



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  
3

Folder  
7

14 February 1990 Meeting. Minutes, March 1990.

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

---

COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA

AGENDA

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1990

9:00 A.M. TO 5:00 P.M.

UJA/Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York  
130 East 59th Street  
New York, New York

- |      |                            |              |
|------|----------------------------|--------------|
| I.   | Registration; Refreshments | 9:00 - 9:30  |
| II.  | Plenary Session            | 9:30 - 12:00 |
|      | A. Introduction            |              |
|      | B. Discussion              |              |
| III. | Luncheon                   | 12:00 - 1:00 |
| IV.  | Discussion Groups          | 1:00 - 3:00  |

Group A - Weiler Room  
Research, the Programmatic Arenas,  
Implementation Mechanism, Community Action Sites  
Chair: Eli Evans

Group B - Rosenwald Room  
Personnel, Implementation Mechanism,  
Community Action Sites  
Chair: Sara Lee

Group C - Reception Room F  
Community and Financing, Implementation Mechanism,  
Community Action Sites  
Chair: Morton Mandel

- |     |  |             |
|-----|--|-------------|
| V.  | Plenary Session                              | 3:00 - 4:50 |
|     | A. Summary Reports                           |             |
|     | B. Discussion                                |             |
| VI. | Concluding Comments - Rabbi Haskel Lookstein | 4:50        |

call  
Mike Loupo - re delivering boxes early.  
There until 5, only.

49 total

COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA

AGENDA

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1990

9:00 A.M. TO 5:00 P.M.

UJA/Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York  
130 East 59th Street  
New York, New York

- I. Registration; Refreshments (A) 9:00 - 9:30
- II. Plenary Session (B) 9:30 - 12:00 - set for 50
- A. Introduction
- B. Discussion
- III. Luncheon 12:00 - 1:00 - Boig - 12  
? - 37  
5 tables of 8
- IV ~~III~~. Discussion Groups 1:00 - 3:00
- Weiler Rm.*  
Group A - ~~Conference Room A~~ - 17  
Research, the Programmatic Arenas,  
Implementation Mechanism, Community Action Sites  
Chair: Eli Evans
- Rosenwald Rm.*  
Group B - ~~Conference Room B~~ - 15  
Personnel, Implementation Mechanism,  
Community Action Sites  
Chair: Sara Lee
- Reception Rm. F*  
Group C - ~~Weiler Room~~ - 14  
Community and Financing, Implementation Mechanism,  
Community Action Sites  
Chair: Morton Mandel
- V ~~IV~~. Plenary Session 3:00 - 4:50
- A. Summary Reports
- B. Discussion
- VI ~~V~~. Concluding Comments - Rabbi Haskel Lookstein 4:50

MINUTES  
COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA  
FEBRUARY 14, 1990  
AT UJA/FEDERATION OF JEWISH PHILANTHROPIES  
NEW YORK CITY  
9:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.

Attendance

Commissioners: Morton L. Mandel, Chair, David Arnow, Jack Bieler, John Colman, Maurice Corson, Joshua Elkin, Eli Evans, Alfred Gottschalk, Arthur Green, Irving Greenberg, Robert Hiller, David Hirschhorn, Carol Ingall, Mark Lainer, Norman Lamm, Sara Lee, Haskel Lookstein, Matthew Maryles, Lester Pollack, Charles Ratner, Esther Leah Ritz, Harriet Rosenthal, Alvin Schiff, Ismar Schorsch, Daniel Shapiro, Isadore Twersky, Bennett Yanowitz

Policy Advisors and Staff: David Ariel, Seymour Fox, Mark Gurvis, Annette Hochstein, Stephen Hoffman, Martin Kraar, Virginia Levi, Joseph Reimer, Arthur Rotman, Herman Stein, Jonathan Woocher, Henry Zucker

Guests: Robert Abramson, Susan Crown, David Finn, Kathleen Hat, Robert Hirt

-----

I. Introductory Remarks

Mr. Mandel called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m. He welcomed participants and introduced first-time attendees and guests: Rabbi Robert Abramson, Director of United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education; David Finn, Partner in Ruder & Finn, the firm assisting in editing the Commission's final report; Dr. Robert Hirt, Vice President for Administration and Professional Education at the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary of Yeshiva University.

The Chair noted that this Commission had been convened on the assumption that the time was right to address the concerns of the North American Jewish community for Jewish continuity and Jewish education. Could we convene a high-powered, pluralistic group, which could agree on a common basic agenda for Jewish education in North America?

We have learned that the answer is yes! Commissioners have agreed on two major priorities: addressing critical personnel needs and enhancing the role of community and financial leadership in support of Jewish education. It is now felt that this Commission may be able to make a difference by identifying these central issues, and causing steps to be taken to bring about important change in these areas.

The purpose of today's meeting was to elicit commissioners' thoughts on the recommendations for action set forth in the background materials. These responses would then be factored into the Commission's recommendations and final report.

A systematic approach is being followed to reach out to interested "publics." Meetings have been held or are scheduled with federation leadership, the national Jewish press, leaders of denominational education groups, and with a number of communities seeking assistance as they focus on their own local education planning process. In addition, meetings have occurred with a variety of associations related to Jewish education and finally, with the leadership of JWB and JESNA.

A number of research papers have been commissioned as background to the Commission's work. These will be circulated to Commission members as they are completed. Raw data (not yet analyzed) from a recent Gallup poll suggests that the relationship of intermarriage to a declining commitment to Judaism may be even greater than previously thought.

Mr. Mandel concluded his remarks by noting that he is encouraged about the future of Jewish education in North America.

## II. Vision for the Future--The Commission's Recommendations

Annette Hochstein, consultant to the Commission, briefly summarized the proposed action plan.

### A. The plan contains four elements:

1. Mobilizing the community for Jewish education.
2. Building the profession of Jewish education in North America.
3. Intervening in promising programmatic arenas.
4. Establishing a research capability.

### B. The plan contains the following concrete recommendations:

1. Involve top lay leadership in support for local Jewish education and identify both private and community sources of funding to support these efforts.
2. Facilitate various strategies for improving personnel, including development of training opportunities, recruitment of appropriate candidates, increasing salaries and benefits, and improving the status of the profession of Jewish education in North America.
3. Establish a facilitating mechanism to implement the Commission's recommendations. This body, to be in place before the completion of the Commission's work, is seen as the catalyst to implementing the Commission's recommendations.

4. Develop a research capability for Jewish education in North America. There is a need to develop a broader knowledge base for Jewish education, including gathering data, and monitoring and evaluating programs which have been undertaken.
5. Develop criteria for, and identify and establish community action sites. The facilitating mechanism will work with local communities to identify needs and opportunities with respect to personnel and community leadership, and will help those communities begin to address those needs. The facilitating mechanism will help structure ways for other communities to implement the lessons learned in community action sites.
6. The Commission has identified a number of programmatic areas within the field of Jewish education which require further study and intervention. Initial studies have been undertaken of several of these areas. It is anticipated that the facilitating mechanism will continue to develop this agenda and to facilitate further work by local communities and a variety of Jewish education institutions. It will also serve as an "honest broker" between projects and potential funders.

### III. General Discussion

Discussion of the proposed recommendations followed.

It was suggested that we must create an atmosphere in which Jewish education is a high priority. Our task is to increase the numbers and leadership quality of people committed to Jewish continuity. The enabling options--personnel and community--depend on each other. Jewish education is a value in itself and should be enhanced for itself rather than only for Jewish continuity.

#### A. Community

The following points were made regarding community leadership:

1. Community support is the over-arching enabling option, essential to allowing us to focus on personnel, and other objectives.
2. We must educate potential leadership to the importance of Jewish education for developing future generations of leaders.
3. The support of local lay leadership is necessary to improve standards and compensation for education personnel.
4. The report should clearly define community leadership to include scholars, educators, and rabbis, in addition to lay leadership. Educators, in particular, need to be involved at all levels.

5. In response to comments on the importance of forming coalitions of community organizations, the Cleveland approach to Jewish education was described as follows:
  - a. The Cleveland commission began by building coalitions among the bureau of Jewish education, the J.C.C., the local College of Jewish Studies, synagogues, and the Federation.
  - b. It determined that personnel and profession building were the keys to change. (Money alone could not accomplish the goals.)
  - c. The Commission decided to work toward elevation of salaries in day schools to match those in public schools, while working to build the profession with special incentives for teachers to participate in training opportunities.
  - d. It also established the Cleveland Fellows Program to prepare a small number of highly trained professionals to work within the community, raising the status of Jewish education.

B. Personnel

The following points were made with respect to personnel:

1. Initial funding should be directed specifically toward personnel.
2. We should consider establishing national standards for salaries. Fringe benefit issues such as health insurance and retirement benefits might be handled nationally; a funding source might be identified to establish a benefit plan similar to the Teachers Insurance Annuity Association/College Retirement Equity Fund.
3. The average Jewish communal worker or religious school educator completes his schooling with a debt of \$50,000 to \$60,000 and a starting salary of \$18,000 to \$22,000. We must develop fellowship and scholarship support, plus partial or full debt forgiveness, to attract more capable people to the field.
4. The creation of more full-time positions depends in part on the professionalization of the field.
5. Problems of retention should be addressed in a variety of ways, including continuing education.

C. Mechanism for Implementation

In discussing the implementation mechanism, the following points were made:

1. There was wide agreement that an implementation mechanism is appropriate.
2. Concern was expressed that we not establish "another bureaucracy." While some commissioners spoke in favor of incorporating the mechanism into an existing national organization, most argued for keeping it independent.
3. Helping to educate local leadership to the urgency of a national recruitment effort is also a responsibility of the implementation mechanism. It was suggested that funding might be available to support a national recruiting effort.

D. Report

The following suggestions were made regarding the Commission's final report:

1. Begin with a description of the genesis of the Commission, including how commissioners were selected and why they accepted. Go on to list the Commission's accomplishments: (a) establishment of funding to enable us to begin to implement goals with respect to personnel and community, (b) establishment of an implementation mechanism, and (c) other projects which have already been accomplished. Conclude with a call to the North American Jewish community to join in these urgent efforts.
2. Clarify what is meant by Jewish education--that it includes the informal as well as the formal.
3. Capture the importance of involving the total community.
4. Focus on the need for excellence in Jewish education for its own sake, not just for Jewish survival.
5. Focus on a need for improvement or enhancement of Jewish education, rather than just change.
6. Take a positive approach to personnel, in addition to making the need for improvement clear. It is possible to include the many positive things happening in Jewish education today and the opportunities for qualified personnel now existing within the field.
7. Maintain a balance among the importance of teacher training, service delivery at the local level, and research and the training of professors of Jewish education.



