



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
11

12 June 1990 Meeting. Minutes, June 1990.

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

TO: Morton L. Mandel, Chair, David Ariel, Seymour Fox, Mark Gurvis,
Annette Hochstein, Stephen Hoffman, Martin Kraar, Joseph Reimer,
Arthur Rotman, Herman Stein, Jonathan Woocher, Henry L. Zucker

FROM: Virginia F. Levi

DATE: June 27, 1990

.....

Enclosed are the minutes of the Commission meeting of June 12 and the
cover letter that accompanied them.

COMMISSION
ON JEWISH EDUCATION
IN NORTH AMERICA

4500 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44103
216/391-8300

Commissioners

Morton L. Mandel
Chairman
Mona Riklis Ackerman
Ronald Appleby
David Arnow
Mandell L. Berman
Jack Bieler
Charles R. Bronfman
John C. Colman
Maurice S. Corson
Lester Crown
David Dubin
Stuart E. Eizenstat
Joshua Elkin
Eli N. Evans
Irwin S. Field
Max M. Fisher
Alfred Gottschalk
Arthur Green
Irving Greenberg
Joseph S. Gruss
Robert I. Hiller
David Hirschhorn
Carol K. Ingall
Ludwig Jesselson
Henry Koschitzky
Mark Lainer
Norman Lamm
Sara S. Lee
Seymour Martin Lipset
Haskel Lookstein
Robert E. Loup
Matthew J. Maryles
Florence Melton
Donald R. Mintz
Lester Pollack
Charles Ratner
Esther Leah Ritz
Harriet L. Rosenthal
Alvin I. Schiff
Lionel H. Schipper
Ismar Schorsch
Harold M. Schulweis
Daniel S. Shapiro
Margaret W. Tishman
Isadore Twersky
Bennett Yanowitz
Isaiah Zeldin

In Formation

Senior Policy Advisors

David S. Ariel
Seymour Fox
Annette Hochstein
Stephen H. Hoffman
Martin S. Kraar
Arthur Rotman
Carmi Schwartz
Herman D. Stein
Jonathan Woocher
Henry L. Zucker

Director

Henry L. Zucker

Staff

Mark Gurvis
Virginia F. Levi
Joseph Reimer

TO: Members of the Commission on Jewish Education
in North America

FROM: Morton L. Mandel, Chair

DATE: June 27, 1990

Enclosed are minutes of the June 12 meeting of the
Commission.

You can expect to receive a draft of the Commission's
final report late in the summer. Staff will contact
you shortly thereafter for your reactions.

Late fall, we hope to hold a final celebratory event
to make a public presentation of the report. We will
be in touch shortly with a date.

COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA

AGENDA

TUESDAY, JUNE 12, 1990

10:00 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.

American Jewish Committee
165 East 56th Street
New York, New York

- | | | |
|------|---|---------------|
| I. | Registration; Refreshments | 9:30 - 10:00 |
| II. | Plenary Session | 10:00 - 12:15 |
| | A. Opening Statement and Chairman's Report | |
| | B. Presentation of Background Materials | |
| | C. Discussion | |
| III. | Luncheon | 12:15 - 1:15 |
| IV. | Plenary Session | 1:15 - 3:20 |
| | A. Continue morning discussion | |
| | B. Status of implementation entity | |
| | C. Good and Welfare | |
| V. | Concluding Comments - Rabbi Isadore Twersky | 3:20 |

MINUTES
COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA
JUNE 12, 1990
AT AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE
NEW YORK CITY
10:00 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.

Attendance

Commissioners: Morton L. Mandel, Chair, David Arnow, Jack Bieler, Charles Bronfman, John Colman, Maurice Corson, Lester Crown, David Dubin, Joshua Elkin, Eli Evans, Irwin Field, Alfred Gottschalk, Arthur Green, Irving Greenberg, David Hirschhorn, Henry Koschitsky, Mark Lainer, Norman Lamm, Sara Lee, Seymour Martin Lipset, Haskel Lookstein, Matthew Maryles, Florence Melton, Lester Pollack, Esther Leah Ritz, Harriet Rosenthal, Alvin Schiff, Daniel Shapiro, Peggy Tishman, 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: Bennett Aaron, Robert Abramson, David Finn, Avraham HaCohen, Kathleen Hat, Robert Hirt, Dena Merriam, Ira Silverman

I. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Mr. Mandel called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m. He welcomed participants, and introduced first-time attendees and guests: Bennett Aaron, immediate Past President of the Jewish Community Federation of Philadelphia; Irwin Field, Commissioner, Past National Chairman of the United Jewish Appeal; and Avraham HaCohen, Executive Director, the AviChai Foundation.

The Chair noted that, over the past two years, this richly diverse group has worked together to develop a blueprint to improve the quality and quantity of Jewish education in North America, and, in the process, has learned that we share many common goals for improved Jewish education.

The Chair also noted that the Commission process has linked the public institutions of organized Jewish life with private foundations in what we hope will become a good model of public/private cooperation in the Jewish community.

Commissioners were reminded that, from the beginning, the Commission has planned to go beyond the issuance of a report, to the implementation of its recommendations. It was reported that the Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education is being established, with Stephen Hoffman as its interim Director, to work with individual communities and continental bodies in implementing Commission recommendations.

A number of foundations have been approached for financial support of the implementation process, and others will be solicited in the months to come. They are being asked to fund the Council, and to set aside funds for five years to support implementation initiatives. Foundations seem receptive. Five foundations, so far, have been asked to underwrite the Council, and all have agreed to do so.

II. REVIEW OF BACKGROUND MATERIALS

Annette Hochstein, Consultant to the Commission, reviewed the background materials for the meeting. She noted that they constitute a draft of Chapters 2-5 of the Commission's final report. Chapters 1 and 6 remain to be drafted.

Chapters 2-4 are intended to convey to the public the rationale for formation of the Commission, what has been learned through the process, and the action commissioners are recommending. Chapter 5 states the Commission's recommendations.

The purpose of the report is to communicate the Commission's message to the community, and to describe implementation. It focuses on the importance of Jewish education to contemporary life, on the realities of Jewish education today, and on the Commission's plan for improving Jewish education.

We propose to implement the Commission's recommendations through work in several lead communities, and by implementing continental strategies. It is proposed that a Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education be established, with the goals of working with continental and local institutions to build the profession of Jewish education, and enhancing community support.

It is proposed that the Council be directed by a Board, that it work closely with the national Jewish organizations, and that it operate with a small core staff.

Lead communities will be involved in redesigning and improving the delivery of Jewish education. They will test best practices and innovative ideas. They will cultivate new sources of personnel, will involve educators in on-the-job training, and will bring key community leaders into the process. When turned to, Council staff will facilitate local planning for an individual community's needs, and will work with the professional staff of that community in the process.

On the continental level, efforts will be made to involve community leaders, to increase the number of people in training programs, to develop a program of marketing and recruitment, and to increase the salaries and benefits of educators. Work will be undertaken to create innovative and effective programs in Jewish education, to further develop the involvement of family foundations and federations in support for Jewish education, and to establish a research capability.

Mrs. Hochstein concluded by reading the following statement, which had been prepared by Professor Twersky:

"Our goal should be to make it possible for every Jewish child (person) to be exposed to the mystery and romance of Jewish history, to the enthralling insights and special sensitivities of Jewish thought, to the sanctity and symbolism of Jewish experience, to the power and profundity of Jewish faith. As a motto we might adopt the dictum that says "they searched from Dan to Beer Sheva and did not find an 'am ha'aretz!" 'Am ha'aretz,' usually understood as an ignoramus, an illiterate, may for our purposes be redefined as one indifferent to Jewish visions and values, untouched by the drama and majesty of Jewish history, unappreciative of the resourcefulness and resilience of the Jewish community, unconcerned with Jewish destiny. Education, in its broadest sense, will enable young people to confront the secret of Jewish tenacity and existence, the quality of Torah teaching which fascinates and attracts irresistibly. They will then be able, even eager, to find their place in a creative and constructive Jewish community."

III. GENERAL DISCUSSION

Discussion of the proposed document focused on the following themes:

- A. It was suggested that the report should make clear the belief that Jewish education spans the entire age spectrum, and is not limited to the school setting.
- B. The diversity of the Commission has been one of its strengths, and this focus on pluralism should be emphasized in the report. Recommendations of the Commission are applicable to all of the denominational groups.
- C. During earlier deliberations of the Commission, a list of programmatic areas was identified. Several commissioners expressed their desire to see these programmatic areas referred to, dealt with, or discussed in the report and emphasized more directly in the work of the lead communities. It was suggested that the role of the family as an environment for Jewish education deserves more emphasis, as does the role of new communications and media technologies.

- D. There was general support for the concept of lead communities. It was suggested that this provides an opportunity for a community to show how it can impact on Jewish education by developing and transferring strategies for success. It will be important to work closely with local leaders, a process for which there are models created by CLAL, JESNA, Wexner and local commissions.

Concern was expressed that the term "lead community" might imply elitism.

- E. The importance of involving key community leaders was emphasized. In that regard, it was suggested that communal leadership should set an example by regularly including elements of Jewish education in meetings. Other suggestions ranged from holding regional leadership meetings to undertaking leadership recruitment.
- F. Several commissioners raised questions about the use of statistical data in the report, in view of the inadequacy of existing statistics. It was suggested that the need for a research capability be emphasized in the report and that Jewish education be described qualitatively, rather than quantitatively.
- G. A question was raised regarding the audience we wish to reach. Does Commission implementation work to improve the quality of Jewish education for the affiliated, the less affiliated, and the unaffiliated, or should we work first with those currently involved, deeply or marginally, and hope, eventually, to draw others into the system?
- H. There was general support for including in the report the statement drafted by Rabbi Twersky, expanded to encompass all age groups and formal, as well as informal, education.
- I. Several commissioners expressed a desire to continue to meet periodically. This would provide interested commissioners and other community leaders the opportunity to review and react to reports on Council activities.
- J. The importance of having funds available to support implementation was emphasized by several commissioners.
- K. It was suggested that the report provide a context for its recommendations by describing the environment into which the recommendations will be introduced. It was noted that, while some will say that Soviet immigration needs overshadow these recommendations, it should be argued that quality Jewish education can't wait for a time when the Jewish community faces no other crises.

- L. Many argued for the importance of building the profession of Jewish educator. This includes encouraging on-the-job training, more intensive recruitment, and enhancement of current training opportunities.
- M. Some commissioners asked whether existing organizations, JESNA in particular, should be charged with implementation, rather than the proposed Council. The presidents of JESNA and JCC Associations expressed their support for an independent Council and their belief that it will become a resource for strengthening national organizations that work for Jewish education.

IV. NEXT STEPS FOR FINAL REPORT

David Finn, of the firm Ruder & Finn, was introduced as the person who is putting the Commission's report in final form. Mr. Finn reported that it is his goal to communicate Commission concerns in a way which will encourage positive response from the Jewish community as a whole. With today's comments by commissioners in mind, the report will now be rewritten and distributed to commissioners for their response prior to the final writing.

In the discussion that followed, it was suggested that careful thought be given to how to publicize and disseminate the report for maximum impact. One way to gain the attention of communities would be to invite communities to submit effective projects for possible recognition and reward.

It was suggested that the tone of the report be optimistic, implying that change and improvement are attainable.

V. IMPLEMENTATION

Stephen Hoffman, Executive Vice President of the Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland, who has agreed to serve as interim Director of the Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education, reported on suggested plans for the Council.

The Council is being established as an independent organization, representative of the diverse interests of the Commission, and cognizant that existing national Jewish communal organizations have particular constituencies, which the Council should be able to transcend. With private foundations emerging as a new force in the Jewish world, it is believed that an independent organization can, by working closely with other national Jewish organizations, advance the Commission's goals most effectively.

The Council will serve as an advocate for Jewish education. It will work toward bridging communities and the national organizations, while focusing resources on Jewish education. It will seek new sources of Jewish educators, and will initiate specific proposals to implement the recommendations of the Commission.

It is envisioned that the Council will have a Board of approximately twenty, representing scholars, educators, communal leaders, and private foundations. It will have a Senior Policy Advisory group and a group of Fellows, whose purpose will be to conceptualize and implement ideas through the lead communities. The Council will have a membership organization comprised of current Commission members and other community leaders with a particular interest in Jewish education. This membership organization will meet annually, and will receive periodic communications on Council activities.

It was noted that the Council is being created within the structure of the Jewish community, and will strive to work cooperatively with the major national organizations. The Presidents of JESNA and JWB voiced their support for the creation of the Council, and spoke of their wish to cooperate closely in its activities.

- VI. The meeting concluded with good and welfare comments, followed by an inspirational D'var Torah by Rabbi Isadore Twersky, Nathan Littauer Professor of Hebrew Literature and Philosophy and Director of the Center for Jewish Studies at Harvard University.

TRANSCRIPT OF N.Y.
COMMISSIONS MEETING OF June 12, 1990
Completed, June 29, 1990

Mr. Mandel: Let me set the stage and review the agenda for today. We obviously are expecting a few more but have the vast bulk of those who are coming and I would just like to say to you again our attendance is remarkable. It's remarkable for two reasons: one is that I know almost all of you quite well for some years and I know what you're doing, what your other demands are and secondly to get this many people in the same city on the same floor, in the same room, at the same time is no small accomplishment and I think it speaks to the issue to not the charm of the chairman but I just wanted to comment on that. We've all seen that for ourselves, attendance has been so good. I ask you to flip out, if you haven't already done so the last piece of paper in the book. It's the agenda and I want to take you through it. First maybe before I go through the agenda, let's just take a look at the dividers in the book. Obviously if you take a look at the dividers, you see the table of contents, the commissioners we put it in again just as a handy reference of senior policy advisors. Then behind background material is the guts of what we're going to be talking about today. Then you have the minutes of last meeting and of course the agenda. Going through the agenda, I have a few comments which I about half way through. Then Annette Hochstein is going to cover highlights, very short brief highlights of the report. We have made the assumption in prior meetings that you have read this and therefore we are not going to try to repeat. We are going to try and highlight the background materials. We should be a half hour from now when that's completed, at which point we want and ask and I know we will receive your questions, comments, reactions to the recommendations to the various major points and minor points in the report. Then we'll continue through lunch which will be in this room. We don't have another room for lunch, there will be buffet in the outer lobby about the time we adjourn and take what you want and come back and we'll use this table

also for lunch and lunch will be 12:15 to 1:15pm. We do have coming at lunchtime David Finn. I remind you that we hired David firm a public relations firm Ruder, Finn to help us in drafting the report, not content but clarity, style, so that the reader gets what he should as a result of the 2 years of work that we put into this and he will be here talking about his reactions and what he has been doing to help us. Then also this afternoon we'll have a chance to hear from Steve Hoffman who has been a member of our senior policy advisory group throughout, has agreed to head up the council for initiative on Jewish Education to get it launched, help it get formed, help it get started, in effect be the first executive, while at the same time retaining his job at as executive head of the ^{Federation} ~~preparation~~ in Cleveland. As we all do carry more than 1 load at a time we think Steve can do that and help us greatly in getting to where we would presumably hire a full time, first time . so we'll hear some of Steve's ideas and where he is and we'll get your reactions to that. Then near the end of the day we'll have a chance to go around the table and react to anything you want to react to including lessons we've learned or should have learned in the commission process, how you feel about that and then we will conclude as you see, our custom has become to ask one member of the group to make some concluding comments in this case, Rabbi Isadore Twersky. We should be completed by 4PM- somewhere between 3:30 and 4PM, it depends on you and how much time we need to discuss together what it is we want to talk about. Any questions about logistics? Lunch here, outside at noon conclusion roughly 4PM and we'll meet in this room as a single group of the entire day. A few comments before I call upon Annette. I remind you that this is now roughly 2 years, Aug. 1 would be 2 years. Our first meeting was 8/1/88. As you know there was a lot of staff work and some of the people on the commission were involved, for about a year,

maybe a little more than a year before we had our first meeting, trying to put all of this together and you will recall that in part it was the need to improve the quality and quantity of Jewish education in part it was a reflection of some of the people in this room, certainly me, personally wanting to use my energy and whatever means, financial resources I had in the whole field of Jewish education and Jewish continuity. I'm not really having a clear notion as to where to start, and others felt the same way and the hope then was that we would be able to put through a blueprint, a program that all of us in this commission could support and see as a way to improve the quality and quantity of the Jewish education process and thereby the richness of our lives. We started on this 2 years ago and I guess I have said at each of these meetings how impressed I was with the response of you, the commissioners, not just your attendance but your involvement. I know that lots of you have spent time with members of our staff, our senior policy, the group in one on one interviews, many face to face, by phone, however we could find you. I think it's fair to say where we are today reflects the work ideas energy of the commission and I'd like to mention also how proud I am of some assumptions we made that have lasted throughout this process, maybe some principles. One of them is the principle of We talk about it all the time. It's a sensitive area in all forms of our human society, certainly among the Jewish people. We have our challenges to find the things that unite us and emphasize those, not just focus on the things that divide us. I'm frankly very pleased and thrilled. It's gratification in the manner in which this group which is comprised of Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, secular, Reconstructionist, whatever. We have lots of things in common, beliefs, ideas, goals, and dreams in common and I'm very pleased and I believe that if we want to we can find ways to work together, I believe that we will.

