELY -
TASK FORCES
3. TASK FORCES - THERE ARE VARIOUS APPROACHES. THE
COMMISSIONERS IN THE INTERVIEWS SEEM TO HAVE SUGGESTED:
 - a. CHAIRS AND CO-CHAIRS, WITH THE STAFF DOING INTENSIVE
WORK.
 - b. MEETINGS ON THE MORNING OF THE COMMISSION MEETINGS
(e.g., 9-11 a.m.)
 - c. A REPORT TO THE FULL COMMISSION AT EACH MEETING
(THERE MAY BE ROOM FOR SOME OF THE ACTIVELY INTERESTED
COMMISSIONERS MEETING WITH THE CHAIRS BETWEEN MEETINGS).

X. TASK FORCE DISCUSSIONS:

IF THERE IS TIME AND IT IS APPROPRIATE TO DISCUSS THE TWO
OPTIONS (PERSONNEL AND COMMUNITY) THERE ARE TWO POSSIBLE FORMATS:

A. DISCUSSION INVOLVING THE WHOLE COMMISSION

*PERSONNEL - ONE HOUR

*THE COMMUNITY - ONE HOUR

B. THE COMMISSION BREAKS UP INTO TWO GROUPS WITH CHAIRS
AND STAFF:

*PERSONNEL (CHAIR: STAFF: FOX AND REIMER)

*COMMUNITY (CHAIR: STAFF: ZUCKER AND HOCHSTEIN)

MLM AND ART NAPARSTEK SHOULD FLOAT FROM GROUP TO GROUP.
FOR THIS FORMAT THE CHAIRS WOULD HAVE TO REPORT BACK TO
THE FULL COMMISSION NO LATER THAN 3:15 P.M.

IN BOTH CASES THE AGENDA MIGHT BE:

- a. REVIEW THE RELEVANT OPTION PAPER (PERSONNEL: PAGE 60;
THE COMMUNITY, PAGE 64 OF BACKGROUND MATERIALS)
- b. DISCUSS THE SCOPE OF THE ASSIGNMENT AND THE DIRECTIONS
THAT SHOULD BE SELECTED.
- c. DISCUSS THE KINDS OF DATA THAT SHOULD BE GATHERED.
- d. GET INPUT.

XI. FUTURE PLANS - MLM

YOU WILL WANT TO SUMMARIZE AND INDICATE THAT FOR THE TASK
FORCES, CHAIRS WILL BE CHOSEN AND THE STAFF WILL PREPARE
BACKGROUND MATERIALS, APPROPRIATE MEETING TIMES WILL BE DECIDED
UPON.

XII. NEXT MEETING - JUNE 14, 1989 - SAME PLACE

XIII. CONCLUDING COMMENT (D'VAR TORAH?) - RABBI ISMAR SCHORSCH,
CHANCELLOR AND PROFESSOR OF JEWISH HISTORY AT THE JEWISH
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF AMERICA.

EXHIBIT A

SOME SENSITIVE AREAS:

A. COMMENTS CRITICAL OF THE OPTIONS:

THE COMMISSIONERS SHOULD BE REMINDED OF THE COMMENT ON PAGE 7 OF "BACKGROUND MATERIALS" THAT THIS COULD EASILY HAVE BEEN A MULTI-YEAR PROJECT. THIS IS AN OVER VIEW, A FIRST DRAFT. IN FACT SOME OF THE DRAFTS OF THE OPTIONS HAVE NOT AS YET BEEN COMPLETED.

B. PROGRAMMATIC OPTIONS: THE FAVORITE OPTION OF A PARTICULAR COMMISSIONER DESERVES RESPECT - BUT CANNOT TAKE UP TOO MUCH OF OUR TIME.