8. Refer to literature on general education, which indicates that salaries alone are not the answer.
9. Address new technology.
10. Include projected costs for achieving various recommendations.
11. Serve as an advocacy document.
12. The issue of timing should be considered. The Commission's report will be released in the midst of efforts to fund the absorption of Soviet Jews. On the other hand, there will always be crises in the Jewish world, so the time to issue a report is when it is ready.
13. The use of a ten-year time frame was questioned. Do we need to do this? It would require the establishment of measurable goals and, therefore, might not be a good idea unless we are prepared to set such goals at this point in time.

#### IV. Reports of Discussion Groups

Discussion then continued in three separate groups. Each group was asked to discuss recommendations relating to the implementation mechanism and community action sites, and also to discuss one or more of the recommendations of the proposed report, as indicated below. Reports of these group discussions were later presented to the full Commission.

##### A. Group A--Research and the Programmatic Arenas--Eli Evans, Chair

Mr. Evans reported that the group recommended that this section of the final report should be rich, varied, and detailed. A study of best practices might provide a basis for treating the programmatic arenas. Group members encouraged a focus on preschoolers and early teens, with an important focus on involving the family. Others suggested a look at the later teenage years as an area not now receiving adequate attention. The role of research will be especially important as we learn how to assess and evaluate our impact on these programmatic areas.

##### B. Group B--Personnel--Sara Lee, Chair

Mrs. Lee reported that the group looked at the four assumptions presented in the background materials and suggested that these be placed in the context of the urgency to act now and of the goals to be achieved. The group found in-service education and training to be a high priority, noting that Jewish educators already on hand need an opportunity to grow and improve. It was suggested that the needs of Jewish educators be looked at comprehensively as we consider the kind of professional education current teachers need to meet the demands of the future. It was also suggested that salary and benefits be treated as incentives to encourage continuing commitment and quality.

There is a critical need for training Jewish education personnel. The group suggested that a cooperative effort be developed among colleges of Jewish studies, seminaries, and secular colleges and universities for this purpose.

Recruitment must be addressed immediately and comprehensively, and profession building, essential for effective recruitment, must be addressed simultaneously.

The group also discussed community action sites and the challenge of working with the many institutions and organizations which exist in any community. It suggested the importance of clarifying the goals of the community as an important first step.

Finally, the group questioned the use of a ten-year time frame as noted in the Commission's background report.

In addition, one member of the group suggested that people who devote their lives to Jewish education should be provided a free Jewish education for their children.

C. Group C--Community and Financing--Morton L. Mandel, Chair

Mr. Mandel reported that this group believes that detailed planning is now called for to enable the recommendations to be implemented, and that the completion of the Commission's work is just the beginning of making an impact on Jewish education.

It is important that all segments of a community be included in the planning process. The report should urge federations to give leadership to seeing that the proper elements in a community are all convened to focus on Jewish education.

Community action sites should be distributed geographically and demographically. The group felt that a community action site could also be a "cut" into a community, e.g., a focus on the supplementary school. Top lay leadership of the community will play a critical role in the community process and must, therefore, be involved and committed, if a community action site is to be a successful project.

The facilitating mechanism is envisioned as an organization with a small, highly qualified staff, which would accomplish its goals largely by working through other organizations such as JWB, JESNA, CJF, the denominations, etc. It would play a facilitating and advocacy role rather than be a major service provider, and would also seek to ensure that an evaluation system is in place. Its primary purpose would be to help "energize the system."

D. Funding Possibilities

Mr. Mandel noted that over the long term, federations and community endowment funds are the most likely source of increased support. However, during the period in which federations step up to this challenge, it is anticipated that initial funding and some ongoing funding for implementation will come from private family foundations and endowment funds.

Mr. Mandel reported that he has been in touch with a few large family foundations about setting aside sums of money to support implementation of the Commission's recommendations. Three have already or will set aside \$5 million each over a period of 5 years for this purpose, subject to the individual foundation's control. Mr. Mandel noted that he is seeking a total of \$25 to \$30 million for early funding and believes that this will be attainable.

In addition, a few family foundations have agreed to assist in underwriting the facilitating mechanism. Some have expressed an interest in working through the mechanism to fund appropriate projects. Other potential funders will be convened in the months ahead for the purpose of discussing this funding further.

E. General Discussion

It was suggested that the facilitating mechanism should work closely with existing organizations. It should take the lead in involving local communities as extensively as possible, with an eye toward continuing implementation of the Commission's goals most effectively at the local level. The mechanism, as an independent body, should be able to work with a range of constituents. It should work closely with continental bodies, and the communities. It should serve as a catalyst.

Most commissioners saw the mechanism as a free-standing organization with its own board and its own source of funding.

It was suggested that the term "mechanism" may be too neutral. One commissioner suggested that it be described as a "force" to disseminate the message of the Commission. Another suggested that it be viewed as a vehicle to facilitate change by enhancing existing institutions. Its functions could include advocacy, standard setting, conducting research and evaluation, and perhaps establishing a national benefits program.

It was suggested that the final report should be written for supporters of the Commission's recommendations as well as for potential implementers. For both purposes, it should set high but realistic goals, should clearly state the steps we recommend to achieve those goals, and should indicate the Commission's readiness to promote financial backing to accomplish these goals. The report

should be very specific in describing the mechanism and should try to set a timetable for accomplishing its goals. The report should list its recommendations, and the actions to be taken, such as the establishment of the facilitating mechanism, of community action sites, and of an early availability of funds.

In summarizing, the Chair noted that many issues have been illuminated at this meeting which will require careful consideration in the weeks ahead. He noted that Stephen Hoffman, currently Executive Vice President of the Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland, has agreed to serve as interim director of the facilitating mechanism on a part-time basis, to help define that body, to help develop a governance process and board, and to begin to answer questions about its role relative to national and local bodies. He noted further that David Finn will assist in the process of writing a final report, translating the many views expressed into the final document. He noted, finally, that at the next meeting of the Commission, scheduled for Tuesday, June 12, 1990, commissioners will have an opportunity to discuss a draft of the final report, which will be mailed to the commissioners prior to the meeting.

V. D'var Torah

The meeting concluded with an inspirational D'var Torah delivered by Rabbi Haskel Lookstein, Principal of the Ramaz School and Rabbi of Congregation Kehilath Jeshurun.

2/12/90

MLM REMARKS  
COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA  
FIFTH MEETING, FEBRUARY 14, 1990

I. OPENING PLENARY - 9:30-11:55 a.m.

A. WHERE WE ARE TODAY - MLM (15-20 minutes)

1. Recognize debt of gratitude to the Commission--their faithfulness to the process, attendance, and good ideas. MLM's personal satisfaction from the contributions each of the commissioners has made to this effort.
2. Introduce first time attendees: Rabbi Robert Abramson, director of United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education; Dr. Robert Hirt, Vice President for Administration and Professional Education at the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary of Yeshiva University; [Dr. Paul Steinberg, Vice President and Dean of Faculty, New York campus of Hebrew Union College joined us briefly at our meeting last June at HUC].
3. Note that today's critical meeting reflects our readiness to organize our ideas into a cohesive and coherent structure. The Commission was convened because there was an assumption that the time was at hand to galvanize the energies and resources of the North American Jewish community on Jewish education. The question then was could we convene a high-powered, pluralistic group, and could this group agree?

4. The answer is yes. This Commission has demonstrated the ability to build a common agenda for North America. Our process has focused on two major priorities--sparking community activity and support for Jewish education, and addressing critical personnel needs. These are, therefore, at the heart of our recommendations. We have also focused on community action sites, research, programmatic areas, and an implementation mechanism, and these are also a part of our recommendations.
5. Review today's schedule as follows: Following MLM remarks, Annette Hochstein will summarize the recommendations outlined in the background materials and the Commission will discuss these in plenary session for the balance of the morning. After the lunch break, we will meet in small groups. In the plenary and groups we need your thoughts. Does the document accurately reflect the Commission's thinking? Are there key points that were missed? At 3:00 p.m. we will reconvene in plenary session, hear from smaller groups, discuss the process for getting to a final report, and get into the subject of implementation.
6. Emphasize outreach, in line with our action orientation. We are easing the way for the implementation mechanism by sharing the Commission's work at the CJF General Assembly

with federation leadership, the Jewish Press Association, and bureau directors; by a presentation in December to the Council of Jewish Educator Organizations and by several recent meetings with denominational Jewish educators. Also, several communities have indicated an interest in serving as community action sites. We are also meeting with several communities to help them focus on their own local education planning process. We have also taken preliminary steps in financing--more about that later.

7. Note that a number of research papers were commissioned as background for the development of our report. These are now being finished and will be circulated to the Commission as they become available. Some may be appropriate for inclusion with our final report.

B. VISION FOR THE FUTURE - THE COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATIONS - MLM

(15-20 minutes)

1. Introduce Annette Hochstein to summarize the recommendations. We want to focus on substantive issues. Commission members should feel free to offer their ideas in discussion.
2. Annette speaks

3. Invite plenary discussion. (50-60 minutes)

[See possible leading questions which may be used, if necessary, to stimulate discussion - attached.]

4. Close plenary discussion. After the lunch break the Commission will meet in three groups. Each group will discuss community and personnel and will also look at one or two other sections of the report. The groups will start promptly at 1:00 p.m. and run until 2:50 p.m. The full group will reconvene at 3:00 p.m.

II. LUNCH BREAK - (Funders' Meeting - Borg Room) - 12 noon-1:00 p.m.

III. GROUP MEETINGS - 1:00-3:00 p.m.

IV. CLOSING PLENARY - 3:00-5:00 p.m.

A. GROUP REPORTS AND DISCUSSION - MLM (90 minutes)

1. Group Reports - (45 minutes)

Welcome everyone back, and call for reports from the group leaders (Eli Evans - Research, Programmatic, Implementation Mechanism, Community Action Sites; Sara Lee - Personnel, Implementation Mechanism, Community Action Sites; Morton Mandel - Community and Financing, Implementation Mechanism, Community Action Sites - MLM report last. Each report should be 10 minutes with 5 minutes for other group members to comment. MLM should incorporate report on meeting with funders into his report.)



2. Discussion - (45 minutes)

Thank the group leaders, ask for comments on the recommendations, and reactions to the group reports.

B. PROCESS BETWEEN NOW AND JUNE - MLM (20 minutes)

1. Note that we have engaged a professional writer to produce our final report. David Finn of Ruder & Finn has agreed to place his firm at our service. This will ensure an exciting and dramatic report that will reflect well on this Commission. (Introduce Finn if he is present.)
2. Indicate that Seymour and Annette will develop their final staff draft of the report. This will be turned over with all of our documentation to Finn, who will then produce a draft report which will be shared by mail with the commissioners. Commissioners will have an opportunity to write or call in their comments and questions. These will be factored into a second draft, which will be mailed prior to our closing meeting on June 12, and acted upon at that meeting.
3. Preliminary thinking about the June 12 meeting is that there should be time to discuss and critique the final draft. We would also expect to focus on some of the implementation issues, to give thought to public relations, and perhaps to

have a public celebratory event to present the report. It is critically important to have a full attendance at the June 12 meeting.