Other principle that I feel good about is that I think we have made worth the notion that private foundations can link up with agencies, and work together to really fulfill what the agencies are really about and what the private foundations are interested in. I don't think we'll be able to evaluate this for 5 years, but to me I think the combination of ~~CJF~~, ~~JESNA~~ and now the old ~~JWB~~ the new Jewish Community Centers Association and private foundations, I think that is working. How well, we'll see, but I think it working, we've gotten all we can get out of it until now. Earlier this meeting I thank the ~~ATC~~ profusely, Ira I want you to hear it, we're delighted to have you here. I'm glad you- Ira Silverman the exec., I'm glad you could be with us.

Third comment: I have now talked to 13 private foundations one way or another, some informally because I do the principle or principles the others formally, appearing before a group. We think there are about 25 in the first list and I will tell you that thus far, without exception there is great interest. Either there's great interest, because there was great interest or there was interest let's say, or because if the group was not seeing Jewish education or Jewish continuity as a major thrust, and I'm very encouraged. I'm an optimist that private foundations and communal institutions, North American institutions can work even closer together than we have been, can share ideas, every foundation I have talked to has their own ideas wants to and should as I personally want to and should preserve sovereignty and decision making none the less. The possibilities for loose linkages I think are enormous and if there won't be there, I'm very surprised. I believe there will and I believe that private Jewish foundations will be working more closer together in the future than we have in the past. Just as a generality, and I believe that's one thing I have learned.

5.

Another comment is I feel we have been successful in putting on the commission, kind of a richly diverse group of people from different disciplines in making it work and my notes have just a few of the headings, scholars, heads of institutions of higher Jewish learning, lay leaders, philanthropists, educators, rabbis, maybe I've left something out. We've made this tapestry work, and I believe that we are where we are because of the contributions that each of these has made, individually and together trying to help us define what may be at it's best Jewish education- what it ought to accomplish, where it ought to take us as humans, as Jews. I believe the report reflects that.

Second lastly I think we agree even at the time some of you were asked by me and others to join in this endeavor that we wanted to do more than issue a report that we wanted to have clear thinking, using the fine clearer minds we can put together, have clearer thinking, clearer recommendations when we wanted them to happen. We'll be discussing that as I indicated later this afternoon, but now at least we're calling the Council for initiative Jewish education.

Lastly I want to touch on funding. A few comments about that, because along with ideas and heart, strength, and energy what fuels this machine is money. In the final analysis that's going to be an important at where we end up. The year 2,000 or any year you want to pick. I remind you that, among our prior discussions we talked about long-term funding. I'll use the word, it's not scientific, hundreds of millions of dollars in America, I believe in addition to whatever it is we're spending now and I don't remember if that number is five hundred million or a million, we're probably talking hundreds of millions of dollars. I can't justify that number and I don't have any backup for that

number. It's very large because the stakes are very high. I believe that those of us who believe that and for the long term clearly along with tuition income and what congregations of various organizations are putting in out of their budgets or out of fund raising, clearly we see the Federation movement in North America as a place where increasing allocations must come from. The degree to which there is success there depends on our continuing ability to run good annual campaigns and it depends on what the priorities are, where the heads are of the ex. people who make those decisions in Detroit, LA, Kansas City, Rochester, or wherever. We have built in America alongside of specialized fund raising this magnificent machine, Federation System. If this is as important as I think it is, and some of you think it is, and frankly as I believe a growing number of "top communal leaders." I believe a growing number of top communal leaders are believing. That case needs to be made and if it's made it will be supported by the federations, so that tuition income, various other sources that we have today increasing federation allocations I believe and maybe there's other sources for the long term. For the immediate term we have in mind a family foundations, individuals, and federation endowment funds. At this point in time we have just begun talking to private Jewish foundations that were not completed. There are family foundations, individual funders, and federation endowment funds. I thought there over the next 6 to 12 months is touch base with as many of these as we can to try and get a quick start. Thus far, we have varying stages of where the foundations, the 13 that we talked about are some already with the history of involvement for some time, but have been willing to make a 5 year certain commitment. What we have asked for is a set aside and hopefully a look for a 5 year certain commitment. Some are thinking about this and some have not and may not may want to make this

commitment, but are or will spend. There's lots going on and what we want to do is add to it, add to it's focus and what we hope will happen is that as we continue in our process, we will be influencing foundations who are already in their head there and bringing on foundations who are not yet to fuel this machine.

On a lower level to fund the council we have already asked 5 commissions to be underwriters, 5 thusfar have agreed, we'd like to add to this group to assure that among the other things Steve Hoffman will not have to do, will not have to raise money. I will tell you that nowhere did I in some cases, I was accompanied by others, nowhere did we not get wonderful reception, not just courteous but interested. In summary let me say where I think we are it's too early to put a hard number on this. It's clear to me that foundations will increase to my own assessment of it, will increase their spending for Jewish education over the next 5 years by a number between \$25-50 million dollars. That's my number, that's my assessment and it's rough but I believe that it will happen and maybe in fact .

One thing I want to clarify, there's not much confusion in this room but there could be elsewhere. We do not see a . There may be some thoughts that there will be a . We do not see a . What we see instead is the council working with the foundations to either act as a bridge or help them see opportunities for doing what they want to do best, and really working toward a set of common goals in making all of this happen. That in general covers what I want to share with you at this point. I'd like to ask Annette Hochstein if she would to quickly take us through in effect the background materials, the highlights of the background materials. Then we want to throw the floor open to really whatever it is that you would like to talk about.

Annette Hochstein: Ladies and gentlemen, since the last meeting of this commission background work was done for the summary report

Jewish

I'll will try to briefly summarize this work in the hope that today's discussion will give us guidance towards drafting the final documents. The materials that you have in front of you are an early draft, an attempt to take all the information collected, distributed to you and discussed over these past 2 years and formulate them for the purpose of communicating them to the community at large.

There are essentially two parts to those materials. Chapters 2, 3, and 4 are meant to convey to the public to those who had not participated in these 6 meetings why the commission was formed, what it learned about Jewish education, how it decided to come to grips with the problems and facing Jewish education and what it decided to do. Chapter 5 contains the translations of these decisions into a concrete plan for action, perhaps the commission's message to the council it is establishing to implement these plans. What did we try to do in this report. If successful, we believe the commission's report should achieve 3 goals:

1. The report should express the commission's message. Here we want to find out if we succeeded to formulate the content of the work of this commission.
2. The report should effectively communicate this message to the Jewish Community. The challenge was to be correctly understood, to translate the work into terms that would be easily read, that would convey the message and the power of the work that was done.
3. The report should describe what will be done the implementation. wanted to convey that this will not be a theoretical endeavor something we all have known since the beginning of the work, but one with very concrete implications.

I'd like to return to the first point. The report should express the

commission's message. We 3 point to these message. A. The crucial importance of Jewish education in contemporary life and the stand that the commission has taken on that. B. The realities of Jewish education today, and three the commission's plan. I would like to stay with that for a moment, and go back to the first point which is the crucial importance of Jewish education in contemporary life. We have tried, and I will read briefly the way this is formulated in the report to express the fact that this commission used Jewish education as an emergency. In face of life and death issues facing the Jewish people the needs of Jewish often seem to be less urgent, less insistant, a problem that can be dealt with at some point in the future. This commission has taken the position that this an illusion, that we may continue to live with emegencies indefinitely so that we can no longer postpone addressing the needs of Jewish education. There is an assumption in the commission's work, an assumption that under law is the whole endeavor and that that the North American Jewish Community has today the will and the capacity to mobilize itself for Jewish education as it has in the past and continues to do for the building of the state of , for the rescue of Jews in distress, for the fight against discrimination.

The second point was to take a count of the realities of Jewish education. There is a large amount of activity going on in Jewish education in North America. There are about a million children and young people between the ages of 3 and 17 of school age children. They are being educated or they receive their Jewish education in about 2,600 schools, day schools and supplementary schools. They retain 220 JCC's in their branches. There are about 200,000 of them who participate in summer camps, day camps and residential camps, about 100,000 participate in youth movement. Every year some 25,000 participate in educational programs in

Israel, there are some 600 programs of _____ at colleges and universities, and all these are served by about 30,000 educators in a variety of positions. However, it should be noted that the vast majority of these 30,000 positions are positions of less than 10 and sometimes 4 hours a week. There are many ways to look at these various activities. The other side of the fact that there are one million children and 2,600 institutions is that about 600,000 children more than half, do not currently attend any type of Jewish education. Less than half of all the Jewish children in North America currently attend any type of Jewish school. A second point is though the importance of Israel and it's impact on the young visitor leave little doubt. Only about 1 in 3 North American Jews has ever visited Israel and of course the figures are lower among the 16 to 25 year olds. And lastly, at this time, when family education is considered to be a particular importance it appears that Jewish parents do not always have the ability to help their children in their Jewish education. Therefore, particularly relevant that only 1 in 10 adults are involved in any type of Jewish learning. So how did the commission decide to address this fact. As I said the commission has decided to undertake a very concrete program of implementation. The questions were, what should be done, who should do it, how should it be done. There are 3 major points to the commission strategy. First the commission decided to undertake a two _____ program, one that would take place initially in lead communities at the local and at the same simultaneously would involve major initiatives at the continental level what we call continental strategies. 2. In order to respond to the question of the third meeting of this commission I believe, of who would do this. The commission decided on the establishment of a council for initiatives in Jewish education. This council would be a driving force for implementing the

commission's plan and for bringing about change. 3. As Mort has just explained, a funding strategy both short and long term is being developed in order to make the resources available so that the plan can indeed be implemented. Initially, the major thrust of the work of the commission will be related to what we come to call the building blocks of Jewish education. Establishing a professional Jewish education and building community support for Jewish education, the commission felt that these two elements are not just the basic building blocks but also that are inter-related. The reason is the following: in order for talented people to be educated to the field, they must believe that the community is embarking on a new era for Jewish education, in which there will be reasonable salaries, which are large enough today, a secure career line, an opportunity to have an impact on the quality of the methods of education. On the other hand, parents, in order to be willing to send their children to Jewish educational programs must recognize and must believe that Jewish education can make a decisive contribution to the lives and lifestyles of their children and the lifestyles of their families. This was the basis of the two building blocks upon which the content of the work of the commission and the implementation plan would rest. I'd like to get to the second point which is the council for initiatives in Jewish education. We have a slide that gives some sense of the organization involved. At present the idea of who will do the work and what work will be done looks as follows: the council for initiatives in Jewish education will be driven by the decisions of its board. All decisions, policies will be set by a board. There will be a small a few people and much of the work will be done by outside consultants, by the central organizations of Jewish life, JESNA, JCC, JWB, CJF are likely to play a key role in some of the functions that are involved in the work

of the council and to serve on their board and those of today deliver the services of Jewish education. Now what will the council do. First of all we have begun speaking about this and it will be addressed later again.

The council will It will try to act as a bridge between sources of funding both private and communal and specific programs and plans. Second, the council will bring about a major planning effort in order to translate the ideas, the stragedy suggested into concrete plans. The council will insure that every step of the implementation is monitored in evaluation and that the countability is given to the successor mechanism of the commission or to the board. Fourth, the council will initiate and facilitate the establishment of lead communities and give whatever assistance needed in order to insure their success. Lastly, the council will engage in a major effort together with the help of others at diffusing what is being learned in various endeavors throughout North America.

I would like to go to what is obviously a major question and that is concretely what is the council going to do. Let us look together at the establishment of lead communities which is one of the major points involved. Several lead communities will be selected and established. There are a number of communities that have come forth already and have told us of their interest in being selected as lead communities. The council will undertake at once to determine the criterion conditions under which communities will be selected and to decide on a process by which the selection will take place. This work will start immediately and may take a few months to be done until the decision is taken as to which communities will be selected.

What will a lead community do. A lead community will engage in a process of redesigning and improving the delivery of Jewish education

12
across the board. I would like to give a number of illustrations because there have been very many suggestions as to what will be done in a lead community. I would like to illustrate some of the things that might happen that have been suggested and that could happen in the lead community. First of all best practices, programs that work will be imported and for local needs. Lead communities will become a place where very many programs that have proven successful in other places will be brought together. The question we will be asking ourselves is when many best programs are brought in one place, what can happen to Jewish education. We will be looking at that under the the assumption that probably very many good things might happen. Second of all, ideas and programs will be encouraged and tested in lead communities. A major effort will be involved at cultivating new sources for personnel. This in the various interview discussions that we have had both individually and in groups and at prior meetings, this is clearly one the biggest problem and major challenges facing any effort at changing Jewish education. Can one recruit new people in order to staff in a better way positions that are currently staffed not always satisfactorily in order to create new positions that need to be created in order to staff new programs. A number of ideas have been suggested. They are described in the background documents that you have I would like to mention a few.

The idea is that in a lead communities from a variety of sources we might be able to recruit 15 to 20 new educators initially in a fairly short amount of time and that these would bring in the quality, level, energy necessary in order to assist the local community in the new endeavors. Let us take for example the idea of the fellows of the council. The idea has been raised and is even being implemented in a preliminary way in some communities in North America. There are large

14-

number of Jewish people in the academic world in studies, general education, in humanities and social sciences who look forward to the possibility of making their contribution to Jewish life. The question who would want for example recruit two such people to give 2, 3, 4, or 5 years of their life to such a lead community. We have reason to believe that under the proper conditions this is possible. The question becomes if we could across North America recruit 10 such people to give guidance to the educators in the community, what would it do. This is just one idea. I will not go into detail because my time is almost up. There are a number of such ideas that lead us to believe that one could at this point in a lead community recruit a calibery of new people that would be able to assist in the endeavor.

A few of the other suggestions, all educators in lead communities will be involved in on the job training programs. There seems to be an agreement among very many commissioners that this has to be. Everybody in a lead community will be involved in a program of self enrichment and learning so that educators will participaate in seminars, in courses they may do so in the summer, in Israel they may do so at institutes of high Jewish learning and a variety of universities and settings that are currently offering in service training. That this will be institutionalized and everyone will be involved. We have mentioned and it has been said to me very strongly at some the interviews I had this week with commissioners that unless an effort is made to involve key community leaders in the endeavor, this is going to be very hard to implement. Therefore such an effort has to be undertaken to gather in a systematic way with a program to inform the leadership about the facts of Jewish eudcation, issues, and what can be done about it.