C. IF QUESTIONS ARE ASKED SUCH AS: WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY PERSONNEL, THE COMMUNITY, OR EVEN A PROGRAMMATIC OPTION, THAT MIGHT BE THE PLACE TO REMIND THEM OF THE INVENTORY, P. 4 OF "BACKGROUND MATERIALS", AND THAT THE INVENTORY (PAGE 5, "BACKGROUND MATERIALS" WILL ALLOW THE COMMISSIONERS TO CHOOSE THE APPROPRIATE ANGLE AND DEPTH FOR DEALING WITH ANY ONE OPTION. THE INVENTORY IS AVAILABLE ON SLIDES AND IN COPIES THAT CAN BE DISTRIBUTED IF THE DISCUSSION REQUIRES IT.

IF IT IS NECESSARY TO DEAL WITH PERSONNEL THEN YOU MAY WANT TO REMIND THEM OF THE OPTION PAPER, PAGE 60, AND THAT IT INCLUDES: RECRUITMENT, TRAINING, RETENSION AND BUILDING OF THE PROFESSION.

EXHIBIT A (continued)

IF IT IS NECESSARY TO ELABORATE ON THE COMMUNITY, REFER TO THE OPTION PAPER, PAGE 64, WHICH INCLUDES: CHANGING THE CLIMATE; RECRUITING AND EDUCATING OUTSTANDING COMMUNITY LEADERS FOR JEWISH EDUCATION; GENERATING SIGNIFICANT ADDITIONAL FUNDING AND THUS PLACING JEWISH EDUCATION AT THE VERY TOP OF THE AGENDA OF THE COMMUNITY; DEALING WITH THE APPROPRIATE STRUCTURES FOR THE ENLARGED ASSIGNMENT OF JEWISH EDUCATION IN THE COMMUNITY. -FEEL FREE TO CALL ON HLZ, ALVIN SCHIFF, MATTHEW MARYLES AND DAVID DUBIN.

- D. IF QUESTIONS OCCUR AS TO WHO ARE THE "EXPERTS", THE OPTIONS PAPERS WERE WRITTEN BY A TEAM LED BY DR. JOSEPH REIMER. ON PAGE 67 THE MORE THAN FORTY CONSULTANTS THAT HAVE EITHER WRITTEN, CONSULTED ON OR REVIEWED THE OPTIONS PAPERS ARE LISTED.

12/21/88 DRAFT

MINUTES
COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA
DECEMBER 13, 1988
AT UJA/FEDERATION OF JEWISH PHILANTHROPIES
NEW YORK CITY
10:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.

Attendance

I. Introductory Remarks

Mr. Mandel called the meeting to order at 10:15. He welcomed the commissioners and announced the addition of three new commissioners: Ronald Appleby, Joseph Cruss, and Lionel Schipper.

Mr. Mandel reiterated the importance of commissioner involvement in the process so that the outcomes of the Commission's work reflect the views of commissioners. In its work the Commission is defining Jewish education in the broadest sense, to include both formal and informal education, and is looking at ways in which Jewish education can help to build a meaningful Jewish continuity.

Mr. Mandel reported that since the first meeting of the Commission on August 1, 1988, the Commission staff has been consulting with commissioners in an effort to narrow the Commission's focus. It is expected that the outcome of the Commission's work will be more than a report--will be a set of recommendations which, when implemented, will promote change. The Mandel family is committed to investing in Jewish education in response to a set of priorities set by the Commission. It is hoped that other families, institutions, and communities will also respond to the Commission's recommendations by finding areas upon which to focus support.

In preparation for this second meeting of the Commission, staff was assigned to develop an approach through which to look at the recommendations of commissioners made prior to and at the first Commission meeting, to assist the Commission in arriving at a consensus on an agenda. Through the involvement of commissioners, consultants, and staff, the background materials which were distributed prior to the meeting were prepared.

Mr. Mandel introduced Annette Hochstein, a Senior Policy Advisor to the Commission, to review the background materials and to discuss the method used in preparing them.

II. Progress Report

A. Review of the Process

Mrs. Hochstein began by presenting an overview of the effort to narrow the focus of the Commission. Staff took the suggestions made by commissioners prior to and at the first Commission meeting and developed from these suggestions a list of options for further study. This process yielded a set of 26 distinct options for further study.