4. Introduce Steve Hoffman as the interim director for the implementation mechanism, and indicate that this arrangement will help us to get a quick start on the implementation work of the Commission. Steve will be working after today's meeting on the governance and staff structure for the implementation mechanism. (You may want to call on Steve for a few comments.)
5. To summarize: We have come a very long way since August 1988 and are positioned for success.
  - a. We have basic agreement on what our report should recommend (as revised by today's discussion).
  - b. We have agreement to proceed with the implementation mechanism, and an interim director to get it started quickly.
  - c. We have a good start on funding and expect to report more concretely in June.
  - d. In short, there is the promise that the process can fulfill our hopes and dreams, and make an invaluable contribution to our Jewish community.

C. D'VAR TORAH (10 minutes)

Call on Rabbi Haskel Lookstein.

Questions which may be used, if necessary, to help guide discussion during the morning plenary.

- a. Is it feasible to carry out the proactive aspects of our commitment through an implementation mechanism with a very small staff? This implies that most of the work has to be carried out by existing institutions (i.e., JESNA, JWB) with the implementation mechanism serving primarily as a catalytic, referral and coordinating organization.
- b. What are the prospects for substantial additional federation funding in light of other pressure on federations arising from the very large Soviet and Eastern European immigration?
- c. What is the probability of involving a much larger proportion of top community leadership in planning for and funding Jewish education?
- d. Is the North American Jewish community ready to afford a much higher status position to teachers and others engaged in Jewish education and to create conditions to attract and retain more of our best qualified young people in the teaching profession?

3/1/90

MLM

Annette, thank you. It was a lovely presentation, very well done. I hope you could all see the slides, and at this point folks, the meeting is wide open for your comments, and don't feel disciplined in the sense that there is any given subject. There isn't. Whereever you want to start is where we will begin.  
OK?

Jack Bieler

I have several points, but the one I want to talk about right now really to a certain extent takes issue with something that was said earlier. I mean a certain theme in the paper we got that's really expressed on page six, and expressed in other places. That is that the major thrust of this whole operation is the interest of Jewish survival. That might capture the imagination of certain segments of the Jewish community. It will not capture the imagination of the people who don't necessarily see their communities much at risk. It will also not necessarily capture the imagination of educators who are in the profession, not because they are necessarily bent on making sure that the Jewish community will survive, but because they think that the endeavor is an endeavor which is worthwhile, independent of whatever that goal is.

MLM

That is what I meant to say earlier.

Jack Bieler

I think that it . . . more adequately represents the issues that a lot of us are concerned about. Granted that this is certainly a major, major issue, but

there also has to be some sort of reflection of the fact that we are committed to an excellent endeavor of Jewish education, not simply one that is utilitarian or pragmatic to accomplish the goal of Jewish survival. Similarly on page seven the statement is made that the key to raising the quality of Jewish education is top community leadership. I don't know if it is the key. Annette in her own comments, by presenting it this way, implies that the major appeal is going to be to the key leadership, and it just so happens that the key leadership is very interested in Jewish survival. But if you want the educators also to be interested in this, then something has to be said to also address their concerns and their issues. Furthermore, I hate to make several references to the same theme of the idea that commissions, as they exist today, are the models for taking the leadership in various Jewish communities. I'm not convinced that that is necessarily so. Perhaps it's not. What is the profile of those commissions? To what extent are professional educators represented on commissions. Are they basically lay commissions, or are they thinking about the pulse of the professional community as well? And therefore, talking about community, finally on page eight when you say that these three things should be discussed, I could see how lay leadership would be interested in one and two. I don't necessarily see that they would all equally be interested, or even if they are, to be in any position to be able to evaluate number three. Therefore, commissions must involve the various groups that are representative in a group like this. We have representation of professional leadership and also people who are very concerned with the quality of Jewish education.

MLM

Very good, Jack. Please, John.

John Colman

Taking on Jack's suggestion here--the work of this Commission and bringing together all the different, not only disciplines, but the whole communal life, I think that it has been a wonderful experience for us. I hope the report can capture that so that that essence could be replicated in the communities. [Not just the lay leaders.]

MLM

Good point. Building on Jack's, it's getting the whole circle, not just one piece of the pie. Excellent, excellent point.

Haskel Lookstein

Getting from the whole pie back to a piece, I'd like to go back to my first comment at the first meeting of the Commission. I just hope that we won't lose sight of that comment, which was "Unless we're going to substantially increase the salaries and benefits of Jewish educators, I think that all the other things we will do, will not bring qualified people into the field." I know right now, for example, of few young people who are coming back from Israel, and they are going to go into the Yeshiva College and may have to make a decision in the next year or two. Are they going to go into Jewish education

where each of them would make a terrific contribution, or are they going to go into the Sy Sims School of Business and eventually go on for an MBA and/or maybe law school or medical school. And they are going to make that decision to a certain extent based upon whether they are going to be able to make a reasonable living for themselves and their families. Based upon whether young men in particular, when they go to take out a young lady, and they say they are going into Jewish education, will that young lady think to herself "I guess I better be a lawyer because I will have to support this guy." Or will the person feel we sacrifice, we all understand, but that a good living will be made and that benefits will be there.

I don't know the hard data, but I understand medical school applications are down around the country. I suspect it's because people considering medicine see greater problems of making money down the road. That's what's happening with medical school applications. I think you could have the most wonderful training institution in the world, but unless there is going to be a feeling that these salaries are going to double soon and triple well before the end of the ten years, because in ten years if they double that is standing still, we are not going to be doing what we should be doing. So, if you look at the paper, I am worried about the listing of recommendations in "C," on page 14. I'm worried about priorities. "C," first of all, comes after "A" and "B." Training comes first and then recruitment comes second, and then conditions of work comes third. Now that just may have been necessarily put in the order of priorities. I simply would like to reiterate, unless we are going to do "C" first, we won't get to "A" and "B" and if we do, we will not be attracting the kinds of numbers that Annette was talking about. It's frightening, the figures that Annette gave. Where are we going to get those 400? Why should they go

into this profession unless we include in our planning some way of drastically changing the level of benefits and salaries for people in the field of Jewish education on a full-time basis.

#### MLM

By the way, I might point out I remember the first meeting, too, and someone talked at the first meeting about the Flexner report on medicine in 1910, in which the same kind of overview study was made of medicine. The expression in there was that the practice of medicine at that time was in such low esteem in society, that parents didn't want their kids to be a doctor. Now that's what you are saying. Parents are not standing up proudly and saying "Hey, my kid just decided to be a Jewish educator." So if they did it in medicine, maybe we can do it in Jewish education.

#### Robert Hiller

Mort, I'll tell you something. If we wait about three or four more years, we will have made the full circle. Parents will not want their kids to become doctors. What is happening? We have a great opportunity here. I'm glad Haskel remembers what he said at the opening session, because I want to go over the same point. I think we are talking mainly here about priorities and focus. That was a very interesting chart that was put on the board, which says the way to begin. What I think Haskel is saying is the same point that I am going to make, coming from a totally different perspective. That is that all that we have to offer can only succeed if we establish the priority of personnel. I think that the Commission set that in its very first meeting. As I read the report, I see a series of ideas and so forth, but I don't think that



they have been formulated the way that I would like to see them in this report. For example, I'll use a simple, illustrative example. When it talks about initial funding, the way I see it, there should be a slash that says "part of which shall be for a national effort to do the following"--clearly in focus. Secondly, when we talk about community action sites and the actions of the local community, part of the job of this new mechanism that we talk about or whatever form the implementation takes place, is the essential and urgent task of educating the local community leadership on the importance of national personnel efforts. And when we talk about the answer, no one should be talked to to, unless part of that discussion on financing is that we have at least a formulation of an idea to design the plan that will create some national standards, help to elevate salary levels and the personnel benefits that are required. The point that I am trying to make is that this has got to be put right up in the front in a variety of ways and it's not in that . . .

#### MLM

It's not dealt with sharply. I wonder if at this point, I could ask Chuck, take just a very short period of time, Chuck to relate the experience in Cleveland with regard to a wall-to-wall participation of everybody. Cleveland has tried to deal with this whole question of salaries. It's just one case-history, maybe the best way, maybe not the best way, but a good way. Chuck, just take a few minutes.

Charles Ratner

Sure. It's premature to say that it's even a good way, let alone the best way. After a process of building the coalitions in Cleveland, we determined, quite independently of this process, that personnel and profession building was the key priority in the community. We went through a long and very difficult process of whether you throw money at the problem or is it more? One of the most powerful things that I have heard here is the experience in Toronto where they effectively raised salaries very dramatically, and I believe they have not been necessarily successful in making that perform the way they hoped to in raising the standards and the quality and the numbers in the profession. So what we determined early on was that we have to put a serious effort in place that would elevate the salary level and at the same time hope to begin to build the profession, and almost in reverse order. The place where we determined the salaries were extremely deficient was in the day schools. We studied the gap between that salary level and that of public education, which by itself isn't as high as it ought to be. But that was our standard, believe it or not, to try to get there and put in a program which said over a period of years we will, through direct subsidy, improve the salary level in the day schools. We have begun that program. We made partners out of the day schools. It's early to say, but it certainly has been exciting in terms of the experience in recruitment the day schools had last year, as opposed to what they had the year before. A second part, and I think the more important part of the ingredient, was a program which would elevate the field. We put something into place which we are just in the process of doing, which is the training base. We built a

coalition in the community between the Bureau of Jewish Education and the College of Jewish Studies and the synagogues. Incentives are given for participation, including incentives for institutional participation modeled after another community. So far, we have, I think, doubled the number of teachers involved in a more, rather than minimal, intensity level in training. The most important part of the ingredient is something we call Cleveland Fellows, modeled obviously after the Jerusalem Fellows Program. That is the longer-term sort of thing in which the objective is to convince people that Jewish education can be exactly what the rabbi said. It can be the opportunity in this field for stature, for status, for contribution, in reverse order. The contribution, the status, and the stature. We are in the process of recruiting the first class of masters degree students and a director for the program, and we believe it could change the whole community's outlook, and it's been very exciting. The most exciting thing about this process, our process, was the coalition building, the community building. What's so exciting here obviously is what I just referred to. I think you have to make some priorities. I am concerned that in this document, one of the things that you recognize was the deficiency early, which may be here, is that the key player in that coalition is the congregation, where 70 percent of the kids are in our community, and I would judge in most communities. While we talk about all of the partners throughout this document, JWB, JESNA, the Commission, and the denominations, etc., in the community, it seems to me, the key partner in wherever the community action site is has to be the congregations.

MLM

Good. Thank you.