15.

What will happen in a lead community. Let's assume for a moment that the lead community has been selected and that work is beginning. The idea suggested is that a local planning committee be created to determine that community's needs locally and to develop a plan in order to address the major problems. A professional staff will assist the community's leaders and educators in this endeavor and the council for initiatives in Jewish education will lend whatever planning and professional assistance is required. There will locally be a fair amount of planning work and thinking work in order to develop the responses and to decide on those programs that are specifically suited to the community and state. As I mentioned before in parallel to the effort with lead communities, continental strategies will be undertaken. A number of major initiatives are called for at the continental level in order for lead communities to be able to move ahead and in order for change to take place in a significant manner. One point is work will have to be done for maintaining the momentum of the commission's work and establishing programs to inform and involve many more community leaders I've just spoken to. At the same a broad scale effort to introduce changes in the personnel structures will have to be undertaken. Commissioners have suggested that it will be necessary to undertake a major marketing and recruitment effort if we are able to find many more young people and find ways to attract them to the training programs and to jobs. Second of all the point called the education of educators. By that we mean the training and the training programs. It will be necessary and suggested to undertake a major effort at increasing significantly the number of people graduating annually from training programs. You will be receiving this date a third research report by Dr. R.E. Davidson who has surveyed the existing training programs. Last year there were 101 graduates of all

trainig programs for a field that has 30,000 positions. 5,000 are full time positions. Obviously this is enormously inadequate. There a sense that it is possible to raise significantly the number of graduates in fairly short amount of time to 3 or 4 hundred that too will not suffice but would be a significant improvement over the current situation. What will this involve. It will involve things such as creating new positions, endowing professorships, sending young people to train to become professors of education. Currently the full time faculty for Jewish education for all the institutions together is 18 people many of whom hold very significant and load to their in addition to their training loads. Obviously that situation has to be changed if training programs are to be able to do their jobs.

The issue of salaries and benefits is one that also requires careful study but will clearly require change. Salaries in Jewish education fall far below salaries in general education. They are considered inadequate. That question will have to be dealt with.

Educators need to be empowered in order to make their contribution to educational policies of their institutions. It both the need of the institutions and the educators. They need to know that they can make the contribution, be want and are able to make to the development of Jewish education. All educators work in programs. Therefore from the beginning this commission has spoken in addition to the building blocks of Jewish education, has spoken of programatic endeavors. The creation of programs in the various areas of Jewish education will be one of the challenges of the Council.

Among the ideas suggested, two at the moment are that the council develop an inventory of successful programs and will make that available to institutions throughout North America so that they can use it adapted

locally. As a major piece, the council will build upon the work already being undertaken and begun by several family foundations in a variety of programatic areas and to continue development in whatever means and ways of being developed. The last point which was discussed very The methods of Jewish education is deemed essential by many commissioners. The development of methods for monotoring and evaulating the implementation of the commission's plan will be undertaken. The result of these two endeavors will be throughout the Jewish community.

These ideas have been summarized in the report and by commissioners under 6 heading as the commission's 6 recommendations. I will briefly read the beginning of each one of them. 1. The commission recommends the establishment of the council for initiatives in Jewish education. 2. The commission urges an effort to involve more key community leaders in the Jewish education enterprise. 3. The commission recommends that a plan be launched to build a profession of Jewish education in North America. 4. The commission recommends the establishment of several lead communities. 5. The commission will encourage developments in programatic areas which offer promising opportunities for new initiatives. 6. The commission recommends the establishment of a research capability in North America. These are the 6 recommendations.

I think it would be most appropriate to conclude these comments by reading to a statement that you will find as the last page in your background document. We are fortunate that one of the commissioners, Professor Isadore Twersky decided to share with us his conception of the commission's mission. Our goals should be to make it possible for every Jewish child to be exposed to the mystery and of Jewish history. To the informing insights and special sensitivity of Jewish thought, the sanctity and symbolism of Jewish existance, to the power and

provundidity of Jewish faith, as a motto we might adopt a that says
the search and did not find as .
usually understood as an ignoramus and illiterate may for our purposes be
redifined as one indifferent to Jewish visions and values, untouched by
the drama and majesty of Jewish history, unappreciative of the
resourcefulness and of the Jewish community, unconcerned with
Jewish destiny. Education in its broadest sense will enable young people
to confront the secret of Jewish and existence, the quality of
through our teaching with facinates and attracts irresistability. They
will then be able to to find their place in a creative and
constructive Jewish community.

Florence Melton: If I may respectfully add to Rabbi Twersky's statement
here a broad sense of statement of purpose to include Jewish people from
early childhood to academic scholarship.

Jack Bieler: First of all, very fundamentally I think the introduction of
this paper emphasizes the importance of Outreach of reaching all sorts of
people that are not being reached right now. I think deals with
improving the delivery system. I don't think that one thing logically
is In other words, the parents that are unable to help with
their children's education is quite different with the assumption that
parents are not interested in helping their children of Jewish education.
Does it logically follow on pg. 45 that if the building blocks will be
improved then parents will recognized that Jewish education can make a
contribution to the lives of their children. I'm not convinced that that
is true. Even if the small percentage of children that get educated will
get a better education that does not address the issue of erosion of
Jewish values throughout the Jewish community. A major piece of this
in terms of dealing with the of dealing with many of the people

who are not confronted with any of this at all. I think that by putting statistics for children as apposed to talking about further length of adolescence, adults, college age students. What it does is gives the implication the major thrust of Jewish education is in the school. I think we have reached the conclusion that this is not necessarily so. Granted statistics are not available, we have no statistics at all. We only have charts about the schools to talk how the basis of communities not being reached, I think we are making a mistake in point #1. In point #2 we said at the end of the last meeting this issue of the community. I would fear that the idea of a lead community would not be if various foundations are only interested in particular projects. I believe the community would really have to constitute an organic relationship of many different kinds of programs and institutions towards creating a comprehensive approach towards Jewish education. The foundations are interested in another piece of let's say you can't find people to deal with the whole organic I think we won't be able to construct the kind of lead community I envision would not simply be a laboratory for a hit and miss type of system but would rather also be an attempt to deal with the problems of old. Third point is the issue of that you mentioned. There are only two places in this paper where the issue of comes up. On pg. 9 it mentions that the commission would benefit from the power of various religious persuasions. is not an issue but rather than a value in terms of itself. I think that it should go further than that. about this idea that will be through Jewish education. I don't know if the point of the commission to towards Jewish education. There is a much stronger statement about is a value in itself and that commission is a of that rather than simply saying that the commission will

advance its goals by

Irwin Field: I wanted to add what the Rabbi started to say because he touched on something which I wanted to discuss. Going back to the first point that he made: There is nothing in this document that speaks to or about the family. The only mention of the word family appears on pg. 45. It says if we approve with the accusation of dedicated and qualified personnel then families will recognize that Jewish education will make a decisive contribution to their lives. I think that is a significant omission of what we're doing. If I go back to the minutes of the last meeting in the group discussion that was chaired by Eli Evans, there is an important point which says that group members encourage the important focus on involving the family. Back to the minutes of the previous meetings, it also was mentioned in each of those meetings. When you cite statistics that only one half of the children attend Jewish schools, we make it sound like it's the children's fault. The victims are guilty, but it's not their fault because they never make that the decision. No child decides to go to a Jewish school. Parents decide what they are going to do at that particular age and we aren't speaking at all to that issue in the whole framework of Jewish education. We know that in general education today, in inner city schools, in the problem schools, in those model schools where they have involved the parents in the school, the school is approved. As Annette spoke before that if we were to empower educators we would improve the system. If we would empower the parents, what would happen to the system then. In the current issue of Forbes the lead story says that from 4 to 12 years old today is a 75 billion dollar commercial spending consumer market. That's what the major companies are gearing. If we were to say that Jew are 1/75 of that a year and if we could get Jewish parents to invest 1/10 of that additional into Jewish

education you're talking about an enormous to Jewish education. Somewhere in this document we have to somehow focus on the family and parents as a primary part of this whole process.

Morton Mandel: I would just like to remind you that early on we identified 19 major areas, any one of which deserves a commission and should have one. The family was one at the other end of the spectrum, early childhood and I'm looking at Eli Evan's how do we end the year of 1990 using the electronic media. There are 19 major areas that need to be explored. I remind you the was that in our brief life we would not get into any more depth than to identify these major building blocks and hope that we can encourage all of them to be the subject of the commission or where the knowledge is there implementation on the part of some of the folks around this table and others getting them to do what Jack Bieler and Irwin Field at least part of Jack's comments. There's none of us starting with me, I would sure live my life over again. I wish I would have been exposed to some of the things my grandchildren have been exposed to. I remind you that we all have strong feelings about all 19 on the life of this commission have not been able to do any more than identify as a major report. That's how we ended up with the family.

Seymour Martin Lipset: I would like to continue that point... I must confess there is a certain underlying logic to what we've done. Mainly what I call market research. I happened to read just this morning in the latest issue of New York Magazine in 7 days that the magazine is closing down. Stern put 10 million dollars into it. He thought that it would sell, that there was a gap between the Village Voice which he owns and New York Magazine. He found that there isn't. There just wasn't a market for it. The question is what is the market for Jewish education? Some of these statistics for example the push for 6 million Jews-- it may turn out

by the way that there are more. There's a new Jewish population survey which is coming up with the fact that there may be as many as 7 or 8 million people who are Jews in The U.S. They did 100,000 random digit dialing to locate Jews. It increases the number of people who are Jewish or think of themselves as Jewish but have nothing to do with the community. If you take our previous data, take 100 Jews, roughly 25 of them are 0--are totally unrelated. So if you start with the 6

million Of the other 75, there is another 25 who are not involved in the community. When we say one out of every three Jews went to Israel, what is the base of that? If the base is 6 million, it's one out of three; if the base 3 million it's 2 out of 3. If we say only 40% of Jewish kids are going to school, if the base is 6 million it's 40%, if the base is 3 million it's 80%. The whole question of who can we sell to. We can't, no matter what we do - stand on our heads - there are a lot of Jewish families who will never send their kids to a Jewish school no matter how good the school is. If we say who are the people sending their kids to Jewish schools, if we identify Jews, 20% are Orthodox, and this whole question of what is the community, who can we sell to and how good a job we're doing or not doing is something we can only address within the context of what the people are. From one perspective we may be doing a better job than we think. That is the perspective of whether people who feel themselves Jewish are sending their kids to school. Only 20% go to synagogue or temple whereas in Christian groups it's much higher. What about the 80%. Obviously some of those 80% are candidates for this, but we really have to know all of this when we deliberate. We can improve the schools, but people have to want to come to them. We should make it better for the people who want to go. The question is how do we get these other people? Can we get them? Where can we get them? I raised the

question at an earlier meeting of the significance of the college population. That's a captive audience. It's the last time last time you can reach Jewish people who have no background. And one of the things that happens in college, and again I think the number is very small, is Jewish kids who come out of totally non-Jewish backgrounds get picked up sometimes in college, through Jewish studies courses or something. But again, how many, to what extent, what is the significance of trying at that point versus other points. All of this calls for basic research. In a certain way I think that basic research is a preliminary. It hasn't been done.

Rabbi Hirt: The section of the report on lead communities is inspiring. It really tries to say that we can look at certain settings and see how we want to develop. I question whether lead communities should be restricted to geographic locals. There might be some advantage to having lead communities by discipline, because if people are to learn from each other there is a very small population currently involved in a given discipline, how can we really be able to learn how to develop it, whether it's in camping or informal education or in basic education. Should there not be a concept of lead community by discipline where there can be a greater sense of networking that has a research component to it, has involvement of personnel rather than doing a localized- even if you have 20 or 30 communities. I think the sharing may be different because of local constituents. I would suggest that in lead communities, while the geographic base works in communities of certain sizes, we might also wish to explore the idea of something by discipline. I'm not saying that it's one of the 19 areas but I think it's- MLM-it's a different cut into it.

The same element is in that of recruitment. Here to what I think is

done in recruitment ought to be looked at from the point of view of what incentives are necessary in order to bring people into the field, not what people will be brought in because they are already available within the market. We need a longer term element space sort of limiting. We've had 2, 3, 5, or 10 people in certain areas that might have an impact. I'm not sure unless we can look at things what might encourage people to enter the field, what kind of people we have to involve and give us that information. We might be able to recruit in a general sense by demographics and not necessarily by substance. Now we ought to take a look at that particularly with people who have had a greater impact upon people who have entered Jewish education. Somewhat of the celebraty endorsement element- a modest example of Auerbach who tells a kid in seventh grade what he ought to be doing, whether he should play basketball in NC and go on to the Celtics is a good example. I think there are people in the various movements and the universities that have great impact on people. Those are the people that have to be projected to be working with a mission to say that these are mottos that you can look at for the future.

John Colman: The report rests importantly on the function of involving more key community leaders in the work of the lead communities and the development of plan. I wonder whether the weakness of that office should be addressed at least partially in the report, namely the assesment of the Jewish capacity of the key community leadership. I wonder how many key community leaders would meet the standards that Rabbi Twersky has given to us. Clearly if community leaders are going to be involved in the choices and the innovation, they do not have to .

Morton L. Mandel: Which comes first the chicken or the egg?

Charles Bronfman: First of all I'll just answer John partly. I don't know whether this an answer...I remember when I was president of our local federation, I frankly didn't give a damn about Jewish education. I was the one under my presidency that got our federation deeply involved in Jewish education. It's not necessarily who the leaders of the community are. If people want it, somehow you've got to deliver it.

I was wondering about the Council and the necessity for a council. It's going to be looked upon as another organization. In the deliberations that lead to the idea of a council, I'm sure that the thought of expanding JESNA's role was considered and I'd like to know how the council idea grew and not the enhancement of a body like JESNA.

Morton L. Mandel: A lot of time was spent and I'm going to suggest that we're going to get to that. Steve is going to make a major presentation this afternoon on that. I put the word major in. I'd like you to hold your question, if that's okay with you, until we do that.

Arthur Green: I am very supportive of the entire report and everything that is in it. I find Professor Twersky's mission statement particularly inspiring. As I read the mission statement and the report itself, I find a significant gap between them and it's that gap I really wanted to talk about, making two points, essentially. I am afraid when I read the mission statement I hear about a new commitment to Jewish education (here I would prefer Jewish learning rather than Jewish education) involved support in the community. When I go to the text of the report I see that we have again with day schools and supplementary schools. So many percentages of day and supplementary schools and that adult education, family education, everything else that something ought to happen about it. I'm afraid that we fall back

into the new patterns thinking that Jewish education really Hebrew school after all. It seems to me that what we are talking about, if I hear the mission statement correct, is creating a new climate in the Jewish community, a climate where Jewish learning, and I use the word learning now rather than education because I think somehow it is more traditional and more involving of the adults and the whole community and not just institutions for children. Where Jewish learning will have a new excitement, a new respectability. I wonder then whether we have gone about our own work in a somehow inadequate way. Given the group of Jewish teachers and learners that we have in this room, I wonder whether these semi-annual meetings we shouldn't have spent an hour or an hour and a half during the day breaking up into groups and doing some real Jewish learning together, modeling that somehow we by our example are making that a real part of what goes on. I would certainly like to see the council or undertake for all of its constituencies. Some real attempts themselves not only in programming for the vast unwashed masses out there, but some real attempts at doing learning on their own in modeling that learning in groups is what's important. I would like to see us, as we have contacts with community leadership around the country, model that federations and federation meetings themselves undertake more than a ceremonial d'var Torah, which is an accomplishment. I know that wasn't always done 20 years ago and the movement to include a d'varTorah is now a step. I feel that has become too ceremonialized and I think about something more than learning. I don't know how much we believe in trickle down economics these days, but I think there is no alternative to a trickle down theory in terms of educational modeling. The only way to do it is by doing it. I have a fear that I don't see quite enough of that in the report as it comes out. With all the best intentions of doing that there is somehow a falling back into framework where the only thing we worry about are the statistics. The

numbers of children in the schools. We are talking about a value transformation in the communities. That will only be done by creating a new climate and I guess I'm saying only that which all of us in the field of Jewish education have known you only do that by setting an example and by creating that climate first in dare I say your own chavura.