B. Developing an Inventory

Each option was reviewed in terms of the following categories:

1. Personnel (who delivers the service)

2. Clientele (to whom is the service addressed)
3. Settings (for what forms of education)
4. Curriculum and methods (content and message)
5. Community (institutional structures, financial and political support needed)

By using this inventory as a basis, the staff sought to develop a picture of each option which could be used in determining a direction for the Commission.

C. Criteria

A set of criteria was established for distinguishing among options in an effort to select some which would have high impact and could be accomplished in a reasonable period of time. The criteria include:

1. Feasibility - likelihood of achieving desired outcome and of implementation.
2. Benefits - such as the number of people affected.
3. Cost - the amount of money required.
4. Time - how long would it take to implement.
5. Importance - the degree to which the accomplishment of one option impacts on the potential to accomplish others.

In consultation with commissioners and other experts, staff prepared papers dealing with each option. In doing so, they discovered that there is very little data to support theories in the field of Jewish education. They also found that there are a number of options for which the resources exist to move ahead.

Following the analysis of each individual option, staff divided the options into two broad categories: programmatic options--those which look at Jewish education through a specific program, setting, or age group, and enabling options--those which provide the means or tools to accomplish the programmatic options. It was found that three enabling options emerged as central. These are:

1. Shortage of personnel.
2. Community--leadership and structure.
3. The generation of additional funding.

These three enabling options are interrelated and have impact on all of the programmatic options. Leadership, structure and the generation of funding are so closely linked that it is recommended they be considered together under the heading "community."

III. Discussion

There followed a general discussion by Commission members. The following is a summary of that discussion.

It was suggested that the programmatic options are more helpful in narrowing the focus than are enabling options. On the other hand, experiments to change program frequently falter due to shortage of personnel or lack of community support. A focus on enabling options would provide the Commission with a means to approaching programmatic options in the future.

An argument was made for selecting one or two programmatic options, focusing on these in depth, and working toward significant impact in one small area. An advantage to a focus on one or more programmatic options would be the possibility of relatively quick, visible results. Others argued for a long-term approach in order to change enabling conditions and impact on a broad range of programs. A concentration on enabling options, while more enriching, might take longer to achieve.

A question was raised regarding the target population of the Commission's efforts. It would be possible to concentrate on improving the quality of Jewish education for those already committed to Judaism or to developing programs to attract those only peripherally committed. It would be useful to have data on these groups to help determine a direction.

Another commissioner identified three potential audiences for Jewish education: "survivalists, the unaffiliated, and the progeny of the affiliated." The progeny are our captive audience and we must ensure that we do not lose them to Judaism. A development of personnel might consider these three subgroups.

More personnel alone is not the answer to our dilemma. It is important to develop a means for training Jewish teachers, differentiated on the basis of the population with which they will work.

Several commissioners argued that the lack of data in the field of Jewish education is problematic. It was suggested that "meaningful research" be added to the list of programmatic options and that efforts be made through the Commission to begin to conduct such research. Others suggested that research and development cannot be a priority at this time. It is a long slow process and we are obligated to move ahead now to change Jewish education.

It was suggested that there are successful programs of Jewish education. It would be useful to study the field of Jewish education in North America, to provide an inventory of what is now happening, and to identify approaches which are successful. Another commissioner suggested that the Commission owes the American Jewish community a status report on Jewish education today and a convincing vision of where it might be in ten years. This vision should include a projection of cost to reach our suggested goals.

It would be valuable to have Jewish educators reflect on the strength and weaknesses of Jewish education. Perhaps a research institute for Jewish education would be a valuable contribution to the field.

It was suggested that the elementary and high school ages are critical to a meaningful Jewish continuity. Perhaps a look at personnel as it relates to these two areas would be helpful.

It was also suggested that we need an overarching view of Jewish education in North America. Twenty years ago its direction was influenced by cultural Zionism and Hebraism. Today we are floundering for the lack of a common vision. Developing the structure and leadership of the community could be significant in creating a meaningful vision of Jewish education which could tap youthful enthusiasm in attracting personnel. It might be useful to establish a task force on "visions and directions of Jewish education" which would take a transdenominational look at the field.