Alfred Gottschalk

I think that it is interesting to note that Mort Mandel and Gorbachev began about the same time. With notion of restructuring, in this particular aspect to Jewish life, as to the same kind of audacity and tenacity. . . ,I think we've seen some remarkable results today, especially in the contemplation of a ten-year plan. About 22 years ago, the Hebrew Union College pioneered the creation of a school of Jewish communal service. It was done because there was a perception in the field that this profession needed to have recruited to it, young women and men as confident as the counterparts in Jewish social work. That these be the individuals who were recruited for the sole purpose of serving the Jewish community because it had this rather interesting experience in the Jewish communal field. In lieu to the various programs that the government engendered, the Peace Corps and the like, the best of our young left Jewish agencies in droves and went to these other great social programs. We didn't create such a school, with all the risks entailed, and there were many, until people such as Hank Zucker and Bob Miller and others in the field of Jewish community service said we will support such a school. We will encourage the various communities around the country to send students to it, we will supply scholarship and fellowship aid during the term of their being students and we will, upon their graduation, welcome them as social workers in our community. Since that time, seven other schools with communal and like purposes have been developed. That's wonderful. Each of them still is

struggling with the same severe problems. And I want to get back to Haskel's point, which is what I think was the crucial one. The average Jewish communal worker, a student graduating from our school today, ends up with an indebtedness upon graduation to his undergraduate institution, and to the Hebrew Union College, which has advanced that individual \$25,000 to \$30,000 or \$40,000, a total indebtedness of \$50,000 and \$60,000 upon graduation. At the range in fields, which may pay a starting salary of \$18,000 to \$22,000, depending on the community. It takes a rather unusual person to want to persevere in a vocation that rewards in these proportions. I think this is a problem of the entire Jewish community, and we have been saying it in so many different ways. And it's no different from the problem we are dealing with here in the field of Jewish education. The average full-time religious school educator will graduate with the same kind of indebtedness, given the number of years of study that will have to be, which means that there has to be development of a the mechanism that gives scholarships and fellowship support. During the time that they are in school, there has to be support, and there be a kind of forgiveness of debt. We are all engaged with individuals who can't possibly repay \$50,000, \$60,000 in the course of their professional career as social workers or Jewish educators. And this cannot be done by any one institution. It has to be part of a coalition of institutions that are tackling this problem of finding 400 qualified Jewish candidates a year with good Jewish education. Or for that matter, for the field of Jewish communal service. And the realization is that we all need people for our own institutions, our own little segments of the totality of the Jewish community, but it's a problem that is universal in the Jewish community. That's why this room is so important, because here we are dealing with the problems together.

I would think, therefore, that of all the points raised, unless we finally get to a point of resolving this one, we are not going to move to the others with any great success.

#### MLM

Thank you. Just a reminder, I've got a bunch of names, I want you to know that I've got your names, but if I don't have it, of course, I will add to the list. Esther Leah Ritz, Al Schiff, Dr. Twersky, Matt Maryles, Josh Elkin, Maurice Corson. That is what I have so far. There may be others, now I just added Norman Lamm. .so Esther Leah, please.

#### Esther Leah Ritz

I have a very strong feeling that I'm in a chicken and egg situation. We are talking about developing community leadership for Jewish education, and we are talking about recruiting personnel. The question occurs to me where to begin. This body, no matter how prestigious, no matter what kind of clarion call it makes, cannot legislate higher salaries and benefits that improve conditions for educators in communities across North America. We can issue that call only to the people who can lead their own communities in developing those standards, creating and enforcing those standards. One of the reasons--have heard of the developments in Cleveland--I was going to say success but we still don't know how far the success has gone, is that Mort Mandel and Chuck Ratner, and Hank Zucker, and Bennett Yanowitz, and a whole bunch of people who are committed to Jewish education, and are themselves major leaders of the American Jewish scene and in the Cleveland Jewish community, have made it their business. I'm convinced that nothing will happen unless this issue, the general issue of upgrading the quality of Jewish education, including personnel, localizing

local resources together to perpetuate a program. That message is carried from this body into every community and becomes the property of the community leadership locally as well as nationally or continentally, and I can't say that often enough. I think we are tending to mix programs (outcomes) and means, and as far as I'm concerned, the motivation of community leadership to commit themselves--where the decisions are made about the resources apply to Jewish education in the local community--is absolutely a key, a key, I wouldn't say the key--there may be keys, but it is certainly a key proposition in carrying this thing through. I think we have to keep that difference in mind.

MLM

Alvin Schiff

Alvin Schiff

In Jewish tradition, we are told that if a person is meritorious, his work is done for him by others. So that the preceding speakers, more eloquently than I, have put what I think should be the focus back on personnel. Remember I told you at a previous meeting, Seymour, I said that I felt that we have to return the highlight to focus on the matter of personnel. You said speak up at the meeting, and I'm going to do that now. We had originally indicated that with two enabling options, the over-arching enabling option has to do with community support. That was done. That was accompanied by the enabling option called personnel. I think we ought to return the focus of our deliberations to highlight personnel. Unbelievable progress has been made. It has been done professionally, it's academically sound, it's practically purposeful, and I think in order for us to get the show on the road, we have to return the focus highlighted, highlight personnel. It's all right to say that this enabling

option includes several things. It's salaries and fringe benefits, conditions of employment and look for that social status that's a part of it. Recognition of excellence. How do you, with a person who is meritorious, how do you earn that merit? It has to be done financially, among other things. We have to create more full-time positions. The day school is where they are. There are no opportunities of supplementary schools, and we have to put on our thinking caps. You know my feeling is that in every supplementary school, there should be at least one full-time family educator who will deal with the family and the classroom. That will give us 2,000 full-time slots. There are some 2,000 supplementary schools in the country. If we do that, we will then build the possibilities and opportunities for full-time professionals in the supplementary setting. Accompanying all that has to be the professionalization. You can't establish professional standards without recruiting those people who meet professional standards and apply them to those in the field who can qualify. Those who are already a captive audience. I will say to you that after our supplementary school study, I'm now engaged in a survey studying the day schools in New York. I'm in the middle of collecting the data. Let me say to you that jumping out of that data, we have 210 schools that we surveyed. There were 140 returns so far. Jumping out of the data is that unless we get the kind of personnel and can pay them, we will continue to lose them. Twenty-five percent of the best people leave within the first five years. That's been established. It's not only in Jewish education, it's throughout the country. Many states have done this study. Let me just give you an example. In greater New York, there are 3,000 people--Jewish educators teaching in the public schools, members of AOJT, the Association of Orthodox Jewish Teachers and the Jewish Teachers Association--3,000 who are from intensive Judaic backgrounds who would qualify to teach almost anywhere. But they don't come to the Jewish school, they are in the public school. Many of



whom graduated in Jewish Theological Seminary, Yeshiva University and the Hebrew Union College, who are in the public school system. The only way to attract them is placing the hiring of this multi-prong emphasis . . .

Procedurally, and that's where Esther Leah put her finger up, I suggest that procedurally this ten-year program ought to be divided by steps. And we ought to have guidelines for communities. Not every community is going to handle it the same way. But every community must be supported and helped to institute the changes regarding personnel. And we ought to do it in two-year cohorts. What do we want in the community in the first two years? What might you do? The second two or three. Ten years is a long way, and if we wait to somehow get the total impact, within ten years we may losing. We may be losing the total war because we haven't fought the battles along the way.

MLM

You want milestones.

Alvin Schiff

That's right, and I call timelines for programming, and guidelines for communities in achieving that. All the other information, all the other things we want to do are absolutely essential. They are the handmaidens of this enabling option. We should continue with them, and they should be sidelined, accompany, the focus of personnel.

MLM

Thank you Alvin. Matty Maryles.

Matthew Maryles

Thank you. This is a truly complex subject to address, because there is a tendency to seek a quick-fix, bottom-line, tangible result which will sort of justify what we have done in the past year and one-half. I don't think that we are going to get to that point. We may write a report with that result. The reason I say that is that simply the problem is too big for any one commission or any one group, or any group of philanthropists to tackle. Let's try to parse the problem into pieces. We have a large number of Jewish children who are getting some form of Jewish education--day school, supplementary, or reformed, and we have demonstrated that the shortage of qualified personnel, who are addressing the needs of those students. There is an even larger body, probably, who are getting no Jewish education in any formal or even informal sense. So even upgrading the quality of personnel, and certainly I'm not against that, I think it's a given, the question is will that deal with the issue you put up front? Inter-marriage, for example. How are we going to get all those other kids who are not in the system whose parents don't think it is important enough to be in the system, into some system of Jewish education? Personnel alone is not going to do that, because even if we are immensely successful, let me throw out the some numbers at the risk of being oversimplified. If there are 30,000 full-time Jewish educators, is that the number? Oh, 5,000 full-time. So let's assume that we decided that we had a pool of money and that we were going to immediately upgrade the financial compensation of these educators were receiving by \$10,000 per year. I think that . . . most would agree that that's a step, but it's not as far as we

would like to go if we really want to achieve the objective of raising levels of compensation. At 5,000 teachers, that's \$50 million per year--\$50 million will require, if we were going to endow this, a fund of \$500 or \$600 million, and that's only to deal with 5,000 day school educators and you know I'm a proponent of day school education. But we will be dealing with a narrow segment in an insufficient way, with an amount of money that would appear to most people to be insurmountable, and we haven't touched really what has driven the formation of this Commission. That is that loads of Jewish kids are not getting the Jewish education we'd like, that those who are getting some are getting an insufficient amount, and we haven't even touched that problem. What will address this problem is creating an atmosphere in each community which says Jewish education is a very high priority. Now, even in the day school movement where presumptively the parents have said Jewish education is a high priority, they are spending money to educate their children. They are doing so consciously. One, there are parents who legitimately cannot afford what it costs to educate their children. Secondly, there are many who will say they can afford it, but I'm only willing to pay so much to educate my children. Now that's not going to be changed simply because you raise the quality of personnel, even though it will have some psychological impact. What will change it will be a sense in the community that Jewish education is the sine qua non for the continuation, and I agree with Jack that we shouldn't oversimplify survival as what's driving us. The Jews have done that for many, many years. Nevertheless, the way to get people's attention is by addressing the fact that there won't be even whatever minimum amount they have in the next generation unless we reach those children. So, I think what we are looking at is a partnership of empowered people with status, both lay and professional. I think we are looking at philanthropy and Jewish communal

leaders as the leaders and catalysts for a grass roots movement, in which everybody says ultimately that Jewish education is the priority. It is what's going to make everything else go in the next ten generations. We cannot walk away from it. I think we have to recognize openly and honestly that there are different forms of Jewish education. All must have an opinion, each of us has an opinion as to which is better. But we ought to recognize that if we really want to give Jewish education of high priority, if we tell a teacher become a supplementary school teacher, and we think that's very worthwhile, one, the very name supplementary school suggests something else, which is top priority, as opposed to supplementary. If we talk about informal, we are saying there's something formal which has got priority over informal. It's very hard, even with good salaries, to convince someone who's looking to make his own mark in life. This is what I did, this what I contributed to humanity, and tell them that this is someplace they should devote their attention. Even in the day schools, we have to convince teachers that they are an empowered partner. That means that they are part of the decision making. Empowered doesn't mean that everybody takes one task and divides it in two. It means that two people come to the table with two different sets of skills and reach for a common objective. I think that's what has to happen with lay leaders and with professionals. We have to recognize what we can do, what we can't do. We have to understand that ultimately if Jewish parents and caring Jewish leaders who'll make this system go. There just is not enough money around in one certain place, even to make it go, we have to get down to grass roots and convince them that we as leaders, and I think that's where the Commission can make a tremendous mark, that this Commission and a lot of people who make their marks in all aspects of Jewish and American life, we are prepared to say with

everything we've done, as individuals collectively as communities, we've missed on Jewish education. Obviously, there are a lot of good Jewish institutions that are around, and I'm proud of the one I'm associated with and I think that many people here are proud of the ones that they are associated with. But we have missed a lot of people. There are places we can improve. With everything we've done, we have to recognize Jewish education is the priority for the '90s.