Secondly, in this same area of not enough emphasis on the adult side, and here I underscore something that has been said already, the college campus I think doesn't take enough space in report. References made to 600 programs of Jewish learning of various kinds in various college campuses, various kinds of programs. Indeed, we don't know enough about them. As my fellow academics here know well, our colleagues at the Association for Jewish Studies would very much resist being lumped wholesale into this world of Jewish educator. Are they Jewish educators? How do we build a bridge between these programs of research and teaching and areas of Judaic concern in a secular university, contacts and the Jewish educational values and goals that we have. That can only be done by a new sort of bridge building especially focused on Hillel, but especially focused on building some sort of link between what the Hillel Director and the Jewish Educator with their goals can do and the Judaic Professor on campus with his or her goals. That thing has to be done and we've very much involved in this business of trying to create a on the college campus and I think that even by agreement with the fact that this is gift we've been given somehow, we who have whatever inadequacies we do in Jewish for children have somehow been given the gift of a second opportunity for Jewish learning as people go through the campus and decide they can take one or two of their humanities required courses in Judaic studies. That is an opportunity we have not begun to mind in terms of the potential educational value. I think that in looking at an overall program at Jewish education in the North American community,

28

today, that has to be more than a short paragraph that says yes there are so and so many programs on Judaic studies on college campuses.

Alfred Gottschalk: So much has been said here with which I agree. I want to go back to Professor Twersky's mission statement and what I think it means to me. The question that was asked by Martin Buber and Franz Rosenswag a generation ago. What is Jewish education? Their answer was, the purpose of Jewish education is to create a Jewish human being who is no less Jewish belonging to the universal family of man and no less universal by being Jewish. They were addressing the problems of the modern world as they saw it. As I read this very comprehensive and excellent report, reflecting 2 years of very serious effort and work, it is a remarkable undertaking. We should say a prayer for having reached this day. You know, 2 years ago, the Berlin Wall was up, eastern Europe was relatively in tact, and people still thought that central planning was the answer or that a new 5 year plan could solve the weaknesses that haunted eastern European economics. I have a feeling that, from the point of view of Heinsight, our report is not related to what's happening in the world at large. In terms of the massive changes in society and the impact of those changes. I don't know how we could have been aware of them, but the fact of the matter is that we have to deal with that new reality. Therefore I would plead that we continue talking with one another. I think, as important as any written report, was the fact that we were able to sit together in a room. Under no other umbrella was that possible. That we continue this questioning what is Jewish education, the purpose to creat a Jewish human being, and what does that entail. Our report addreses the idiosyncratic nature of the Jewish community as highlighted by Walter Akerman's last paragraph. A rather remarkable paper you sent us, which I'd like to remind us of.: The idea of centrally organized planning...

("the entire final paragraph of Akerman's paper"). There I think lies the key to our report. It is in its genius in going back to the individual units which comprise this Mosaic of Jewish education, the Jewish religious movements, the non-religious movements and those devoted to Jewish education. The need to strengthen that which exists. I think that Professor Lipset has put his finger on something very important. We know who is here. This is, we know who comes to our school - whose those children and their families are. We do not know who the people are out there whom we might appeal to. Therefore I would plead that we concentrate on those we have, raising the level of education, quality of education that we deal with role modeling. These are the people, when they go out and teach, who will have problems and bring them into the Jewish school. No proclamation, no report can change those realities.

Last point, and that is the coordination obviously is necessary. I think that Walter Akerman is correct that coordination and central planning are two separate functions and are respectable. One does not replace the other and certainly nothing is contemplated for this report that would go toward a central planning organization which would develop before that goes out to everyone. That this continuing body would assist others in developing that.

David Hirschhorn: I assume we are all here because of a common concern for Jewish continuity. We are also here because we think the Jewish Education has a role to play in it. I am concerned at the way the tone of this report is developing. It would appear to suggest whatever we can do in Jewish education is the answer to Jewish continuity. It has already been suggested by others that there are other major forces at work, societal changes that has taken place. There is the whole issue of the family, not just the Jewish

family but the family and its role. I think we may be overselling and that we leave ourselves in position of a report which suggests that if we improve Jewish education we have solved the problems of Jewish continuity. I know this section on the relationship of Jewish education to Jewish continuity remains to be written. I haven't seen it and I don't know what it says, but I have a concern if it suggests-- that is one and one equals two-- and I wonder whether or not we need to rethink the introductory section which oversimplifies the rationale for the creation of this commission in terms of the fact if we do a better job with Jewish education, Jewish continuity problems will be solved. We set that as an objective and if we don't necessarily improve Jewish continuity, you wouldn't say that we have failed, so we haven't set a realistic goal for ourselves.

Morton L. Mandel: Thank you David. I want to remind everyone that our process has been and certainly will be after this meeting, everything is being recorded and notes are being taken as well. All of these comments will be examined as carefully as we know how to examine them and will be filtered into any revisions which you will then see again, which is what we have done each of our prior 5 meetings.

Alvin Schiff: I must say that I continually am impressed with the of elequent reactions to the report and I wouldn't want to be in the staff position and have to digest them and make the amalgam that will finally come out.

Why should the recommendation made by the successful businessman or successful real estate man - what do you owe your success to? He says 3 things: location, location, location. I think our goal at this meeting is focused, focused, focused. What are we going to focus on? I see coming out

of this remarkably well organized report, I see there are 2 separate thrusts and I think they have been touched upon somewhat. One has to do with outreach and the other has to do with inreach. I think the report essentially deals with the affiliated, the marginally affiliated, and the un-affiliated or under-affiliated Jews. I don't know right now if there is "enough gold in them thar hills" to deal with the total variety of un-affiliated, alienated Jews.- whether they are half of the Jewish population, a third, or 60%. I would like to concentrate on what I call inreach - people who have some kind of affiliation, are under-affiliated, send their kids to schools, may go on a trip to Israel, may have some relationship to a JCC, adult education, or have some relationship to the organized Jewish community. I call that inreach. I would like to suggest- we said we don't know about how much it costs us. Well in a sense, Jewish education big wheels have done alot of figuring on that. It's well over a billion dollars. I can provide you with figures that may be not so correct, but my figures are close to one billion two hundred million dollars. Big business. What can the Commission do relating to the expenditure over one billion dollars. Question I think the answer to that is leverage. How can best leverage a relatively small amount of money that will be available to do what is needed for this Jewish community? In American terms, it's small, whether it's 5 million or 8 million, but as far as Jews are concerned, spread all over the whole atlas or the continent of North America, it's a huge job. I guess there would be 2 overall roles for the Commission coming out of all our discussions and it's implied if not expressed in the report. One has to do with the continuing role of advocacy. When I look back at the Johnson era-sputnick that woke us up. In 1957 we were woken up by Sputnik. I think there was a 10 fold increase after that in government and foundation support of higher education. Look what's happening to us. Where did they come from?

nmhey came from the self-realization that education can not be viewed as a consumer good any more. It has to be viewed as an investment in the future of America. All reports thereafter, including the Nation At Risk, feed on that and I think that has to be that continuous relationship. We're not going to solve it by saying we're looking at Jewish education now. During the next decade or 2 decades one of the things that the Commission had to do is turn the hearts of American Jews who care with the under-affiliated, marginally affiliated, and affiliated groups into considering Jewish education, whatever the dimensions are-informal, formal, adult, early childhood- turning that into a feeling of urgency and investment in the future rather than a consumer good. Even those who go on a trip to Israel might against something else- it costs me \$2,000, \$3,000- I'll take my family, I'll send my kid. It's still viewed by even those who are committed as a consumer good. I would suggest that this one of the roles.

The implementation role, to me, one of the things I learned from and that I loved in the report was that of changing the language of community site to lead community. I think it's not only semantic. Annette did it well and the report does it well. Let me embellish on that piece. When we talked about community sites, we spoke mostly about a mode or a mood of experimentation in the community see to what level we could bring the community. Lead community if not a difference in semantics. It's a very important, substantive difference. It's taking a community or a program within a community and showing how that can affect Jewish life/Jewish education. I would like to suggest that there are precedents in the American scene. These precedents come out of the elementary or secondary education act, post 1965, thereafter fleshed out by Title 4 and must say my experience was I was chairman of the Evaluation Committee of Title 4 and I must say that they develop a

methodology that I think may be useful to us. A key to that, which is different than community sites, the key to that is developing, transferring success strategies. That's what the national network is all about. That's what all the dissemination efforts and I'd like to suggest we put our money on more ways to develop those leads. They don't necessarily have to be a total community. It can be a part of a community, a program community that could be exported for use elsewhere and that the Council could be effective in providing the leverage for the funding on two sides of the coin. The first area could be helping develop what already exists into something that is exportable, then validating it, because once you develop something and make it better we don't know how well we did it. There has to be a position, there has to be money and support made available to validate that. Once it's validated, that community that becomes a lead community has to be able to demonstrate to others that it can be done elsewhere. There has to be that bridge. Then the funding has to be given to that lead community to demonstrate to others that "look it works. the program works, it can be exported." Finally, the funding can go to the person who wants to adopt it. That's where the dissemination piece comes up. I must tell you when I read it, it turned me on in that respect. I see it as a 4 level activity. Whether it's a total community, and I don't think it can be done as a total community, whether it can be done as programs in a community and if possible a total community helping them develop, validate, demonstrate and disseminate it and I think if we do that within the inreach concept- outreach is another thing. I must say that outreach is absolutely important, but a lot of things we do as outreach are really inreach because we already touch and reach these people in some ways. I'd like to suggest that that is my contribution.

But having said that, I want to make something else- the Jewish Family. Our

24

research, the board of Jewish Education Research, we researched supplementary schools and the research was done- Seymour knows this and others know this - says to us that we are never going to be successful with the 60 or 70%, and I maintain that it's about 70% of the children somehow will be exposed, even though less than half or half are currently involved. During their lifetime, given the common trend of children in schools between age 5 and 18, about 70% are really exposed. The question is will that stick? What will happen to them? The largest majority of those kids are going to be turned off because their families are not with them. I just want to leave you on this note. (some loss while tape was turned over) We've never had administrators like this. Never. No sophisticated administrators. What's wrong with our schools? Particularly in urban area. The problem with our schools is that parents send us the wrong kids. We will always have the wrong kids if we don't invest -- in the families.

David Arnow - I have generally quite positive feelings about the report as a whole. I want to second a comment that Jack made initially about the place in the report for the concept of pluralism. It is recognized as a fact, not as a value. I have no problem with that. Related to that, I want to make a comment about the mission statement. I like the idea of a mission statement. This is not the longest document in the world, but it is nice to have a mission statement where we're headed. I have a problem with the process by which this statement was developed and therefore the contents as well. This is the first time I've seen the mission statement. I don't know if that's true for others. ...

MLM - That is not meant to be a mission statement. That is a commentary made by the rabbi that we thought highly of. It's not the mission of the Commission on Jewish Education and I don't believe that Rabbi Twersky meant it as such. He just sent us a statement that he believes deeply reflects his point of view, and we thought it was beautiful and we wanted to share it with you.

David Arnow - My question is, what is the future of this statement? Vis-a-vis the rest of the document?

MLM - There is no future of this statement. It's Isadore Twersky's commentary and I understand.

Twersky - I was asked to reformulate something that I had said at our very first meeting and I tried to reconstruct. It in no way coordinated with the report.

MLM - We stuck it in here so that it would be easily available to all of you in the book. It is not page 80 of the report. That's my fault for not being clear.

Arnou - I have no further comments.

Hirschhorn - Will the mission statement be included?

MLM - What statement? You mean a mission statement. Right now there is no mission statement that we think of as part of the report.

David Dubin - Maybe the comments have dealt with family, age groups, program concepts and really details of implementation where for me that's at gimel and I'm still at aleph. What goes through my mind is I read this very well-constructed report, which I thought conceptually was very succinct and educationally repetitive -- what goes through my mind is something much more practical. I feel a little guilty about saying it after studying Rosensweig and Buber this summer and hearing all these wonderful educational, philosophical comments. It's a practical concern I have. There are many ideas in this report, many conceptual suggestions and the question I have is how do we make what we have here palatable to the people who are not here?

Because in order for this to be successful, it involves people who are not in this room. What can we do to create an environment of receptivity both in terms of the local as well as the continental strategies? All of these architectural designs, all of those educational people in the vineyards out there. And that's the piece that I don't know if it's missing or it's the next step in the process, because I think we need to find ways to diminish the erosion that always takes place between these wonderful ideas that we come out with, and here there's a whirlwind of ideas that would have to take place in these communities, and the actual implementation. Before we get to some of the specific concerns. And that's the whole piece of how do we transmit and network all of this in a way in which other people will be as enthusiastic as we are? Maybe this will be the work of Steve when he picks it up with the council of the initiatives. I think there needs to be a whole piece that's not in the report, and I don't know if it should be in the report, about the transmission process. Should Mort Mandel and Seymour Fox and Steve Hoffman and whoever else meet with the executive directors of federations and presidents of communities around the country who are either going to be or not in these communities, to share with them what this blueprint is all about. I think something like that may be in order. Shouldn't there be some mini-regional meetings involving the key quarterbacks who are going to have to really give leadership to all of these conceptual ideas to the communities. I have this fear that this wonderful material, and I think there are some creative ideas that are conceptually sound here, I thought it was wonderful. How do we articulate it in a way in which it makes sense from a practical point of view to the people who are not in this room?

Somewhere along the line, there are ideas and creative ideas, perhaps PR people relate to that, somewhere along the line, before we get into families or Euber, we have to I think deal with that.