One commissioner likened the enabling options to the "infrastructure" of the Jewish education community and suggested that any look at programmatic options should be done in the context of this infrastructure.

We should develop criteria for professionalizing Jewish education as has been suggested for general education. This would include improved training, an opportunity for autonomy, a system of evaluation, and opportunities for professional growth. In addition, we must improve the prestige, salaries, and benefits to Jewish educators and help them to avoid burnout.

This Commission has the potential to have a dramatic impact on Jewish education. We can help to develop both a climate and a context within which to bring about change. Personnel and community are critical to this effort.

A study of the enabling options would allow the Commission to work on Jewish education without narrowing the focus too far and too fast. The Commission might work to develop models in two or three communities which could then be a starting point for more general change.

IV. Personnel

A. Presentation

Professor Seymour Fox, a Senior Policy Advisor to the Commission, provided an overview of the enabling option of personnel. He reported that no attempts have been made to approach the problems of personnel from all four angles identified by this study: recruitment, training, retention, and profession-building. The potential impact of altering these conditions can be great; one principal or community center director can have an impact on a large number of students.

At present, there is no clear plan for recruiting personnel to the field of Jewish education.

Training institutions suffer from a lack of teachers and funding. There are not twenty full-time professors of Jewish education in North America today. A first step on the road to more effective personnel would be to train the teachers of teachers. Such an effort could begin with little delay because models exist to do so.

One key to improved retention would be to systematically increase salaries and benefits of those involved in Jewish education. In addition, a multi-directional ladder of advancement should be developed so that the most effective teachers have an opportunity to rise within the profession. Some might move into administrative positions but others would be encouraged to continue to teach while rising in the profession, possibly in the role of master teacher.

It is proposed that we devise a plan for developing improved personnel and establish four or five demonstration centers through which to implement this plan. Each center might focus on a different aspect of personnel. When we have a better sense of what is effective, we could move to implement it in other areas.

B. Discussion

The following points were made by commissioners in the discussion which followed:

The empowerment of teachers relates to community leaders--rabbis, day school administrators, JCC directors. In order to empower teachers, we run the risk of cutting others out because "certain vested interests are not open to empowerment." An alternative might be to consider establishing a national organization of master teachers which would confer status and would bring recognized quality educators together to discuss common concerns.

We must remember that a large proportion of current Jewish educators are "avocational," not full-time professionals. This group may require different approaches of personnel development from that aimed at professional Jewish educators.

There is pressure within the community to change what is happening in the classroom. We should not lose sight of the need for better qualified, more effective senior personnel. There is the sense that a director, principal, or supervisor can have the most immediate impact on the educational system. There is a need for a formal, systematic method of training these senior personnel.

It was also suggested that the greatest challenge is to train good teachers and to keep them in the classroom. They need to be educated as Jews and they need salaries, benefits, and a quality of life which will keep them in the field. It is important that Jewish educators be trained to deal with people and issues of education in addition to being educated Jews.

In considering the issue of empowerment, we must look well beyond recruitment, salaries, and benefits. We might consider what draws people to Judaic studies in greater numbers than to Jewish education and attempt to duplicate these conditions.

Another suggestion was that we work to develop lead teachers who could help in curriculum development and who would be in a position to see and fill the gaps within an institution. A vehicle for training teachers might be to establish a lab school and to offer internships in that setting.

As we attempt to clarify what teachers and principals should know and do, we should anticipate a future when Jewish educators may require different sets of skills and qualities.

It was noted that recruitment and retention are closely related to community. The community can demonstrate that it values Jewish educators by offering competitive salaries and benefits.

Community leaders could demonstrate the value of Jewish education

by participating in seminars or forums designed to increase their own Jewish knowledge. By demonstrating support at this level, the status of the field could be raised.

The quality of teachers in the field is determined by leadership. We should focus on improving principals and directors.