MLM

Excellent. Dr. Twersky.

Twersky

I thought I was going to take off from Robert Hiller's comments, which I was very happy with, but in the interim, I'm led to two preliminary statements and then something about the way I see the nature of the report. I feel very strongly about this matter. Two preliminaries are that I think we must avoid two conceptual, philosophical extremes. One is that without us, Jewish continuity is in danger. We said this at the first meeting in I've stated informally and on other occasions, I think that's clearly not the case. I mentioned this in the letter to you, Mort. Our task really is to increase the numbers of people that will be found in an ongoing, confident Jewish community that's committed. But we are not going to create that. That's there. The other extreme is to say that with us, we'll achieve a messianic goal of making education available to everybody. That is the Talmud already, Sanhedrin, I'm studying now describes this as a messianic goal--that one would go from their to the Yeshiva and not find one ignorant person. I think both of these extremes should be avoided. I think that we will make a difference in PR, creative, and committed, and true to our mandate.

Here I want to speak very personally. I ask myself what is and what was our mandate? I go back to the discussions that preceded our first meeting on a hot August day when the air conditioning broke down, but nevertheless, we were moved. It was great. Expectations were high. I thought that we had taken as something axiomatic that education is important. Perhaps the single most important component in Jewish continuity. It's not something we need to prove. It was an axion. Nobody gave us a mandate. I was not told that we were asked by the Jewish communities in North America to meet and to issue a ten-year report that can change the nature of Jewish education. I think there is something grandiose about that, and that's not what we should be doing. To my mind, the report that comes out of this Commission, should start with a description of the genesis of this Commission, what were the initiatives that were responsible for inviting the commissioners who are here, to the extent we can capture these reactions, why the commissioners accepted the invitation. I know I can be very specific about what I was told and about my own thinking that led me to say yes, I'll make an exception to my own rules and accept this invitation. I think after the description of the genesis of the Commission, we should go on and list the results. What have we have accomplished in the course of these two years, being very specific. I think we should talk about the fund, whatever amounts will be made available to enable us to begin, and here we agreed upon two areas, personnel and community action sites. I think we should then say something about the implementing mechanism that will be set up before the Commission dissolves itself. Perhaps mention some smaller projects that were discussed along the way just to show that we are we--Commission.

I think what we are talking about is improvement, enhancement, not necessarily change. There is much out there, as we said at the beginning, that is going on that is very encouraging. And if not for what is out there we wouldn't be sitting here today. So we need to improve, to enhance, what is happening out there. That's the way I see the report being structured and I would like very much and I hope to get some reaction. I feel strongly that to do it the other way, just begin with generalities, grandiose rhetoric about education and about the woes, the achievements and the woes, will not give our report the impact that it should have. Now, if I may, just one question really and my reaction to this. I for one don't remember. I attended all the meetings. I missed that last October one but I read all the minutes. I don't remember that this group ever discussed or approved that long list of research papers that find in our report here. I think that too might tend to deflect attention from what we are really all about and what we want to accomplish. My own reaction, if I may say to the first of them (on page 33). What I am referring is the link between Jewish continuity and Jewish education. It seems to me that everybody here knows very well, intuitively, that Jewish education broadly defined, as we have done from the very beginning--formal and informal--I don't see anything demeaning when we say formal and informal or day school and supplementary. We're just spelling out what we mean by comprehensive. Jewish education in this sense is the single most important determinant in Jewish continuity. That doesn't need research. I don't think that needs proving. It's axiomatic. There are many ways that contribute to Jewish continuity. I think of an encounter with Israel or knowledge of the Holocaust. Meeting a Jew with a great mind or a great heart, or both--if they exist. Any such experience will contribute immensely to Jewish continuity. Reading a book. I recently read a

story of somebody who picked up a French translation of..... on the Left Bank and that turned on and turned him back. All of these things are important, but the single most important is clearly Jewish education and I find it redundant that we need to undertake to prove that. Now I have comments on all the other proposed papers, as well, but I'll save them for another time.

MLM

Thank you Isadore for your very thoughtful comments. Josh Elkin, Maurice Corson, Dr. Lamm, Sara Lee, Mark Lainer, Eli Evans, David Arnow

Josh Elkin

As I sit here and listen, the list gets longer and the need to respond to some of the comments. If I could just for a minute, just a preliminary comment in response to Mr. Twersky's remarks. I think everyone in this room does accept Jewish education as the critical piece in promoting Jewish continuity. There are other things but it certainly is at the center of it, but I think its instructive just to look at what's happened in the community from where Professor Twersky and I come, which has just launched a commission and the commission is called the Commission on Jewish Continuity. I think the choice is deliberate. I think that if the Boston community, where it's at right now, in all deference to the wonderful things that are going on there, were to convene a commission on Jewish education, I would say at this point, given people's consciousness, the caliber of people that manage to get on that commission would be different. Hopefully, 18 months from now, which is the time line of that commission, people will be sitting in a room in Boston and



will be looking around and will reach the conclusion I think that we've already reached. I think there's a marketing piece here in getting people to realize that in fact there is a connection that we all see as being very obvious. I want to go back just for a moment to a point that was made about the complexity of the problem. Far be it for me to disparage at all the comments that have been made about salaries and benefits. I think they are interplacred and appropriate, but two additional points I'd like to make about this. One is that the report that is written might want to relate at least in part to the fact that there is a lot of literature in general education that suggests that salary and benefits by themselves, which I think is the Toronto experience so far at least, don't make a difference and so we are dealing with a multi-faceted problem. I would like to propose that in terms of trying to make sure that people reading the report don't put the Commission in a position of having to pigeonhole itself into one particular section, I would like to suggest that even among the enabling options that we are discussing here, that there is very important focus on personnel, very important to focus on community. I would like to suggest that the enabling options are in fact going to enable each other. That this relationship between the two of them, that yes the enabling options of personnel and community will enable a lot of programmatic things to happen but there is a symbiotic relationship between the two of them and if, in fact, we are working on building community support, that will have an effect on the profession and all the things we want to do in the profession. If we intervene on the profession, part of being able to do that and to raise the money that is necessary and to hold on to the people, we're going to have to convince the community to be more supportive which gets to Matthew's point of the ambience that's going on. I would like to sort of

suggest that in casting these two enabling options, that we are careful to not let people be very reductionistic about this and say that there's a certain place that you can intervene. You really do have to intervene on both simultaneously. You'll get a synergy if you do that. Relate it to the community. I want to go back to page one of the material that was sent out. If you take the formulation there as far as the community, it's much better than the formulation that Jack pointed out was the problem where the focus was just on top community leadership which I think implies from its language lay leadership. In the fourth paragraph on page one, "a process of communal mobilization for Jewish education will be launched, of outstanding leaders, scholars, educators, and rabbis," and I would just like to underscore the fact that it goes back to the point about the supplementary schools, that we've got to keep all of these people invested and we need them to really become involved. The rabbinic community is critical from the movement that I'm most associated with. We have a lot of work to do there. The educators themselves feeling empowered in the process and not feeling that something is happening to them without their being involved in that process. Thirdly, I think that one of the exciting things that we have experienced here has been the linkages and the networking that have gone on among people from a variety of different perspectives, and I would think that one of the things that we should be encouraging is that if indeed there are to be local commissions and committees that are going to be working in various communities, that there be an awareness up front, and possibly included in the report, that some mechanism for continuing those linkages after a process of self-study be anticipated even in advance. When we started this Commission, the notion of some successor to the Commission was very very unclear and it will have a particular role on the

national level. In the local community, it can keep the players talking to each other and keep the synergy going and make sure that the community doesn't go back to its very fragmented and fractured way of functioning. And lastly, just because a lot of others want to talk and I don't know when I'll get another chance to get something out, I want to clear something up that does not have to be related to right now but I think that we had better be thinking about and I'm sure that some people have thought about it already, is that when was there a time in Jewish history when there wasn't more than one big agenda that was coming on the horizon? I think that everything that is happening in large measure since the last meeting concerning Soviet Jewry. I don't even think that we're beginning, maybe only the people in the uppermost levels of leadership in the federation can begin to grasp exactly what's going on. But I think that we have to be cognizant of the fact that this report is going to hit the community probably right on the mark with a whole other set of issues and I just think we have to be thinking about how do we deal with this. We could propose a \$500 million fund which has been proposed already. I mean, we need \$500 million here. How are we going to do this all? I think that that's something that we have to be realizing--the milieu into which the report is going to be put. I don't expect things to be much different than they are right now. The agenda for Soviet Jewry is probably going to be more and more urgent and pressing and needy.

MLM

Thank you, Josh. Maurice Corson.