Norman Lamm - I'd like to share a few of my concerns, and there are a variety of them. First in our conversation I was discussing so far this morning, we've been meeting close to two years and I am disturbed by the tendency to start rethinking the whole thing from aleph. We have had a certain basis of agreement, some consensus has arisen. It is reflected in an excellent report. Now to start reinventing the whole Commission by discussing whether or not Jewish education is the answer to everything I don't think anyone thinks it's the answer to everything. For introducing ideological notes, and I'm against any mention of pluralism, why do you want to muddy those waters again? That's not necessary. That's not what we're here for. If what we are doing is pluralism, so be it. Why bother with semantics. We are getting ideological compounded and confounded here. As I say, I am quite pleased with the report and I think we have to proceed. But among other things that haven't been mentioned today are some very good complaints that we haven't been inclusive enough before that have been mentioned today. We should have had family education, advanced planning, cable TV, physical facilities, subsidizing the cost of education-- and someone mentioned this, that parents simply find it impossible to pay the cost of a good Jewish education. All kinds of things have been mentioned, and here I would like to say that in general I think it is correct. We have got a comprehensive view of what we want to achieve in the long run. My fear

is that we are going to overburden ourselves. The Talmud says...if you know where you want to go and you grab for too much, you will achieve nothing. If you have a more limited goal, you possibly will attain. We have three major aspects of the work of this Commission that I can discern. Number one--I'll start with the bottom line--simply getting enough money to be able to do great things in Jewish education, that's what we're doing with the family foundations and federations, etc. The second is to act as a lobbyist, as an advocacy group for Jewish education amongst the Jewish communities throughout North America. The third is everything else, which comes to the substance of Jewish education itself. Here, we have all the other suggestions coming in. Here I would say that from a theoretical point of view, to establish scope, fine, but otherwise, in practice, I'm a minimalist. Of all the things we mentioned, what I believe we have to do, and I think basically we're moving in that direction, is to establish what are our primary first steps. How are we going to take our priorities in thing? It is true that there are so many problems in Jewish education, that anything you touch can be made better. What we have to do is make a decision. I have the feeling from all that I've read that a major area is teachers, because with planning and curricula and with subsidies we are going to get nothing if you don't have decent teachers. I tell my own children and my own students, when you go to college, don't take courses, take teachers. You follow the best teacher and you will learn more than you will from the best course. What we have to have is more improvements in teacher education, in teacher professionalization. I learned many things from the material that was distributed--I found it very enlightening--including the frank admission that there are so many areas that

we know so little about and so many areas where we can't do very much, not only in Jewish education but in general education. But this is an area where, if we can at least begin to do something to raise the quality of Jewish teachers, professionalize them, increase their salaries, give them status, it's going to be an enormously difficult task. If we are going to take everything else at the same time, we are just not going to do it. Now with the lead communities we have, the idea is a splendid one. Lead communities, continental strategies. Fine. But here, I think we must, no matter how much money you are going to raise, it's not going to be enough. Someone said something about "not enough gold in them thar hills," there isn't. What we have to do is take one area, focus on that, and focus on all the other things which have to come along in order for that to succeed. If we can succeed in that, we will have made an historic dent in the whole thing instead of taking the whole ball of wax. Which leads me to my next and final concern. If we indeed are proceeding in this manner, and I can discern a great deal of focus went into this, over and beyond what we as commissioners have discussed--there was a great deal of good staff work here--if indeed we do have an approach that will be rational and try to look upon the problems of Jewish education in a real way, a practical way that we can make a difference, that probably is going to conflict with the money available. I see a conflict arising, and I don't know how it can be solved except by negotiation. Let's say our collective wisdom is to start with summer camps, teacher education, the Israel experience, whatever you like. We take this and we understand that this is really the way to begin to make the best difference for the least amount of money and therefore have enough left for

other problems. But you said that the family foundations, etc., agreed to come along, that each one would do his own thing in the area of Jewish education. There's going to be no pot and therefore some people will do one thing and some will do another. The result will be that we'll come along with a plan and that plan will not be funded because--I'm speaking from a background of experience of going to as a president of a university, I have to have money for bread and butter, French and Talmud and English and biology and he wants to have a course in Chinese potmaking. This distorts. Money that is given. The truth is, very often I turn down money because it distorts the purpose of education. I can't be everything to all people. What I'm afraid is developing here is that many of the donors, out of the goodness of their own hearts, have their own hobbyhorses in Jewish education. We will come to another conclusion, I think that is going to require a great deal of very wise and diplomatic horse trading and negotiating so that maybe we can convince the donors to participate not only in giving, but giving in a rational method that will make sure that ultimately all our needs will be resolved, but I would not overlook the possibility of difficulty.

MLM - Norman, there's a lot to what you say. It probably will be some combination of all of the above. That's the real world and the extent to which we can get more and more rational over the next decade will measure our success in this. I think we'll win some and lose some.

Maurice Corson - Just one reaction to what Dr. Lamm has said. I think that one cannot talk about problems in Jewish education in North America. It's very clear from what Dr. Lamm has said and from my own knowledge of the orthodox community that the orthodox community has a clear idea of what it wants to do. It needs money, first, second, and third. Better funding and scholarships and that's the melody that I hear all the time and all the other I think are secondary or tertiary for them. The rest of the Jewish community is struggling with a variety of other questions and that leads me to another comment before I get to my point. Two areas where you get the most bang for the buck in terms of transforming apathetic, indifferent young Jews into passionate, ethnic, identifying the experience and potential experience. Both of these are given a relatively light touch in this document. We seem to be preoccupied with the other areas of Jewish education, which now leads me to my comments which are very very difficult to actualize and to implement the findings, which I think are credible and appropriate. The document obviously is carefully thought through and I compliment the authors and the resource people who were involved in it. But I have two problems. One, I would like to hear, not from Yeshiva University, but from the non-orthodox teacher training, educator training institutions whether it will be real easy to get from 100 to 400 people of real quality and outstanding potential into full-time training programs for Jewish education. My hunch is that it's not going to be easy at all because there's a prior problem, and that is before someone decides to go into Jewish education, they got to be a "hasena Jew." They have to be very hot as a Jew. And once they are very hot as a Jew, they want to decide on a

career of Jewish service, we have discovered that there are other avenues, careers of Jewish service that seem to be much more attractive. Foremost among them is the rabbinate so even if you turn on young people, they tend not to want to go into Jewish education, outside the orthodox community, because other avenues are either more lucrative or more prestigious and I think it will be very difficult, even if you throw money into fellowships, and I'll have more to say about that later, to get to from 100 to 400. But I would like to hear if there's anybody around the table who represents such an institution who has hands on information, whether or not if we gave them X dollars you could begin to recruit another 50 or 100 top-flight candidates for professional training programs in Jewish education. Sara Lee is looking at me. I don't know if she has the answer, but she would be more qualified than me to comment.

Second comment. I had the feeling in talking about the lead communities it's a wonderful idea. It's like an experiment in an absolutely sterile laboratory. There is very little consideration given to the actual grassroots governance of the institutions you are going to try and change. You go into a community and you've got orthodox and conservative and reform auspices in schools. And the JCC and federation and any other external body that comes in there is going to have a very difficult time trying to get these institutions to do what they want them to do or they think they should do. Again, all institutions will be very quick to say give us money and we'll do our thing. But they're not going to be so quick to jump into some procrustean bed of what they should be doing or to accept personnel from

outside their denominational grouping or their training programs. So I am concerned about whether or not it is realistic to think that we can produce full-time candidates for full-time training programs just because we make an announcement or have some money available, and secondly I am really concerned about the feasibility of a lead community getting into the job of actually improving the educational institutions within that community without reference and involvement at the governance level of the lead community and of the council that will be created. Again I decry, and I've done it before, I'm a broken record, among the people who should have been preparing this document are those who represent the institutions that will actually deliver Jewish education and it's not JESNA and it's not JWB and it's not CJF, it is the United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education, it is the Yeshiva University Council on Jewish Education, it is the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, and they have not, I think, been sufficiently invested with the shaping of this document and therefore I think it's going to be hard for them to buy into it's findings. I want to just say two positive comments. I commend and applaud the comment Charles Bronfman made--another bureaucracy is not what we need. I would love to hear further discussion about the feasibility of providing JESNA with the funding and manpower necessary to enable it to do the job for which it was created which mainly is very much analogous and parallel to the job of the council as it is foreseen. I would like to compliment and express my appreciation to Professor Green for putting the dagesh on the college campus and Hillel and AJS as an area that needs development.

41
MLM - I don't want to comment on all of this. I will say, that Bennett Yanowitz, the president of JESNA and Jonathan Woocher have been very closely involved in all of this.

Eli Evans - I wanted to focus on Rabbi Twersky's statement because I think the idea of a mission statement or beginning the report with a quote might be an interesting approach. I recall that the Carnegie Commission on Broadcasting began with a quote from E. B. White in which he discussed television and gave it central important and perhaps wrestling with Rabbi Twersky's statement as a mission statement would be a very useful exercise as sort of one comment, one little statement that states in many ways.

Secondly, I would really like to see the report put a price tag on what we want to do in the next decade. Put a price tag on it. I think back again to the reports I've participated in or read in the past and it seems to me that that would lend some real dynamic to the report. I don't know how we reach those figures, but there was a suggestion that we were talking roughly about doubling the amount of money being spent on formal and informal Jewish education as it now is in the United States. I'd like to see us wrestle with this price tag somewhere in the final statement of the report.

And finally, let me discuss what I think is a real missing factor in the report and I think it's been echoed in many ways around the table. There's not an educator in America today that isn't aware of the impact of modern media as something with educational impact. Irwin Field talked about the

area of four to twelve-year-olds as a \$75 billion business in this country and as the father of a five-year-old I can tell you that this shapes their attitude in profound ways and there's nothing that a parent can do about it because of the nature of friendships. And I think Irwin said something else that is interesting. He talked about empowering parents as a possible theme of that section of the report. Let me ask that the Commission staff consider embracing telecommunications as an instrument of reform, as a way into the Jewish home, of empowering parents, of focusing on the family, as giving them the tools and educational materials and the possibility of educating their own families and getting them involved.

The second thing is that I just did a look at Jewish museums that are being developed in this country. There's something like \$400 million to be spent on the development of Jewish museums in the next five years. Believe it or not, much of it has already been raised. They are focusing very dramatically on the possibility of family education in the software that's being developed. Al Schiff just leaned over to me and said that he sees the computer in family education as the theme to cover. I think that the telecommunications revolution and all of its power has real possibilities here plus the space environment in which this education takes place and the recognition that the best that we have of formal education doesn't give the handfuls of the population not involved a way to be involved.

And lastly, in the last few months I have been looking at fibre optics revolution. There are many of you in the room who are aware of it. You

certainly are out in California. I think Erwin is an experimental city for fibre optics. Israel has now committed itself to totally rewiring the country in the five years, to go from having one or two channels of television to twenty-four channels of television. A channel has been turned over to the Open University in Israel, several channels have been turned over to the Israel Educational Authority. The fibre optic issue--what does it mean to us, it's marrying the telephone and cable together, and dial in the programs you want. There is a central library of programs that you dial up and pick your venue from that and it makes available to you everything that's possible. This is a revolution that is going to be profound in this country and profound in Israel. The possibilities of linking the two cultures in this space. I suggest to you that if in the forty year history only one-third of Jews in this country have gone to Israel, and two-thirds have not, that we cannot expect the two-thirds to go to Israel in the next 10-20 years. Therefore, the possibilities of using media is really there. I suggest to you that if the idea to expose young people to the greatest teachers, that Martin Buber is on tape and on film and so is Abraham Joshua Heschel and so is Eli Weisel and there is a possibility of bringing these great, inspiring personalities into the home. How will we teach the holocaust to the next generation? I wrestle with that with my own son who came in and asked me about it the other day and had some fear about it and I think that a Jewish parent in this country, unaffiliated or not, who hasn't faced this issue, we're struggling with it now in the Jewish heritage video collection and are wrestling with the idea of doing a whole series of teaching with video tape. To talk about adolescence and the

holocaust. There is an idea of using this with teen-agers as a possible market. I see this as a real problem in the report and I would like to see us step up to it, faced into the future, and embrace that future and say that this is a great opportunity for Jewish education. It must be done on a national level as well as a local level. On the national level, because programs cost a lot of money to create and on a local level because teachers have to be brought into this new world and learn how to use it. I think if we do that we will have served a very important space.

Josh Elkin - Let me offer three comments. One. Picking up on what Eli just said. Maybe there's a possibility, and this ties in to a point I wanted to make of having the introduction--we don't have an introduction so you might not mind some suggestions of what should go into it. There might be the possibility of some sort of brief environmental scan of where we are. We would be able to put a few things there that might not be able to get enough attention in the body of the report, but to be able to talk a little bit about the telecommunications revolution. I think, and I said this at the last meeting as well, that there needs to be a reference early on in the work to the issue of Soviet Jewry. I think that it's working out kind of fortunately that the report is not going to come out for a little while because I think that we are all involved in an enormous amount of fundraising and an enormous amount of effort, but I think that along with a general society sort of thing such as the telecommunications revolutions, I think there is an opportunity to say something specifically about what is happening in Jewish life. One of the things that I personally fear is that we're going to find ourselves so

enveloped--I'm not saying this to denigrate the importance of it--so enveloped in the crisis need to respond to a massive exodus of Jews from the Soviet Union that the issues of Jewish education which I think are common to us here and the Jews there and the Jews who are coming out are going to get lost because of a shortage of money, because of an inability to have the energy to cover all the bases. I think it would be wise to embrace the issue head-on and talk about why it's important that we remain focused on the critical, central part of Jewish education.

Secondly, I just want to mention that I want to just put as a way of helping to achieve some consensus, that I too am a believer that inreach is the way to go and not outreach. I think it would be very important in the report to make it really clear that the report is not really going to be catering in any significant way to the vast number of Jews who have not bought in in some little way. I don't know if we have a chance of being leavers with that population. I think we have an awful lot of work to do with people who have already made some small steps.

Thirdly, relating to the concept of lead community, which I like a great deal, and tying it with a couple of comments, I guess, Maurice's comment about how we are going to deal with the local turf that's there and all the stakeholders and the vested interests that are there. I want to connect too about Annette's presentation about community leaders, but I have to say I kind of missed in the report, though she gave emphasis to it in her remarks, and as I was thinking about it I think it's probably something that needs to

have more emphasis in the actual report itself. I think that the influencing of a greater number of community leaders is really the way to tailor whatever is going to happen to a local community. If you don't get people in a local community on board, buying into a particular set of options or directions, I think that whatever you begin to do is not going to have a chance or succeeding. I would put in a plug for finding a way to, without being prescriptive, simply give people a clue as they read this document of what has worked in the area of community leadership development. I just made a quick list, and I don't know everything that's going on, but there are ventures that CLAL has done that, there are ventures that Wexner Heritage Foundation has done, ventures that JESNA has done and the federation has done in young leadership development. There are the thirteen-some odd commissions around the country that themselves--I'm sure if we went to Cleveland and interviewed the people that participated in that commission, that the commission was a lay leadership venture and I think this whole commission has been a venture in building leadership and building collaboration. I mention also the Israel programs, particularly the JCC's are taking lay people, are taking members, taking executives to Israel for three months. I think that there are models that exist, and I'm not suggesting a whole other chapter in the report, but I am suggesting a couple of pages. If community lay leadership is critical, and I do believe it is critical in terms of having any of these changes stick over time, I think that it would be wise to say something substantive about what we know has made a difference in the lives of people already so that communities can have an idea of what they might want to replicate.

MLM - One comment before lunch to give you something to think about, and I'm glad my friend Lester Crown is here because I'm going to ask him to verify something I'm going to share with you. At our second meeting, having been overwhelmed at our first meeting and in our interviews, by the complexity, the breadth, the dimensions, the branches flowing out of the main river and the tributaries flowing out of each of the branches, and seeing how complex and diverse this whole issue of Jewish education/Jewish continuity/Jewish learning, however we choose to phrase it, is, we made a decision. That decision was that we would focus on two areas and identify 19 others, and the 19 might be 26 or 38. And in fact, what this report does, and I think it will be enriched by a lot of the comments today, is deal only with a piece of it. And I sense a little frustration because we don't have it all in here. My dear friends, no matter how long we live we probably will not get to it all, but my hope is that we will advance the state of the art somewhat by the Commission on Jewish Education in North America, leaving yet all sorts of areas to be explored. There is no way that we can do justice to all of the ideas and ever finish. Here's why I wanted Lester. I heard one time, Lester, that in designing an airplane the only way you stop your engineers and designers is to say okay, as of Wednesday at 2 o'clock, August 14th we want no more ideas. We're going to go to production with that airplane. Because there is no end to the refinement. Does that sound familiar?

Crown - Well not quite, but...you do have to stop at some point.

MLM - Okay, so what I'm sharing with you is, we want to have this report, we want to have a celebratory event this fall. We want to put this to bed at some point in time, and I guess it's going to be after this meeting, and I know it won't have everything in it, and I know, God willing, there won't be glaring omissions. There probably will be some that we wish we had included. We just have to finish this process. Not end what we're all trying to do about the quality of our lives, the richness of our lives, but finish this process. And I think there is good news. The good news is that a lot of you are engaged in your own life that preceded the Commission, that will live after the Commission, number one. Number two, we are going to generate a vehicle, and you'll hear more if you didn't get to it about keeping this process alive that will enable us to set together and work together for years to come. So, if we don't get it all in, we want to hear you today, but if we don't get it all in, please don't shoot me.