There are existing structures within the field of Jewish education which merit support. We would do well to seek these out, critique them, recognize quality where it exists and reward that quality.

The Commission might take the role of an accrediting body in the field of Jewish education. It could help to establish contemporary philosophies of Jewish education and might take a critical look at curriculum, facilities, and the fiscal structure of individual institutions and programs.

Summer institutes of one to two weeks in duration might provide a means of bringing Jewish education or inspiration to the adult community. A full-time Judaic scholar in residence in a community might provide a series of lectures and other programs to serve the same purpose.

There are currently two quite separate fields of Jewish education: formal and informal. By removing the barriers between

these two fields we could encourage interaction and overlap. This might be accomplished through a national organization open to all Jewish educators.

CAJE is a national organization of approximately 4,000 Jewish educators. Its goal is to augment Jewish education, pre-school through college. This organization might serve as the professional body referred to above.

It was noted that Toronto has increased salaries of its Jewish teachers but that this, alone, has not been sufficient to improve recruitment or retention.

A shortage of teachers is not unique to the field of Jewish education. General education is also suffering from this problem. The status associated with the field of education appears to be a major stumbling block.

Perhaps we should explore the creation of a national system of benefits for Jewish educators similar to TIAA-CREF. Communities could buy into the system to provide a comprehensive program of health care and retirement benefits. There might be similar opportunities to augment salaries. Such an approach might be especially useful for small communities which do not have a base to increase salaries independently and which rely heavily on part-time teachers.

By paying a decent wage and providing adequate benefits, we can support the development of a core of Jewish educators.

Federations should be encouraged to help fund such efforts.

There is a resident scholar at the JCC of the Palisades who works with top lay leadership in the community, teaching Jewish philosophy and values. He also uses texts to articulate values with staff and holds "fireside chats" in various neighborhoods to talk with the less affiliated. There is an increase in the level of Jewish knowledge among lay people who, as a result, feel involved and are supportive of the program. This is an individual whose full-time responsibility it is to serve this role. This might serve as a model for other communities.

A core of mentors might be established within a community. They can work with principals, teachers, parents, and family educators, helping to develop a climate and the expertise to enhance Jewish education.

There was general support among commissioners for focusing on personnel as an item for the Commission's agenda. The goal might be to make Jewish education a profession. The definition of an educator should include the youth leader, teacher, rabbi and principal.

It is important that all of these groups interact. By also looking at the option of community, we might serve to change the climate for Jewish education.

C. Community

Henry L. Zucker, a Senior Policy Advisor to the Commission, made a presentation on the community option. This option is based on the assumption that community leaders and structures can significantly impact on Jewish education and on the levels of financial support available to effect change. The financing of Jewish education is the responsibility of the community. Family foundations, Federation endowments, and community leaders could be tapped for additional support of Jewish education. It is important that a community evaluate and monitor Jewish education in order that the money is wisely spent. Community leadership, if committed to this endeavor, can have a significant impact on it.

In the discussion that followed it was suggested that Jewish schools should become involved in community education. At present, the two are very separate.

It would be helpful to establish ways of measuring the effectiveness of Jewish education. At present, with no agreed-upon set of criteria, the community has no objective way of assessing outcomes.

It is important that we be clear on our goals and that we establish basic measures of progress toward these goals. Do we wish to create conditions for Jewish continuity or to educate Jews?

If continuity is our primary goal, then we may wish to ask

1. Who will be the next generation of community leaders?
2. How do we know if we are succeeding?
3. Is it our goal to guarantee Bar Mitzvah or to avoid inter-marriage?

Mr. Mandel thanked the commissioners for their thoughtful comments and suggestions. He indicated that the staff would review commissioner input and recommend a plan for next steps.

V. Future Plans

It was announced that the next meeting of the Commission is scheduled for Wednesday, June 14, 1989 in New York from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Meetings of smaller groups may be scheduled in the interim.

Recommendations on next steps will be circulated to commissioners for comment.

Rabbi Schorsch delivered D'Var Torah and the meeting was concluded at 4:00 p.m.