Maurice Corson

I'm going to touch on three areas, two of which at least have been discussed in part by other members of the Commission, in their comments. I want to touch

upon inconclusiveness, implementation and personnel. I want to begin by saying that Professor Twersky's comments had a deep resonance with me. I think that we need to be earthbound to some degree, to a greater degree, both in terms of our expectations and our self-perception as to what the Commission possibly can do and the potential for change. Lifestyle changes, that's what we are talking about in terms of the American Jewish community, will not result quickly. They won't be the direct result of increased funding or bright young people graduating from our training institutions. I'm reminded of efforts made by the various denominations over the years to effectuate lifestyle changes in the lives of their congregants. United Synagogue had a program for sabbath observance a number of years ago, and these efforts have taken place from time to time. What we are talking about is a very significant portion of the Jewish community that does not place high premium on Jewish education and is not willing to spend a lot of money out of pocket, and therefore the Jewish community itself is trying to develop a way of upgrading Jewish education without necessarily making increased demands on those who will not be responsive. I was talking to a young man who worked for me some years ago who lives now in Riverdale and is very committed to intensive Jewish education, and he earns a modest salary as a Jewish communal professional. He wants to send his child to Schechter day school, and the tuition is \$6,000 a year. He simply can't afford it, but he will afford it because he has a very deep commitment to that kind of education and somehow, someday, he's going to find a way of doing it. I remember my own experience as a congregational rabbi where, if we asked people to increase substantially their dues or their tuition for religious school or the number of hours or the requirements for participation in a Bar Mitzvah program, we would lose some number of people who would go to some other

institution that would have lower standards. So I think that we have to be rather cautious in terms of our articulated expectations and we do need a marketing plan to create some excitement in the Jewish community. Although, that's the soft stuff that I wanted to talk about. Now the hard stuff. I want to commend you, Morton, and those who are working with you for expanding the Commission to include those who Chuck Ratner said before are really at the forefront of Jewish educational delivery on the local scene. That is the synagogal community. Participation here of Bob Abramson from the United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education and Bob Hirt I think is the salutary extremely welcome, and I think will help in whatever implementation is to come out of this Commission in the future. I would hope that we will have similar representation from the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. I sound like a voice that repeats itself all the time. I have shared this with Seymour and with Hank and with others. I hope that we will come to a time when Hillel will be represented around this table before the final report is issued because it seems to me that for every youngster who goes to a religious school or a day school, there are twice as many who find themselves on a college campus because if 50 percent of the kids are getting Jewish education formally, 90-some percent are on college campuses and they are on college campuses at the most critical years in terms of formulating their own values, articulating their own lifestyle, their own priorities, their own Jewish loyalties and affiliations and if we omit significant participation, both as recipients of the funding increases that we are talking about, Hillel which is a star system, both in terms of personnel and in terms of funding and programming, I think we are going to be missing a major opportunity for impacting on the Jewish community in the field of education. That's inconclusiveness. In terms of

implementation and I don't think anyone has referred to this, I simply want to repeat in this forum what I have shared more privately with Seymour and others. It would seem to me a gross error if the implementation mechanism . . . . agencies to a christen of national agencies who have, for the first time, come together very successfully and I think very meaningfully, to work the field of Jewish education and then sort of the three national agencies that are joining in sponsoring this Commission, namely the Council of Jewish Federations, JESNA, and the JWB. I would hope that that consortium will be able to be perpetuated, because one of the, perhaps unintended but nevertheless most beneficent consequences of this Commission, for which you are to be commended, is that they were brought together to talk about something they never together talked about before, and they've done so, I think, with a good deal of commitment and with very positive results. I would hope, and I put my hat in the ring as one voice at least, that the implementation mechanism will be placed under the operational auspices of JESNA, which is our national body for addressing the quality of Jewish education and the relationships between local communities and federations and the larger American Jewish community. That agency, I speak not as a partisan, but as someone who simply looks at that agency in the large Jewish community is, I think, like Hillel, underfunded, understaffed, underappreciated, and underprioritized, and if there is anything that I would urge this Commission to do, it's to reverse that and to give that agency the status, the personnel, the funding that I think it needs, and with which I think it can have a profound greater impact in the Jewish community, and I would hope that the implementation mechanism will be in some way significantly a part of, although under a separate board of directors and separately funded by the Commission. Thirdly, personnel, and here I speak with

with a little bit of experience, namely that of the Wexner Foundation, which for the past four years has been thinking about this problem, and for the past three years has been working in this area. The problems are much more complicated than I would like to go in to, or that you would permit me to go into. I do want to touch on a couple of issues that I think that we have been made sensitive to in our work in trying to recruit the brightest and the best young women to go, to undertake graduate training for careers as Jewish educational leaders. We have learned that there is no national recruiting mechanism for the field of Jewish education. There is something that exists in some of the other fields that we are trying to address. Each of the rabbinical schools has something of a recruiting mechanism. Each of the denominations is supportive of it. In the communal service field there is a recruiting mechanism of some kind, but of the three fields that we are dealing with, the most impoverished is Jewish education. So there needs to be a special fund created just for developing a recruitment mechanism. The second thing that we have learned is that even when we try to aggressively recruit, it's hard to do it because the climate is not particularly supportive yet. Of the three fields that we are trying to upgrade, the smallest representation in our Fellowship program comes from the field of Jewish education, and it's something that we are trying and struggling with. Sara Lee's, who's on our graduate fellowship selection committee is shaking her head. We talked about this at our recent meeting. We are trying to deal with it. But we are only dealing with one part of that problem. We are dealing with the top educational leadership. We need to recruit people for the broad field, for teachers in classroom as well as top educational leadership, and there is nothing that is being done there, so I think that's imperative. We need scholarships as well as fellowships, and

that's been talked about in terms of tuition remission and forgiveness of loans. We need to improve the training programs that exist and create new ones. That's been alluded to in the findings. We need the fringe benefits and salaries, and then we need to address, in a much more thoughtful way, the problems of retention. No one has given us any scientific data as to how many people enter the Jewish educational field stay in it. The impressionistic information is that a lot leave. So we at the Wexner Foundation are trying to deal with that problem in some area and that is by developing continuing education opportunities for people in the field, and we hope thereby to, in some way, raise their self esteem, give them a feeling they're part of a profession that is worthy and to enrich themselves professionally as they continue. But each one of these fields of these fields that I have mentioned, recruitment, fellowships, scholarships, training programs, salaries, continuing education requires a lot of attention, and I would suggest keeping with what Bob Hiller said at the outset that we need to put some dollars on what it's going to take to turn those specific areas around into some area of improvement.

MLM

OK, very good.

Dr. Lamm

Mort, I think I would like to think through a little better my comments, rather than do them raw. So I would prefer to pass now, and come back a little bit later.



MLM

OK, Sara Lee

Sara Lee

I would say, I would certainly affirm with any of the comments that they made up to this point, but perhaps take a slightly different cut into what I think is an implementation problem. It's interesting to sit here and listen to people take as givens a bunch of assumptions about what is going on in the Jewish community, the role of Jewish education, the value of it, what's happening. I wonder if we went back to the very beginning of this Commission, whether all of those assumptions that inoperate people's comments would indeed be there. In other words, there has been a whole process of developing awareness and being given information and learning, that I think, even the very outstanding leadership on this Commission has gone through. Therefore, it appears to me that because this is essentially a voluntaristic community, something I think we have to keep remembering. We live in a voluntaristic community no matter what Federations say, no matter how much money they give out, no matter how many commissions they commission, the reality is that Jewish education is delivered in congregations and in schools that are independent, that are not part of any system which can mandate or that can set up rules and standards to which these educational institutions would adhere. Consequently, it seems to me that one of the next steps that this Commission needs to contemplate as part of its facilitation, is an educative process for the people who are the deliverers, and the employers, and the conceptualizers of Jewish educational institutions. That is to say, somehow we need to have the most significant people who will be implementing the thoughts and ideas of this

Commission brought together in some way to go through this kind of experience, albeit not as extensively over three years. As Professor Twersky said, nobody, I guess, authorized you, Mort, or anybody else who convened in this body, and in the same way it appears that we do not need to seek authorization to invite people to very important gatherings in which this education process takes place. And I think unless we do that, none of the initiatives that have been suggested here, by the way, even those in personnel, even if we would have mandated raises and salaries, and if we would have mandated benefits, and if we were to give fellowships and scholarships, the fact of the matter is unless the context in which Jewish educators work and in which Jewish education is carried out, unless that is profoundly changed, none of the changes will have any meaning whatsoever. No program, no new curriculum, no new initiative. Therefore, I see one of the tasks as highly educative. There is a whole body of people who have to come to the same assumptions and understandings. So if we go back to say that to some degree that people have pointed out, that the statements this Commission wishes to make are somewhat rhetorical. We are speaking to a Jewish community that does not have these same assumptions. Therefore, I think that education process is essential and it meets the part of our consideration of the next steps.

MLM

Thank you, Sara Lee. Mark Lainer

Mark Lainer

It seems to me that the discussion we have had so far raises some questions about the focus of what we are doing. I am not sure that they can ultimately

be answered, but at least the questions have been raised. One possibility is to take what's been written already, which has gotten us this far, as we see how it is going to come out in the end after our June meeting that's coming up. You can rewrite in such a way where, for example, you could give the personnel issue the main focus, which apparently some people feel very strongly we should do. I've been dealing with the question in the sense that community awareness, community consciousness-raising, in and of itself, may be, for me, a pretty important goal. The reason I say that is that in Los Angeles, for example, we have gone through a process recently in light of the new immigrants who have been coming in, we have been required to raise monies to be able to have scholarships for them. Some of these schools were taking these young people and were just overwhelmed by them. So we actually were able to get certain foundations and groups a few extra \$100,000 in the last few years to be able to raise scholarships. To me, that's good enough. However, for some people around here, I would feel that if we had that extra money, they would say that we should then focus it in the area of personnel, that just putting it in scholarships is not good enough. I'm just wondering whether here we have a certain amount of mixed signals amongst ourselves, as to really which way we want to go, and possibly whether we need to really ask the question to ourselves as we close this thing down and we move it into the next level of implementation, are we giving the kind of message we really want to give? I must tell you when I heard the first few speakers, and I listened to Sara, and of course this is something that I'm aware of, I think that the question of personnel really kind of strikes you and hits you very hard. But then after I

think about it, and if I see it in practicality from the particular community, I personally feel that we are better off with what we are doing, which is to give a broader base, albeit emphasizing personnel, but still give a broader base. I'm not sure that everybody necessarily agrees with that, and that's why I'm really raising the question.

MLM

Very good question, Mark. Thank you. Eli Evans.

Eli Evans

My reaction to the report was that we need to remember that we are writing an advocacy document on one level. Therefore, the goals, and mission, and vision of the report have to make demands on the communities. And the idea of putting a pricetag on what we want to happen, I think is a good idea and a good discipline for the community. I went through this with the Carnegie Commission, the first one on the future of public broadcasting which commission demanded and said that it was going to take \$400 million over the next 15 years in order to put the public broadcasting system on the map. It became an advocacy document for people inside the system, in Congress, in the local communities, and it happened. You can argue all you want about public broadcasting is become in the last 20 years, but it is a much different system than it was before 1960. I think we need to put pricetags on it and make demands on the community. However it comes out, we can set goals, salary goals

equal to the public schools, and say this is what it would cost to bring the current system up to what public schools are doing and this is what it would cost. That's going to be headlines and that's going to get this whole idea debated in a much more dramatic fashion than vague demands for salary.