LUNCH

Sara Lee - I'd like to put my remarks in the context of differentiation between the function of the report and what might happen after the report. I think the report itself can be a very important stimulus and I think we have an unprecedented opportunity because so many people have the existence of the Commission and its meetings and are awaiting what it is the Commission will have to say to people who are concerned about these issues. Therefore, I applaud the fine job that has been done in formulating it and synthesizing the work of the Commission, but I'd like to suggest two components that we

might consider that address the concerns that have been raised earlier today. If we conceptualize this report as having a very strong educative and advocacy function in regard to Jewish learning, Jewish literacy and Jewish education, we are, it seems to me, missing or have underemphasized two important components. One that has been referred to is to raise the important questions that we must confront about the nature of the Jewish community, the Jewish family, and current realities of Jewish life in North America. To raise those questions so that people will use them as important questions in looking at the current structures and delivery systems of Jewish learning in this country. It seems to me that to talk about the Jewish family and other issues that have been raised, needs to be put into that kind of context, as questions that must be addressed, that must be researched, that must be thought about in order to formulate a plan for how we might enhance Jewish learning in this country. I think those are sociological questions, and they are not only about the nature of Jewish life, but about the nature of Jewish institutions and how they perceive themselves.

The second, which I think relates to Professor Twersky's wonderful vision statement, I'll call it a vision statement, is the question of a philosophical stance, an advocacy stance about Jewish learning. I think that's also not emphasized sufficiently in the report. It seems to me we need to start with a vision of what we should be as a community in terms of Jewish learning. And I want to differentiate here between advocacy and marketing. Advocacy is the vision that we want to promulgate as essential to the continuity of Jewish life and marketing are strategies

that you figure out in terms of formulating the particulars of how that vision gets translated. I'd like to suggest that those are two elements which, if they were put into the report, would be important in making this a very strong, educative, advocacy statement for the Jewish community. I think the elements are there. They've been in our past discussions; they've been implicit, they've been explicit. It seems to me they need to be lifted out and put into some stronger formulation. I'd like to put on the table that I'd like to consider how we might use Professor Twersky's formulation as a beginning of such a vision and philosophical statement.

Second, I think the report struggles with a tension between prescribing and advocating and recognizing the autonomy of the communities and also the different realities in those communities. But I think that we have not strongly enough included in this report visions of what might be. Without saying that these are solutions, these are the answers, this is what you have to do, I think people need to have some sense of what might be. The notion of very good programs or approaches or some of the rich thinking that's come out of the tradition. The report is quite general, I think addressing itself to the tension between autonomy and prescription. I think we need to indicate, hint at, preview what should be or what might be.

I last want to, not directly answer, but respond to Rabbi Corson's comments. It seems to me that his comment about whether we could get 200, 300, 400 people to enter the field--I don't think any of us know the answer. What his comment does suggest, is that there are many more questions to answer before

we focus on very direct strategies to change the situation. We do have to ask some of the questions that Rabbi Corson has raised and I think they are not limited to his comments about the ability to recruit Jewish educators. It seems to me that that falls into my first category of needing to know a lot more about what the realities and the mind set are that are out there, that we need to address in order to develop the appropriate strategies to address the issues that we've put on the table. In that respect I want to add one more comment. I think that the report is strong in calling upon quantitative data that supports some of the impressionistic ideas we have about what is going on. I think that we have a need for a lot more qualitative data about what's happening rather than just numbers, because I think that that won't serve us well. I think we may be very disappointed if we devise our strategies based solely on quantitative data about how many need and how many we have. I would urge that we think about the report as a very important statement that we can make to the Jewish community. Other reports that have been developed in other contexts have served that function and I think if we expand our sense of what the report should be, I think we can stimulate the kind of activity that we want to take place in the community as a whole.

Peggy Tishman - Thank you Sara Lee for saying a lot of the things that are on my mind. One of the first things you said, Mort, when you opened this meeting is that what fuels the machine is money and I'd like to take exception to that. I think that what fuels the machine is probably, to a certain degree money, but to the other degree, and I would have put this

1

-4-

first, is quality. I think that's what we're all searching for. Quality in the Jewish educational system. We're not sure how to go about it, but we know from the public school experience in New York that throwing money at it is really not the answer.

Having said that, I rejoice in whatever we call Rabbi Twersky's statement. For me it would be a wonderful mission because I feel very strongly that every child that doesn't get the opportunity to enjoy being Jewish really loses a great of the wonder of life and the special quality of life in North America. I have a question that draws on what Sara Lee said about these lead communities. I'm not sure I understand how we're going to know if a lead community has really achieved what we want it to achieve. I'm not sure I know what the criteria are that will tell me how it worked. I loved what Seymour said, but I invariably do love what he says, because I feel that if we encompass a larger world than what we originally started with that maybe that would be one of the criteria that would say yes, this lead community has worked, and maybe if we say that, when we move from one community to the next, we have transferred the success strategy that that is also a criterion which says that the lead community has been successful and now I piggyback on what Alvin said. I think that it would be very very helpful if, after this Commission is finished and we do have these lead communities, if somehow or other we can reconvene or you could send us the material now we know this works and now we know this doesn't work. That for me would give me a great feeling of achievement.

Florence Melton: I would first like to comment on the term consumerism. I'm a market person in the business world for many years and I know that every marketing- it has to have a philosophy or it doesn't sustain itself. In my mind, Jewish education is a human enterprise. I have great faith in the fact that through quality Jewish education, that the element of the spiritual emanates. Because from knowledge and understanding comes with them and from with them comes further need to fulfill the hunger of learning. I've seen this happen in programs that are seminal in my view to creative energy in Jewish education. In what the Programs are doing and what the Wexner Heritage Programs are doing for young leadership. Putting the spiritual element as coming with the territory. It's inherent in the learning process. There's no question about it and I think that. (some text lost in flipping the tape) Because they have discovered in their journey for Judaism, they have discovered that they have a hunger for the spiritual and the spiritual is inherent in the quality learning. I just wanted to clarify that. I don't like the whole context or the whole reference of consumerism because that eliminates what our basic goals are all about.

The other thing I'd like to say is a bombshell. I have studied in great depth the paper which deals with professionalism of teachers and with the training of professional teachers and I have come to a conclusion, and nobody may agree with it. With great temerity I open this whole ball of wax that there isn't a training center existing in the U.S. today that in my view can serve the long-term training- for example, that there would be a college, a North American college of training for Jewish educators in which they would have a department for pre-school, a department for special training for special needs for handicapped children or whatever, a department for training of administrators/principals, a department for

58

training of camping counselors, and so on and so on, and a department for paraprofessionals for the small communities. Here you would be able to afford to hire the best professors, and as I read through the material here, there isn't one of the institutions that has the proper professors. They don't have the money to do it. They don't have the curricular materials. They may have long range plans, but the constraints are not within the purview of their control. What I'm saying is, if I had a lot of money, a big foundation myself, personally, I would endow such a college for the training of Jewish educators. I would see to it that they had the best and that they would have communication with Hebrew University Department of Education and that they would learn from every single existing source what is the best available, who are the best people. I don't care how much it costs, we need them. That's how I'd put my money if I had it.

Irving Greenberg: First of all, there is a very real reaction around the table which is an understandable reaction because people are about to sign off on the report and are suddenly realizing all the very important and extraordinary things that we can overlook and not do justice to. As one who argued at the first meeting, take one area, one programmatic area and throw everything at it, I deeply feel for their pain. I understand it. Having said that, we didn't decide to go that way. I think we now have to decide what it is that we did decide. We said we were going to focus on personnel and communities which lead us to the lead community model and once we've done that I think that that is a major breakthrough which we will then follow up with specific breakthroughs in each of the areas that are on the table because they all deserve it. What I would like to urge, however, and need to say is to reach balance in the report. I think unconsciously the report did slip back into the notion of formal

education education as the authentic education. I would argue that we articulate that we are talking informal as well as formal, adult as well as children, and that when we go to lead communities, some in fact will choose that particular focus or we will encourage them to articulate that. One other way of doing that I'd like to urge. I do think the mission statement is helpful and that Professor Twersky has given us 80% of it or maybe 90% of it. I'd like to see here to the child to adult and informal added to it. I think if you would do it that would be very helpful in giving the reassurance that all these are not being left for others.

The second point I'd like to make is about the leadership education. Rather to put it clear to educate Jewish leaders to the importance of Jewish education. I agree with Charles that some of the important breakthroughs came from people like him before they were involved in Jewish education and supporting. The truth is, we are pushing Jewish education for the leaders of the future, we have to do what we say. If we think the lay people who are going to make the changes don't need it, then truthfully we probably don't believe in the other areas either. I don't think that's what is happening now. I think we've gotten most of the early victories of surprise conversions without education. As the competition gets hotter and as needs go up and we get to the complex situation we're in now, unless there is we will not be able to make good judgement. People of quality or on priorities. Therefore I think you have to build in, at we've already built in selling this to lay leadership. I think the Council, the follow-up to this body has to articulate that, consciously schedule it in, and if you educate enough you'll even get more support.

Third point. I look again, as I said as someone who originally wanted to

push for the other ~~route~~^{route}. I have done some more research since those meetings and I wanted to say that I'm persuaded the other way right now. The Council is a very important issue. We have to face our own conclusions. We could not do all 19 areas, but the Council gives a chance at starting to meet many of those areas because my reading of that is communities are going to respond, that they are excited to think that they might get additional challenge money and expertise from outside to push them, and coordination. Therefore, this will be a catalyst, which is what we really wanted, and a leverage, which is what we really wanted. That's the important breakthrough we're bringing here today. Particularly can't come from the top down as Fred Gottschalk said earlier today, can't come from prescription, but can come from individual communities and then . So we're on to a very important mechanism. Far from being a mistake or an overlooked position, I think we have to see this as the key mechanism and we have to push it. In particular I sense that . Josh Elkin has put it on the table already. I want to say I see a real problem here, as one who has argued that this is a historic opportunity, it's electrifying I also see a very dangerous downside. I see many executives and top leaders who say drop everything else, we've just got to get this done. (MLM notes he is referring to Operation Exodus.) That's an invasion; it's irresponsible in my judgement, and I say this as one who thinks it should get top priority. It's an invasion, it's irresponsible because those Russian immigrants themselves are going to need this educational process. Jewish education can't be focused on great crisis. We know this from Jewish history too. All those miracles of the Exodus and Sinai didn't change the people. changed the people when the Rabbis educated them to the point where they understood, then the Exodus worked and then Sinai worked. We have to have the courage of our own

6'
convictions. That's our message. In my judgement it's more important now than it was when we started 2 years ago. At such a time it's important that we rally. We can see that Jewish education is not to be put aside while we do the important things in life, but rather at a time when we recognize the other major responsibility is being dramatically, this is a dramatic/non-dramatic breakthrough for the future of the Jewish people and we have to assert that to the community and make that part of our report. That's why we need a council to follow up.

Esther Leah Ritz: I'm glad ~~Yitz~~ said what he did at the beginning of his presentation because I do want to say that as we have been discussing all morning, and identifying the gaps in the report, we've lost track of the fact that it is our report. What is there is what we talked about. What is there are the priorities that surfaced in the course of our earlier discussion and the fact that putting it together has allowed us to identify the gaps before we finalize the report is a life saver to me because of my concern about some of those gaps. It is our responsibility, not the drafters of the report who made it come out that way.

I recall, I was on the Wirtz Weiler graduate school of social work board at the time JWB completed its study on maximizing Jewish educational effectiveness in the centers. There was almost panic in that board and in the faculty about what impact the report having to do with Jewish education in the informal setting of Jewish Community Centers was going to have on the education of the kind of professionals who work in centers. Was this going to require a whole switch from the social work mode to the Jewish educator mode in Jewish Community Centers? In our discussion today we've been talking about Jewish educators and the implication always is the educator in the classroom. I think we have to keep in mind what was said- that we are talking about the whole gamut of formal and informal

educational experiences that change people's relationships, individual relationships, family relationships, to the Jewish people. If we have lost that in the report, I feel it must be restored in some way-- that notion as informal as well as formal. One of the things where we lost the idea of family education, how the family itself becomes an educational instrument, beyond training or being a family. It's the duality of the family that I want to call attention to. In our report we have to insure that we have fulfilled our own responsibilities.

I want to spend just a minute on the question of lead communities because Alvin is very enthusiastic about the change in the formulation. I'm not so sure I am. The tendency of using the term lead communities is that it carries the implication of an elite community, an advanced community. The fact of the matter is that if we are going to create models for use across North America, we have to have the guts to use among the communities some which are relatively primitive. If we do not do that, the reaction will be, "Oh well, Cleveland. Of course they can do it." We can't. We have to be able to prove to communities that are not Cleveland that it can be done- including Milwaukee. So that, whatever we call it, I think we have to be very clear that we are not only looking to the best communities to create models, but to communities that are not so great to help those other not so great communities move up the continuum.

Apropos of lead communities too, I'm not entirely sure that- it might even be communities that choose a program will be most effective. I must admit a preference for community-wide planning, and community-wide identification of gaps priorities and the filling of those gaps within a community-wide program, so that in a given community both the formal and informal, the of family education can all be given consideration. Within that consideration then, those weak links can be identified which

need strengthening. Those that are better and stronger will be continued. Otherwise I'm afraid we're going to wind up with a patchwork. We're going to have a bunch of programs or activities that are successful one place or another and we are not going to have the development of a comprehensive educational thrust that can be identified.

Thirdly, I know you mentioned some kind of a bash, when we finally launch the Council. I don't know if that's the appropriate time, but I think that once the Council is created and underway there must be a second continental Jewish leadership conference on Jewish education. The first one changed the attitudes of a great number of people and launched a series of events including this. (MLM - Sha means 1984.) We have, if not the next generation, may be the second generation after that now in community leadership and namely the charging up occurred in 1984, but at a different level because we will have this report as the basis for charging them up. I don't see this as the bash that launches next fall because I don't think that the Council will be ready to implement that kind of a conference. I think it's different from '84, but it has to be on the agenda as a way of charging our community leadership and identifying the new round of leadership that must take leadership for this local endeavor and this continental endeavor.

Mark Lainer: Now that we're on the road of where do we go from here type of thinking and start looking at some of the realities that we're dealing with, it seems to me that we have some inconsistencies and in some ways they have been mentioned during the course of the discussion. It makes me a little nervous because ultimately it leads me to the conclusion that we do need to focus, but again. Let me give you some examples. We have come up with, as one of the main issues, the building of the Profession and, if you follow this to its logical conclusions, that would

67
be one area that we would like to place great emphasis on. However, the way we are going to proceed will be by working with lead communities where most of the initiative will come from the local communities. So, one of my concerns is that the lead communities may choose to do one of the other programmatic areas and leave, unless we can encourage them or do something else, we'll have to go along with them because that will be the choice that they have made. That's where their funding is going to go. That's where their emphasis is going to go. I'm concerned about how we're going to maintain the priority that we gave to, for example, the building of Jewish educational professionals.

Similarly, once you pick and select a community as a lead community, then my concern is what happens to the rest of the country. If we're trying to encourage people throughout the country to build the educational establishment, bring more lay people into their system, etc., if we focus on certain communities as being the lead communities, it seems to me that the rest of the ~~company~~ ^{country} may say, "well, that's it, they've done their job and we are left out in the lurch and there's nothing there for us."

Another inconsistency, to some extent that we've raised before, is what happens to our on-going institutions that we do have. Again, we're not trying to reinvent the wheel, we're trying to work with organizations we have like JESNA. We do have schools of higher learning in Jewish education. We have gatherings of day schools and schools we need to work with. It seems to me that we, I don't think, intend to create an institution that's going to supersede any of these people. When I go through this kind of thinking in terms of how we deal with those existing realities out there, I come back to the place where I would like to end, which is that we must focus on the area of advocacy. We must focus on the area of being a catalyst, of being through the strength of this group,

because this group is made up of so many people who gather together to work together and this is in some ways a very high level type of group. I think we need to maintain that focus on advocacy, on giving community support, and encouraging people to participate in the Jewish educational program. I feel very strongly, for example, that within 2 years- at least in 2 years- this group should gather again for a very important purpose, namely to reinvigorate the process. Once we get down to tachlis, once we start working at certain things, there's going to be a lot of detail going on out there and I think it's going to be important to give it a kick or at least a pat on the back, just to keep the process going. I would like to make sure that we end up emphasizing the concept of people participating in Jewish education at local communities and making that a high priority.

Haskel Lookstein: Somebody said to me a very short time ago, the person shall remain nameless. I am virtually quoting. "I went to Sunday school and hated it. My children went to Sunday school and they hated it. Half of my grandchildren went to Sunday school and they hated it. Two of my grandchildren are now going to a kind of supplementary educational program, and they love it. Why?" I happen to know the supplementary program and there's a very simple reason why. The teacher who's teaching the supplementary program is a very gifted teacher. I haven't really left where I was 2 years ago, when I first reacted to the opening statements of Mort Mandel and others. The only thing I would like to do is suggest that in this excellent report, I happen to like it very much, beginning with vision statement or mission statement or whatever you want to call it-prologue-is just a matter of priorities and emphasis. Most of you know better than I know that in every area of life one has to choose and one has to decide what do you do first. I just would like to see that in the recommendations, paragraph 3 which is devoted to building the profession

of Jewish education in North America, that if it has¹ come third because there has to be a council before there can be this and there have to be community leaders involved before you can get there, just some way ought to be found to print paragraph 3 in larger type. With all the visual aids available, maybe Eli Evans can work on something in media to do this, just make it leap off the page because I listened to Mrs. Melton talk about it if she could do it she would start a college for training teachers, I think to myself, great, but if somebody isn't going to pay the teachers at the end of that training, she's not going to have students for that college. It's as simple as that. All the innovations, programs, research, curriculum development will have some use, but relatively their usefulness will be marginal without the right people in the field. With the right people in the field, everything else can be extremely productive. Therefore it should somehow be writ large.

Mr. Gruss, for example, is a Jewish charitable genius, probably a general charitable genius, gave a very fine grant to Yeshiva University high schools a couple of years ago to dramatically increase the salaries of the teachers. I would imagine that Rabbi Lamm and Rabbi Hirt could verify what a difference that has made in the quality of the faculty that they can both attract and retain. We at Ramaz have been doing this, unfortunately we have not found the Mr. Gruss yet to give us the help, we've been doing it and we know that we have very little turn over and we are attracting, on the whole, very good faculty. My executive committee is already beginning to talk about, listen we've reached as far as we can reach. If we keep going this way, tuition will be out of control and then they'll be no school in which good teachers can teach. You have to cut back the salaries. You can't give 6-1/2 and 8% increases and you can't give special incentives because you'll be having a \$20,000 tuition in

27

another 10 years and who is going to pay \$20,000- you won't have a school. Some way must be found to help fund this and not leave it just to those of us who are in the field to do this. Therefore, I really agree with the report, but if you could find a way to lift that paragraph 3 off the page, starting with salaries, moving on to training and including empowerment and making the profession really attractive to the best people, you'll solve the problem of that person who hated Sunday school, whose children hated it, and whose grandchildren, until the last two, hated it and the difference is the teacher who's doing the whole thing.

Isadore Twersky: (first ~~person~~ ^{portion} unintelligible) I said this morning that was not intended as a formal statement and I did not coordinate it with the writing of the report. Having said that, I do want to add that I think it's rather transparent that that statement of mine is anything but advocacy exclusively for formal education. If anything, I may say the opposite. By premeditation, it's broad to include formal and informal. Maybe the word child in the first line should be changed to person or state every person, child, or adult.

Now, as far as the report, I anticipated Mort's request for suggestions. Professor Fox and I spent well over 2 hours. I gave him almost page by page very detailed comments on stylistic and substantive concerns about the report. I want just to extract, very quickly, a few principles that underlie the massive detail.

First of all, I think that the report indicates all or if not all much that needs to be done in the field of Jewish education and then focuses as it must, on what this Commission identified as its series of activities. This is not a statement of Jewish education. It is a report of a certain commission which had such on membership and this report reflects now rather accurately the proposition to create the commission and

the actual course of deliberations since August 1988. That is as it should be. I think the focus must not be blurred. This is a report of this Commission. The advocacy on the other hand for continued initiatives and I don't know why we spend time that advocacy is loud and clear. I hope that advocacy will continue.

A word about the Council. I was waiting patiently this morning to hear something about the Council and I want to repeat something I said at our last meeting. Unless we start with a meaningful , then we look comical to say the least. We will have changed our vision or repudiated our rational. Another way of putting this is the statement [Hebrew] to say little and do much. We will have, by the end of the summer, a long eloquent report in hand. Now I think that our immediate actions must at least be commensurate with our talk if not greater than our talk. There should at least be commensurability as we announce our talk over 2 years the action we are ready to undertake immediately. There are any number of places in the report for which there is room . One thing I felt important was that nothing in the report should be seen as discrediting or underestimating what is now going on in the field of Jewish education. I think the reason we are here is because there are many good, successful things going on in Jewish education and we want to strengthen and improve them. Therefore certain terms I think have to be avoided and I discussed this with Seymour Fox. One specific idea that kept surfacing as I read the report carefully was, in my opinion, the need to modify what is here a ubiquitous emphasis on change. I think as we read Mort's last letter, the word improvement is much more to the point. We've talked about improvement, strengthening, expanding, deepening, etc. We are really not changing. Certainly not imposing change. I don't think that we are

69

imposing anything. I trust that the Council will make it absolutely clear.

Third, one specific . I think that the importance of on the job or on site or inservice training has been rather critical in our discussion. I don't think it is given enough emphasis in the report. If I read it correctly, it's not mentioned until page 38, whereas there are numerous contexts before that where it should appear. It is very important that we ascribe to this and that it is reflected with many of the concrete issues that are talked about. Undergraduate institutions and 30,000 teachers in the field. Obviously on the job and in service training is crucial. Here I would like to add what is mentioned on page 40. I believe it should be emphasized further, by bigger type or whatever, that Israel is now a major source, a locale for this on site training. The same month long seminar given in Israel- teachers returned from that experience- it's just great. Not only , but personally.

I would like to make a comment on family only because I endorse everything that was said about its importance. I thought that this was preaching to the converted because I assumed any lead community would include the family and I find this mentioned on page 7, page 23, and other places as well. I recently read the report of the foundation. issues on family activities in two cities. I think might be a model for any comprehensive plan for lead communities that we develop.

One final comment I would make. Page 51, a statement is made that was with the issuing of this report the Commission will be reconstituted a representative body of the North American Jewish community. How is this to be done, by a wave of the wand? You can't do that. We can't say about

70.
ourselves that we are the representative body. We're all in agreement, as I understand it, that we'd like to meet once a year, but nobody has given us this mandate. The commission, which is a rather representative body ... (MLM-that's really the intent. I see it doesn't say that. If I may on that point, this is meant to be responsive to what you have said either today or to me or to others privately, that the Commission and possibly one or two others ought to be added, possibly some of those folks who could never make a single meeting ought not to be retained, and we ought to meet again once a year or something like that. That is what this is meant to be and the word "a representative body" or even worse, *the*, which *we didn't* say, is not intended by this.)

[MLM introduces David Finn who explains the process of preparing the report]

Irwin Field: I would make a suggestion from practical experience. One thing is to write something and another is to have people read it. Anything that's 100 pages, I would strongly urge that there be a 5 page executive summary because we want people to have an appetizer and maybe they'll take the whole meal. If they're looking at 100 pages, there are not too many people who are going to read it. [David Finn: If you read a very important book that could change the world, it will have an introduction and a conclusion, but it may not have an executive summary. Maybe there should be a guide or something but I'm not sure there should be an executive summary.] Isadore Twersky: As an alternative to what Irwin Field has said, I share the same concern. I think another idea might be to make it less than 100 pages. I think there are parts of this that are a bit repetitious and might be tightened up.

Lester Pollack: I think the packaging of the report that David just

articulated is very critical, but I'd like to hear more about dissemination and publication of the report - how it has impact on the communities and how we get the attention of people outside of this room who we have not yet talked to. That we've done something important, that we've done something valuable, that this is going to be a catalyst for action, that we're advocates. I think that some of the other points that Alvin, Dave Dubin, and Esther Leah have made-a bash and then maybe a major convocation- I think we ought to develop how we're going to drop this bombshell and this very important work on the community and make sure that it has the desired effect. I think it's a very critical Florence Melton - I think it's going to be a report among many. I think as good as the report is and whether it's long or short it's going to be another report unless -- the question that Lester brought up is critical because communities have so much literature that comes in to them. How are we going to get to communities to take note of the Commission as an activator? In my view there's one way to do it. I suggest, and I talked to Annette about this, that the first thing the Commission could do to be on the front page of every Jewish newspaper in North America, is to establish an in-gathering -- announce an in-gathering of programs that work and to give recognition and awards to those people or communities who have used these programs successfully and that will send to us all of the components, the elements, that made that program work over and over again. Who were the players? What did they do? What was involved? How did they assess the success of the programs? We would put together a compendium of all programs that worked and we would make that available to every teacher resource center and that would put us on the front pages with acceptance by the professionals. It would give them recognition. It would recognize

71
72.

the communities. It will give us the kind of publicity where they say well what are these people going to do? The first thing we're going to do is to give them something. That's how they're going to pay attention to us.

Alfred Gottschalk: I'm very grateful for David Finn's structuring of the report. I can see his problems. I can see the problems of anyone who would read a report such as this. Therefore you treated it in a chronological way. The creation of the Commission, where we are today, coming to grips, blueprint for the future, recommendations. Whether or not one shortens this report, I think that the order should be reversed. My personal view is that we should start with blueprint for the future and the recommendations and let that be the highlight of the report, because the rest is descriptive narration of how we got to our recommendations on Jewish education. It's very important to know, but there may be some people who will do what most of us do when you get a report or a book. I always read a book from the back. I look at the bibliography and the footnotes and then decide whether or not I want to read it. For those who would be interested in an executive summary or whatever you call it, let's start with the conclusions and then work backwards. It's a thought that gets us out of this trap of historical narration and wondering then are they ever going to really get to what they want to tell us?

Kathleen Hat: I think that what we're talking about is that our report needs to be the strongest statement possible about the future of Jewish education. In looking at that, we have to think about what our strengths as a Commission are and what our weaknesses are. The weakness I really see in this draft is that we have almost too much data or we have data that's nearly 10 years old. We have pie charts. Every report we all read has pie charts and graphs, etc. If you remember that we are not preaching

to the converted and we are trying to get to the people who are sitting on the fence, who have a marginal interest and might be inspired, then we have to think about being the inspiring force. We have to make more of an emphasis on our vision rather than on data. If I were a skeptic reading this report and I would see 1982 next to a pie chart I would say that these people haven't done their homework. If I read other data like on page 20 we have a statement that there's been an 80% rise in day school enrollment, I find that very provocative and I find myself asking why is that so and wanting to know more within the context of the report and feeling a little bit cheated that I didn't know more. I also think that statement focused a little bit too much on formal education and we've all talked about how much we need to highlight the other forms of education that are out there. On page 24 there's a kind of marginal or footnote statement about the fact that we tried to get more data but it wasn't available. Again, playing devil's advocate, I would say that that was making excuses and that we should instead not use the data at all but rather concentrate on the vision statement. That actually brings me to what Florence just said, which I think is fantastic. The announcement of an in-gathering which would not only be an inspiring kind of idea but would also serve to clarify a chicken/egg situation that is in the report right now. On page 57 we state that each local school, camp, etc. in the lead communities should consider adapting elements from the inventory of best practices maintained by the Council, but further along on page 66 we say the Council as part of its long range strategy, will develop that inventory of best practices. I think that in-gathering can serve as the fundamental basis for that inventory.

Seymour Martin Lipset: I have the same concern that Florence does with this movement of the report. One of the problems that Mr. Finn was

suggesting is, no matter what you say, what it says in the report more good things can happen. If you look at what other reports had an influence, and some of these have been discussed earlier, Flexner started out by saying there's a disaster. The medical schools are no good and went on to analyze that in great detail. Then proposed a model, in fact we are following the Flexner model. you get attention by this. Now you don't want to state Jewish education is no good, but there is a disaster and the disaster is the problem of Jewish continuity. There was a curious little article in the New York Times a week or two ago, and a lot of what he was saying was true. The question is if Jewish education is the key to Jewish continuity, and now what we've done in the report is that we've followed the model which is to take all of us and have our interview and report our conceptions. But not really do a detailed analysis beyond what we know. I think to get some attention, if we are not going to say that there's a major problem and that this problem has to be dealt with through these proposals, we just are not going to get attention by saying that Jewish education is a good thing and if we want more good Jewish education, we want a lot more money to be put into it that will be helpful. The idea of lead communities is a good one. It's following the Flexner model. I make a prediction that this is not going to get that much attention unless we are in effect saying there is a major problem for which we have answers.

Daniel Shapiro: This may have been mentioned earlier, but the report talks about our urging private foundations and families to set aside money for Jewish education and support the work of the Council. To what extent do we, in connection with lead communities, have some news to tell the world. (MLM you missed this morning. I could give you a whole private lecture on that.)

5.

Alvin Schiff: There are reports and there are reports. There are reports of studies, scientific studies that have taken place. They require a certain kind of report. They may require an executive summary, as well. This is a report of deliberations, a report of opinions, a report of some thing that was studied thrown into the hopper of general opinion. I'd like to suggest that what this report has to do is strike at the best possible consensus of opinion, reflect a sense of movement, and direct attention to a level of expectations. I don't know whether an executive summary is needed, even though people don't want to read that much, but it has to make people feel that things can change or things can improve. Unlike a report of a study that has shown such urgency because of findings that are so negative. We may that there are certain negative aspects of Jewish education, but the community at large that we have to sound the alarm, we have to also show that there is a central movement as well as expectation of greater goals.

Steve Hoffman: I thought what we ought to do first is to start with the question Charles Bronfman asked earlier which is why independence verses blending it in with existing entities. I think the answer to that really gets found in the origins of this Commission itself. When you look around the room, you see a distinctly different conglomerate of institutions and interests brought together for the first time. We think that that in fact occurred because we created a format that was different and unique in North American Jewish life. We had the concern, frankly, that any other model at this point the capital we've gained through that uniqueness. There are many institutions around the table that see themselves as equal to or in a-- as the federation system, for example. JESNA to pick on Jo~~hn~~ and Bennett for a moment, represents the federation system. They are owned by the federation system and accountable to the federation system.

1
c

If we move within their orbit, there is the possibility that there would be institutions that don't want to play in the same ball park if they feel they are being subjugated in some way to that federation system. It's not the most pleasant fact of Jewish communal life, but it is a reality. Equally it could be said that there are other institutions within the federation system that see themselves as peers of JESNA or the JCC Association and would not want to see themselves giving up some perception of sovereignty or freedom of movement by having to affiliate with organizations being run by one or the other party. There is a secondary method to the madness here, and that is there is a new emerging force that has done a lot of good in Jewish communal enterprise and that is the private foundations. A phenomenon that we talk about from time to time in our meetings that just wasn't there a generation ago. Part of the focus of the Council is to try to mature that force a little more than where it might be if there were no Council for initiatives in Jewish education. We believe that if there is an independent council, the foundations are major players. I'm going to discuss that in a minute. That will advance the cause further than if it's just another operation of an existing Jewish organization.