Secondly, I don't believe all of the fringe benefit issues are essentially local issues, and I argued this point very early in the Commission meetings. There are benefits of us sitting here as a national group that we can look at this system nationally. I think we ought to look at the health and determine issues as a possibility of the national system that it be underwritten by major philanthropists at, perhaps, enormous costs--\$50 - \$100 million, but with a set so much for the recruitment issues of the local level, because people do have wives who want to teach or others to then come into the system and get the kind of coverage they couldn't get in their jobs and that they could give to their families. That would be a tremendous contribution to the field. I've had some preliminary conversations with people at TIAA and CREF, because you remember, Andrew Carnegie dreamed in 1916 that should be retirement for teachers, a simple idea, and put up a little money to make that happen. It is now a \$60 - \$70 billion system, the envy of the world. It is one of the reasons that professors in this country can move from institution to institution and it has been one of the main reasons why we have been able to have a system in this country that allows people to go in and out of the universities and not lose those benefits. I think that that would be a tremendous contribution. I realize that the demands on the staff in thinking about such a thing and the consultant demands to think about it. If we came out with an idea that was specific in this report, it is not impossible that a major philanthropist would step up and say this is what it would take to save Jewish education in

America. I'm willing to devote my fortune, and do it. We should give them the opportunity around the country to do it. Lastly, Matthew Maryles made reference to the other half, the people who are not involved in education, in Jewish education, who do not belong to congregations, and I argued this point in the beginning and I think that it's really my major argument with the cast of the report as it now exists. I realize that in this room we have a lot of professional educators, and I don't argue with the point that the pivot of this report has got to revolve around Jewish education and its institutions in America today. But we cannot write the report for the 21st century that doesn't it address new technologies, television, cable, VCR, which is now is 70 percent of American homes, and in 95 percent in American homes by the end of this century, and the opportunities with cassettes. We cannot write a report for the 21st century that doesn't address this opportunity that families have to introduce themselves to major issues and questions in Jewish law and where we can give them the opportunity to do so. Now, Dr. Twersky mentioned the encounter with the Holocaust, the meeting with the great minds, the interaction in Israel, is three elements that are important to the Jewish soul. I would contend that possibly I don't want to missquote you on that, but I would contend that there are so few ways without the, or us to encounter the Holocaust as the century comes to a close. That we must take the opportunity to do something seriously. We have been, as a foundation funding the video archives of survivor testimonies in jail, and now at the museum in New York, and has some 2,500 testimonies on video that would not have existed otherwise, and we have linked up with facing history and ourselves in Boston and developed a curriculum for the public schools around those testimonies. When Abraham

Joshua Peshel appeared on American television some 15 years ago, ABC asked for anybody interested in a script to write in, and 25,000 letters came in the week after he appeared on national television. Recently, we uncovered the raw material of the editorial tapes of Edward R. Murrow's interviews with David Ben Gurion. There is a 15-minute interview that will appear, and you will see it now in 1956, but there was an hour and one-half of conversation that went on and here's Ben Gurion addressing with Murrow all of the great issues of the future of the Jewish people, which are in terms of their relationships with the Arab community around them, are so critical and central. Everything that is being discussed is just an unbelievable experience and Mr. Ben Gurion addressed in 1956 terms the issues that we are really debating today. The opportunities are extraordinary for us to do this, for us to introduce our children to do, and to begin to train teachers and the teaching community how to use this material. I think that this is a critical opportunity for the Commission of a writing a report that will be far-reaching and visionary in that sense. I think it would enable philanthropists to think about education, not just in terms of the classroom, but in terms of the way in which there are certain truths involving an American life today. The average child in this country, Jews included, under six years of age spends four to five hours a day in front of the TV set, and is there anything Jewish there? The Hillel campus kids watch TV and love to go to the movies in the dark, as somebody said to me. These film groups have an enormous attendance: 15 to 20 million people, according to the Nielson's, 15 to 20 million watched Shalom Sesame. Now, I want you to think about the implication of those numbers and what it means. It means that the ratings were equal to Sesame Street and every city across the country, including in the Midlands and the South, and also people, a great

success of Sesame Street to major cities and now 45,000 of those tapes have been sold to Jewish homes in America. So I think that there is a hunger there for families to introduce their kids, and I think we need to address that as an important issue, and not just an afterthought of this report. It seems that the media and the technology fits in very well with the need to try to address those people who don't belong to ..in the home and I don't see any other way to do it.

MLM

Thank you. David Arnow

David Arnow

A couple of points. As a psychologist with a research background, perhaps I'm somewhat suspicious when I hear about axioms. Dr. Twersky, I must respond to your statement about an axiomatic relationship between education and continuity. It's one that is why we share, and I was particularly curious when I came across an article a couple of month's ago, which I wound up sending to you, Mort, of a research study that showed that at least in terms of intermarriage, you can use that as a very gross way of thinking about continuity, that Jewish education is the third most important factor in predicting intermarriage. The first factor was merely associating with other Jews and having a large proportion of Jewish friends. So if we're going to start thinking about continuity, I think we have to be perhaps a little more realistic, and perhaps that means a little bit more modest about the role Jewish education plays. Two: In terms of the thrust of the report and the tone of the report, I think that the tone in general needs to say that Jewish



education is really a value itself, and we want to enhance that value, that we are not, as Jack said, interested primarily in Jewish education as a means to any other end--the end of continuity, the end of raising money for Israel, the end of making loyal organizational servants of our people. It's an end in itself, and I think that this issue is the high ground and I think that that's where we want to be. We want to be above all of the other issues about Jewish education for this or for that. Related to that, I think conversely there is a real danger in focusing in the report on the issue of continuity. That gets us focused on the "to be or not to be" question, which Jews have a great deal of anxiety about, understandably of course, but the point of our endeavor is really to say how to be, how to educate, etc. We don't want to get into the "to be or not to be" issue, particularly because I think that that is connected with the very kinds of anxieties--will the Jewish people be?--that may in the long run have created some of the problems with affiliation that we have. Who wants, after all, to jump into the boat if you are being told by your community leaders. that this boat is going to be sinking unless we do this, or unless we do that. We've sold for too long and, maybe even too effectively, this image of the boat that is about to sink, unless we do this or unless we do that. I would like us to steer very clear of that.

A point that Joshua made. We do have something to say. We want to sound trumpets, the clarion sound, but when to do that? Right now, as I'm sure everybody in this room knows very well, there are other trumpets about ready to start sounding and I think it would be undermining our efforts to sound the trumpets at the wrong time. For pragmatic reasons, there are going to be people around this very table who are going to need to be raising hundreds of millions of dollars to send someplace else. And for this to come at a time when it seems like if it will perhaps inherently make it a lower priority item than it would be otherwise would be from a timing point of view, I think a real mistake. So I think that in terms of the ultimate release of this report, and if a little judgment has to be exercised in terms of when to spring this on the community, there are some real serious discussions to take place.

#### MLM

I'm going to ask Matty Maryles to help us out. I'm sure you know when to buy and sell stock, Matty, so you can help us on this one.

#### Maryles

I know more about this than buying and selling stock.

#### Ismar Schorsch

I think that the success of the Commission is a consequence of staff work and I think the Commission departs from the staff work at great risk. I think the staff work behind this Commission is superb and the report that we are deliberating on has the kind of balance that we ought not to abandon quickly. The balance can be depicted structurally. There are three levels I think

that this report talks about. It talks about the delivery of Jewish education to youngsters at the local level. It talks about the training of teachers which is level two, and it talks about research and the creation of professors of Jewish education in level three. All three of those levels are vital and I think we would impair the quality of the final report if we abandon the balance of those three levels. What cuts through this debate is an enormous tension over personnel and that is what is pulling us away from the balance of the report. And I would like to just offer a few thoughts on reconciling that tension between the three levels and with their balance and panic over personnel. The problem of personnel is a real one, but I think we ought to formulate it positively and here I pick up on what David Arnow just said. I do not think we should come to the community in desperation. That if we do not do this, there will not be any Jewish future. I think we ought to come positively. In the last 25 years a lot of very exciting things have taken place in the American Jewish community. And we don't have enough personnel to fill those places. We are talking about the creation of a day school system. We are talking about the creation of Jewish museums. We are talking about large summer programs, camps, trips to Israel. The number of religious, cultural, educational, achievements of this community over the last 25 years is staggering. In some ways, it is comparable to what happened in the area of Jewish studies, which is another great achievement. All of a sudden American universities opened their doors. Positions were being created across the country. We didn't have personnel. We had inferior individuals stepping into positions that were begging for competence and we addressed that personnel issue. In a sense, that's what's happened elsewhere in the Jewish community. Through the creation of dynamic institutions at all levels all over the place

that are begging for professional competence. So that's the positive message it seems to me that ought to be our point of departure. I do think we ought to concentrate on personnel. I think the three levels ought to be related in terms of our preoccupation for creating the kind of personnel that these institutions merit. So I would suggest that much of the local effort also be directed at the production of personnel. There are a lot of people manning the trenches right now. They are not necessarily well trained. Much of the local effort, it seems to me, ought to be invested in inservice training. The people that are there are dedicated. They may be not as knowledgeable as you would like, but they are to be salvaged and improved. So a lot of effort at the local level, which is indispensable for mobilizing the community, ought to be about recruiting personnel to manage at the local level. Personnel is a complicated problem. Just articulating it is not talking about a solution. We don't have the institutions to train personnel today. I asked myself, how would we train 400 teachers a year today? Where are the places that could train 400 teachers today? They don't exist. We have yet to create the infrastructure to produce the teachers. That's why the third level of your staff's report is so crucial. That is creation of professorships, institutions, and research. We don't have the personnel to train the teachers. Certainly not in the numbers that we are talking about. And that's why I think the balance of your report is so crucial. That third level of creating professorships in Jewish education at the right institutions across the country is indispensable for training the teachers. Training the teacher is more than just teaching a kid Hebrew or a little bit of Jewish history which he is then going to go out and dispense. It is a lot more sophisticated than that and we all know that. But where are the professors of Jewish education?

Where is the research? That's why I think level three is so crucial. And if level three is done visibly and systematically, you will also raise the status to the whole field. Right now the field does not have a university base. And there is no serious academic feel in this country without a university base. So I think that level three will address level two and level one and we ought not to short change it and I think if you think of all three levels as addressing the personnel question, it may break some of the tension.

MLM

Thank you. David Hirschhorn.

David Hirschhorn

As has already been said by several, this is a very complex problem. It raises for me a number of questions and I'll start by also making a point. As far as I am concerned, there is much of the report that I agree with and therefore I want to dwell on those things on which I have some concern and questions. Not necessarily answers. As Eli Evans has mentioned, I wonder whether our report should be primarily an advocacy type of report as opposed to suggesting that we're going to be involved in implementation. I don't clear, even though there is indicated in the report that it will be working with existing institutions and I realize that much thought that is involved as to how you work with it, but it leaves open what this relationship is. And I don't think we can issue a report leaving it that open. I would be inclined, and I'm not sure of this, that I would be inclined to lean in the direction of relying on existing institutions to be the implementers as opposed to this Commission being

involved in implementing. Which suggests also the question I have, whether there is a rationale for creating another body. I'm not sure that that is justified. Other than for advocacy. So those are questions on my mind that disturb me about the report as it now stands. I also realize it's a very ambitious program that's been set forth and it suggests that we have a ten-year plan. A ten-year plan suggests that at the end of ten years, we are going to identify some goals which you're going to say have been or have not been accomplished. I question the desirability of including a timeframe of ten years. It bothers me unless we have an objective which will say at the end of ten years we will know that this is what we have accomplished. We are going to be saying to people, this is what we expect to do. I don't think we are in a position to do that. I also endorse the suggestion that some qualification of the effort needs to be undertaken. It's going to be very difficult but even if we deal with , it's helpful as part of the advocacy effort and being able to identify the scope of what we're doing so that it can be dealt with seriously. The matter of timing disturbs me too. We didn't know at the time that we started that this was going to be a problem but I do think we need to be seriously concerned about whether this is the time for us to embark on another major effort, and I'm assuming that it will be a major effort. Just a final comment about Jewish survival, that has been discussed here. I suspect that the real concern about Jewish survival probably is based on birth rate. I've seen a report recently which makes a point that unless there is a significant change in the birth rate, which I understand is 1.8 for American Jews, demographically we will not survive. We will go out of existence. So that is a real significant problem. I don't know whether it comes under the heading of Jewish education, but it's a reality.

MLM

Thank you David. Bennett Yanowitz and Norman Lamm is what I have left or is it a reverse order?

Bennett Yanowitz

As I read the report, I kept reading it from different perspectives as JESNA president, as a member of our federation board of Cleveland Jewish continuity, of the first president of our supplemental communal Hebrew high school, CJF board member and I recite all those not in terms of any special "yichis," but in terms of the complexity of the problem and what has to happen is to be wary of the moment as you read it I think influences your thinking on it. What we all have to be aware of is that there is a large Jewish educational establishment out there that is very complex and involves a lot of dedicated people who are doing a lot of work, raising a lot of dollars, I don't know if it's \$500 million or \$750 million, but somewhere in that range and going annually into our Jewish educational endeavor. And that we have to be aware that we are moving into an area which is large, established, and complex and trying to have impact on it. I suppose I should also mention one other as the husband of the chairman of the board of the College of Jewish Studies in Cleveland and I probably get more on that at home than any other piece of Jewish education. But it all comes down in most cases to finances and personnel when you're dealing with the problems and how you impact on it. For many years the only day school movement of any consequence was

orthodox, and it was largely supported, not by federations, but by the commitment of the parents who had a belief in the importance of the education of the child, and by teachers who sacrificed financially because of their belief in what they are doing. We've broadened out the day school movement now, but I think universally while the salaries have not come up to the level of the public schools, the amount of the salaries, which are the major components in Jewish education, are enormous. If we were take that budget and increase it by 5 percent, we are dealing with more dollars than we have raised on the Passage to Freedom programs for Soviet Jewry this past year. I think we have to keep that in perspective. I asked myself as I have read it, could JESNA have been the convening agent for this kind of Commission, as the central body for Jewish education in the United States? My answer was no. It takes the impact of a Morton Mandel, this remarkable staff that he has assembled, the impetus over a year and one-half to first bring it together and to carry it through, because I think JESNA is part of this complex establishment that I have described, would of and by itself not have been able to convene this remarkable group and bring it around the table, on the number of occasions that we have. But in terms of where we go with it, I would agree with much of what has been said, I think it has been a fine discussion here this morning. I think we have to have a visionary document, one which has an advocacy character to it, as Mark has said, consciousness raising in the community. I think we have to be guarded on our premise and our goals of the conclusions. With all of those things, I think there are some things that we describe in the implementing mechanism that our goals may be a little overly ambitious. I agree wholeheartedly with the statement on page 27, that the mechanism will act as a facilitator and resource for local initiatives in planning and



bringing together the appropriate local and continental resources. But when I go on to the next page in terms of where we say it will be a driving force in the attempt to bring about across the boards systemic change for Jewish education in North America. That's a healthy bite, and I think that if we are going to set that goal, we have to be pretty careful in defining what we mean by that and how we hope to do it. In terms of whether it should be the national agencies or separate implementing mechanism, I think that's a complex issue by itself. My instinct, wearing the JESNA hat, when Maurice Corson says give it to the national bodies is instinctively to say "amen." But it is much more complex than that, and I think we have to again look at our goals. Whatever that body is, I'm sure that there will be a large degree of cooperation and involvement by all of us. I'm not concerned about the institutional character as much as I am about the total involvement and dedication to the goals however they are defined in here.

MLM

Thank you, Bennett. Norman.

Norman Lamm

We have been at this for about one year and one-half, and I think a couple of years before then, we had this earlier group that was meeting. How many years was that, Mort?

MLM

That must have been two years and different group, but nonetheless the same general subject.

Norman Lamm

We have been building up to this, and I'll tell you, it has been very exciting for the faint signs of hope that the larger community is waking up to certain realities, and it's been building like a crescendo. I find that thrilling, hopeful, encouraging, whether or not it's axiomatic that education is the single most important element in Jewish continuity is irrelevant. Maybe Jewish friends is more effective, but we are not going to be effective in influencing Jews throughout America to move back to Jewish neighborhoods. Demography, certainly, is terribly important, terribly important. The success of the effort to increase demography depends upon the nature of your constituency. That's a completely different kind and almost intractable problem for most American Jews. What we are involved in, therefore, is a Jewish education, which is of all the available options, the one that is the variable that we most can do something about. So it's very exciting. But now I must tell you now that we are here at the penultimate meeting, which means we are ready for "tachlis," and I'm getting a little nervous. That all the investment of time, and effort, and work, and staff, and everything that has gone on with it, it has to succeed. I, therefore, deeply appreciate some of the warning signals we have heard this morning, from Professor Twersky about the need for some collective modesty in our aspirations, from Matty Maryles, who brought an eloquent warning, not to expect to solve all of the problems because if we try to solve all the problems, we will solve nothing. I would add in addition to the problem of timing--the whole Russian Jewry effort is coming out at the same time that we are. There are other problems. We are going to be asking the community for money. Our community, the money-givers in our community to a

large extent are people who are related to Wall Street, and that's not exactly the healthiest condition these days, as recently as this morning's New York Times, and the real estate people, and the real estatemenicks are all running scared right now. So it's not the best time, but then I console myself with the thought that it never was the best time for Jewish education. So we have to go ahead, we can't postpone this effort, that's out of the question. Because I can assure you that after the Russian Jewry effort will be over, another crisis will develop. We Jews are a crisis people--not the chosen people as much as a crisis people. So, let's not forget, what we are dealing with is an equally great crisis, except that it is chronic. It keeps on going and going instead of making a dramatic splash at all times. But, therefore, I would establish the following general principles in what we are going to do. (1) The idea of getting community leadership mobilized--that, by all means, has to be done. There is no external reason why that should not be done. We started it. That is an absolute must, because without leadership, nothing else is going to get done; (2) We are facing here--in this whole conversation we have had this morning, two different points of view have emerged. One of them has been we can't do the whole job, let's take one thing and do it well. Take the 5,000 full-time people and develop them better. Give them each a \$10,000 raise, no matter what it takes. At least we will be sure that they are going to live well and, therefore, do a job. Others have said you can't. You have this, you have all kinds of things that have to be done, and there is an interrelationship between them. Looking at one thing will mean that you have to neglect the others and, therefore, only that will be done, and even that won't get done because they won't have professional status, they won't have training institutions, and so on and so forth. Yes, we have to go

into all fields. But clearly when it comes to where we are going to put our money, there it comes down as so much of life does, not to great principles, but the quantification. And here I believe that we will to make certain choices. I think we will have to work to recommend certain choices. I shouldn't say we are going to make the choices. The people who give the money are going to make the choices, but they are asking us what our opinions are. I believe that we will have to not put all our eggs into one basket, but we'll have to be rather careful in putting more eggs in the better baskets, and less eggs in the other ones. I, for one, would put more money into those areas where I think we are going to succeed rather than into those areas where we have a quiet feeling, but know we will not succeed. Therefore, as between educating those children whose parents have at least some interest in educating them, as opposed to those whose parents just don't give a damn, I would go for the former, rather than for the latter. I would simply try to help those families where we know we stand a chance, because the parents are predisposed to the values of Jewish education, rather than to the millions who really don't care at all. Similarly, in the matter of personnel, which I think we've all agreed is so terribly important, here too, it requires a determination. Which of these areas is most important, which is of secondary importance, which is of tertiary importance. And the quantity of help that will be given should relate to such value judgements, which we can't avoid, even if it's going to break consensus, because now that we are ready for action, it has to be that kind of choice. This group has to continue as, I suppose we are going to continue in some way, primarily as an advocacy group, and become a lobby throughout the country, throughout the continent, to see that the other things get done as well.

MLM

There's one more person who has requested the floor, is there anybody who hasn't spoken that would like to say something? We are going to be meeting this afternoon in small groups and we'll be meeting again this afternoon in plenary. If not, I'm going to call on Esther Leah Ritz.

Esther Leah Ritz

Thanks, Mort. I should have allowed Rabbi Lamm to have the last word because it was a very effective last word, but something occurred to me and since I spoke early, I missed the opportunity to react to a number of things that were said.. I want to go back to the very beginning of this Commission. When we were talking about Jewish education, we were not talking only about teachers and classrooms, and I think it is necessary at this penultimate session to repeat that. In fact, the report must say in some way or other, what we mean by Jewish education. I would offer as an example and I don't have it here, the definition of Jewish education which was used by JWB's commission on maximizing Jewish education, which said, in effect, that education, learning, Jewish living for its own sake, and to strengthen the Jewish people, is a lifelong process that had to take place in a whole gamut of settings, including the school, the center, the club, the neighborhood, the family, and so on. Something like that must be said, and I need to reiterate it now because we have had the feeling expressed by Eli Evans that the tendency was to look only at the classroom and, therefore, we were ignoring media and other possibilities, and then immediately conformation of that by the fact that the rest of the discussion dealt with the classroom and teachers. I beg that the report itself and that this Commission think of Jewish education in its broadest terms. We tried at JWB, and Mort chaired that commission, to find

some term other than Jewish education and certainly not substituting for the word continuity. We couldn't and, therefore, we had to define what we meant, and I think that's our task also.

MLM

Good. Very well put. Folks, two subject headings. One, my own reaction to the statements this morning is that I am just so happy that every word has been recorded. These were a group of extraordinary statements, in my opinion, and it's not that I didn't know who all of you are, it's just that after a couple of years, we have arrived at a common language and we are using words that I think that we all understand and maybe some ideas we have talked through together. I was just terribly impressed, and I would say to you if you by popular request decide to vote to leave right now, that this all would have been very, very worth it. It has just been a wonderful, wonderful morning. But don't you dare make such a break. Secondly, I just wanted to go through the mechanics again, there are . . . . .