The functions of the Council. Annette mentioned earlier, it's written in your report. We've all talked about the advocacy aspect of the Council to take the report and keep moving it forward. It's also as a connective function. We need to establish between the communities, institutions, and the foundations. We believe the Council can play that role. There is the need to stimulate a broader and deeper research agenda. This is not being done in a directed way today. It's being done in an informal way today. I think the Council can put its resources into ways to make it more formally done and a better job of it. There is a

synergism that can be created within the foundation community.

Foundations today meet informally. They don't meet formally. We don't want to take an iota of independence away from any foundation. If anything, if you listen around the room today you see revealed to yourself the rich diversity of interests of the individual foundations. Dr.

Gottschalk, I think, earlier captured in Ackerman the paragraph that talks about what's so important about that diversity and how we get there either by divine inspiration or happenstance, depending on your motivating force. The foundations represent that today in the North American Jewish Community, but we believe there can be a synergism if they sit together in a directed, focused way which is Jewish education. We just won't see through the informal association that is currently going on.

Another function of the Council will be to energize new professional resources. We have an educational establishment. It is multi-faceted. We have also discovered, through the process of this commission, a number of people who are not necessarily part of that establishment today. They are leading educators in North America. They are Jewish. Just as you come to the table from time to time to combine your professional expertise, business expertise, you put on your Jewish hat and you move us from 5 on a scale of operations to 8 or 9, we believe there are educators who are not now in the game who can be brought into the game and therefore move us higher in the scale of operations. These new professional resources could be used in our communities and with the foundations.

Another function of the Council will be to initiate specific proposals to implement the objectives we've talked about in our report. A major drive of the Council will be to stimulate further research on these specific proposals, further action plans, help them in the foundation and

7/

federation and other funding community and start putting them into place. It will do so using the JCCA, JESNA, JTS, Yeshiva, the Reconstructionist College, agencies, universities like Stanford, Brandise, Harvard, our Hebrew colleges, and other places that are out there already working. We are not going to go out and create a whole new world to accomplish our objectives. We are going to take the best operations we have, straighten them and get the job done, as they're talking about it. We've had a lot of ideas come out. Frankly, we think one of the things needed is a council to help start pushing some of these through the system.

To that end we, ^{propose a board of about 30,} half of whom will represent the foundation community. The other half - these are rough numbers - will represent a blend of academicians, scholars, and national lay leadership. We see a huge staff- a director, chief educational officer, and then part time maybe a secretary and then part time people who will be brought in as consultants to help initiate and see through specific projects that the Council agrees to undertake. There will be a senior policy advisory group. We've found that a useful model. This will be about 8 people drawn from our national communal organizations who's expertise is in national community organization strategy. The other 4 will represent the content people (I'm kind of devoid of content. I just know how to get it done.) - academicians, scholars who know the substance of what we are about. We've talked about a fellows group. I pick a number of 50 to try to dramatize. I think there is a large number of people who the Council will be able to call upon for specific projects, to work with the lead communities. They will be drawn from the existing Jewish education establishment as well as people who are not necessarily in that establishment today but we

think who the Council could ask to lend us their expertise. The larger group that we are, ~~Supplemental~~ by some people who may be missing, elements of our national scene, would form a kind of membership of the Council as apposed to the board of the Council. That's the group we'll meet a year from now, a year after that, and a year after that to see how we are doing and maybe suggest some changes in direction.

The funding, as Mort talked about this morning, will be drawn from core foundation supporters and then we hope to work with an additional universe of 15 to 25 foundations in addition to the 10 core foundations in moving our program along. There will be the usual efforts to keep in touch through various communications to a large constituency through mailings.

That's the guts of the program. We've talked about the functions. Needless to say our major projects will be in the lead communities. We envision maybe 3-5 of those communities. Our efforts to build the profession, to do a better job of community development and leadership. We want to initiate the research agenda. We want to provide assistance where we're asked to and where we can make a good connection with a specific program, adding ideas to the 23 we've already talked about. Finally we want to be of assistance to the foundations, both the core funders and the associated interest groups. That's really it in a nutshell, at least as far as I'm prepared to go today. MLM these are the core ideas. The board has not yet met. When the board meets for the first time it will own the agenda and will do it in its wisdom (and I hope wisdom is the right word) chooses. This is not foreordained. This is a distillation of what has emerged so far. In a sense, that's the design that will be handed to the first meeting of the board to fashion what they will fashion.

Charles Bronfman: I heard Steve's excellent rationale for the formation of the Council. Perhaps this is *dirty pool* and perhaps not. I'd just like to ask JESNA and JWB and ~~me~~ CIF if they agree with the assumptions.

Bennett Yanowitz: We are one of the cosponsoring organizations and in that light we have been very much concerned and aware of this from the beginning. Concerned not in terms of feeling threatened, but concerned that the opportunities that are there for advancing Jewish education will be realized in the work of this Commission. This was approved conceptually by our Executive Committee before we ever signed on. The question of the relationship of JESNA to whatever comes out of here was one of the concerns from the very beginning. We have addressed that question from the conception. My personal view, and I know it reflects the view of the organization insofar as we have discussed this, because we have not discussed this as a specific item of business in terms of the question of independent organizational utilization of existing organizations to carry out in its entirety the work of the Commission is one where, as we have looked at JESNA and its resources, we feel that given resources anything could be accomplished, but we have a full plate at the present time. We are very proud at how far JESNA has come over 6 or 7 years of its new existence. Mort appeared at our last board meeting and we had a very full report by Mort personally and a discussion about the work of the Commission and JESNA, at that time, had the understanding which it was very comfortable with, that the Commission would continue in its work in some form and that whatever that form took, JESNA has the leading body in the field of national Jewish education would relate closely to it, would be utilized by it. Its resources would be enhanced as a result of the work of the Commission. In what ways we might be funded directly or indirectly no one tried to address. Our understanding

is that we would be picking up somewhere along the way the challenges that would be thrown to us as an up growth of the Commission's work. We are comfortable with the Council going forward in essentially the manner that was described today.

Lester Pollack: When I was first interviewed about my views of the end product of some of the work of this Commission, I think I felt very strongly that one of the things that this Commission continues to do and is focus on Jewish education and enhance and augment the community's role in Jewish education and coordinating all the institutions involved. I personally am a supporter of the creation of the Council because I think it is one of the high points of with people who represent and are interested in Jewish education and of the iterations and demographic changes and community changes in general. From the point of view from JCCA, we have an ongoing high priority to continue to maximize the provision of Jewish education through Jewish community centers. That's a commitment that's ongoing. I've always envisioned the organization and the leadership of the organization, as we've looked at our role as a sponsoring organization here, that we will continue to participate with this body, with JESNA, with other bodies, and with the Council to support the effort but not be competitively involved in this. We are very comfortable, at least I am personally, and as Bennett said we have not yet gone to the board. I expect that we'll do that later this year, that we will fully discuss it. I agree with the idea that we will sponsor the Council.

MLM: I guess I'm not sticking my neck out too far. Bill Berman, the president of CJF is not here. Marty is a member of our Senior Policy Advisory Group and completely supports it. That is not the same as saying the president were here, but the president is not here.

62
Bennett Yanowitz: I used the word "comfortable" a couple of times. That really is an understatement. There is a real sense of enthusiasm at our board for the work of the Commission.

Florence Melton: It was my understanding when we first started this commission and from time to time I have asked the question as to whether or not this Commission would have task forces for the purpose of determining our direction. I personally find it disturbing that the decisions have been made in advance as to which direction the Commission would go. If there will be a Council, then how shall the Council function, if it's already been determined what we are going to do. There are other opportunities in the field of Jewish education and to me represent professionalism that can't be ignored and that certainly must be taken into the equation if we are to make maximum use of existing professionals. That is the 4,000 member CAJE Organization of teachers who are the heart of Jewish education in this country. I therefore find it a little disturbing, since this is one of things that I brought up from the very beginning and so did Mandel, Berman, and a few other people and its never been mentioned again. I think it's rather disturbing that the decisions have been made as to what direction the Commission will move. When I have been under the impression myself that there would be task forces and there would be a great deal of work done before such determinations would be made.

MLM: Thank you Florence. You know CAJE has been involved in some of our deliberations.

Maurice Corson: I share Steve's that the of major Jewish philanthropic resources from family foundations is a very significant and potentially a very blessed development in the North

7
1
1

American Jewish Community. I must tell you, however, that having been involved in this process of developing with a family a major Jewish philanthropic foundation, I am standing in great fear that a precedent is being established that will for the North American Jewish Community. Every time a major issue emerges, one could make the same rationale for setting up a new instrumentality that will comfortably serve as an umbrella for those families and individuals to come together and to solicit from them an elicit from them financial support to address a problem in Jewish life and thereby creating a precedent for bypassing the organized Jewish community and its instrumentalities. Soviet Jury, Operation Exodus, is a major concern. It would seem to me that UJA would scream bloody murder if the Jewish families got together and wanted to create their own instrumentality, independent of UJA. UJA has the power to prevent that or discourage that or to express its point of view. Similarly, on Israel issues, it would seem to me to be counterproductive for there to be a new and separate instrumentality created. Now, the argument for doing that in favor of Jewish education is I think a real argument, but I think it establishes a precedent that I hope will not be followed in other issues and I don't think needs to be followed in this situation, as well. It seems to me that there are alternative ways of encouraging major philanthropic support, transfusions of significant resources to help address problems of Jewish education without setting up what I submit again for that broken record that I am will become not a one of two man staff but a separate bureaucracy. I point out, it will tied institutionally and accountable to the larger Jewish community. I think that's an unfortunate development, although I understand your reasoning.

Esther Leah Ritz: I am astounded to hear what I just heard. If there was

ever an issue which required a mobilization with the elements involved in the proposed Council, it is Jewish education. If there were ever a proposed structure the Voluntary Foundation Community to the organizational structure of the North American Jewish Community, it is the proposed Council. I have heard the endorsements of the 3 major elements, JESNA, JCC Association, CJF - I know of CJF's involvement. Mort reported at any number of quarterlies and general assemblies on the process that has been going on here. This is not happening outside the framework of the American Jewish Community. It is happening within it. As far as UJA is concerned, it has a charge which is to raise and coordinate the fund raising for the NUJA for overseas Jewish needs. That is its responsibility. It is not in control of the North American Jewish Community and I wouldn't ask question one about addressing the problems of Jewish education in North America. They're not in this business. It's not their affair. I am entirely comfortable with the relationship between this enterprise and the organized Jewish community and especially thrilled with the connection between those organizational structures in the North American Jewish Community and the Jewish Foundation Community to try to develop some coherence, rationality, some creativity mobilizing those elements to address what is a major problem of survival of the Jewish Community.

Haskel Lookstein: At the risk of disagreeing with Rabbi Corson, with whom I have basically been agreeing most of the time, I have to go with my colleague ^{Esther} Leah Ritz. As I was listening to Steve Hoffman present this, he moved so smoothly and quickly through the report on the Council that maybe there was another part here that Leah didn't mention and which I think shows that this particular Commission may be different from all the other Commissions. That is that it has been very carefully

organized to try to pull together many different parts of the community. The organized community is you talked about, but there's Orthodox, there's conservative, reformed, there are the major Rabbinic training centers. It's geographically representative. Without trying to guild a lily, I think its a superbly developed commission and I don't think we have to worry so much about this. If the Council will reflect that kind of balance, there really is no need for this to be a precedent for other things. I agree with you on that - if it's a precedent for going off with all kinds of councils for all kinds of issues God only help us. This is unique and I think it is being done with a lot of good safeguards and if the safeguards continue it should be very productive and effective, hopefully resulting in some blessing for all of us.

Robert Abramson: The Council must succeed. It's at that and the Council is our best chance to move forward. I would respectfully submit that if it's going to succeed, it must engage from the outset those institutions and organizations responsible for the delivery of resources and services. The synagogues, which I am involved in, are vitally responsive, but they must be a or else we are going to be dealing with undoing that process for a long time.

Morton L Mandel: There's no question about that and there are a lot of things yet ahead of us, but I couldn't agree more.

David Hirschhorn: I wonder why on page 71 where you identify organizations that are full partners, why wouldn't you consider the national organizations representing the various synagogue movements?

Morton L Mandel: As I read this, it does not mean these should be the only partners, but because they have been part of us historically, I guess as we drafted this ..

Hirschhorn: By its absence it stands out you wonder why it is not

identified.

Fred Gottschalk: I think you intimated it, but you didn't state it exclusively as part of your process of interviewing. The delivery systems - I know you called a special meeting to meet with the leaders of the Reform Movements Delivery System, so there was consultation on level. I know it's also true for the conservative movement, so there's no presumption that they were excluded.

Morton L. Mandel: Is there anyone we didn't get to this morning because we abruptly quit that has anything that they feel because they didn't get the floor that they would like to say? If not, I'd like to take a few minutes on the and welfare, mainly to give you chance for the guidance of the Council and also if you have anything else to say because this will be the last formal business meeting we will have.

John Colman: One of the things that this Commission has had is an immense array of [next part lost while tape was turned over] in a way that will almost be a training for communities to draw upon these resources. If you think about lay leaders and communal institutions trying to replicate on a local level what's been done here on a national level, this is the case history that people ought to be able to draw upon.

Robert Hirt: I think it might be helpful, prior to any larger launching meeting being held, for the family foundations that are already on board as well as the potential lead communities to receive advance copies of the report and to be visited by members of the Commission and by some members of the professional staff so they could be included in that meeting. I think it would go much further than having a meeting and then sending the report out. People would feel closer to it and would have a chance to comment and that initial meeting would already elicit comments of people who are participating rather than for the to be upon you to say

this is what's going to happen. Just to have the presence of those people will generate a kind of enthusiasm, even if it's not ready in September. If you had 40 people from around the country who didn't participate. If they were coming in very early and knew all about the report we'd generate much more a positive feeling than having a question that took 2 years around this table to not be raised. I think it would leave people walking away somewhat tentative.

Josh Elkin: I want to echo John's point about writing up a case study about the process, but specifically in terms of the papers that were commissioned which I take from the scope of the report that is spoken about. Those papers will not be included in that report. I would just say, just from conversations with people involved in the Conservative Movement, in the United Synagogue Commission on Jewish education and the school, there's great interest in the research documents that have been generated. I think that they, in and of themselves, represent a tremendous contribution and I hope that they will be available.

Irving Greenberg: There was this morning and I still hear this afternoon some confusion about the term lead community that I think should be underscored here which is that it's not just the top communities that are now beating a path to Jewish education. I think it's very important that we allow a community to elect itself. It seems to me that's a very important contribution here to get people aspiring to the lead communities.

Sara Lee: I just want to go back to something professor Lipset said. I think it's an important differentiation. Namely, the crisis we're talking about that has brought us together is a crisis this community faces in regards to Jewish Continuity of which Jewish education is not the perpetrator, but victim. I wouldn't use those terms, but I think it would

be very important because ultimately what is done in this Council will be to empower Jewish education and to support and enhance all that is good in Jewish education. If that differentiation as to what the crisis is is not made, it sounds as if the crisis is something which Jewish education has engendered as apposed to being a crisis of our contemporary condition. I think that's a very, very important point that should not be lost as an introduction to this document.

Secondly, what gives us hope is the inclusion of a vision of what might be if we could address that crisis in very positive terms. I just want to push that again, both in terms of the writing of the document and the spirit that moves our deliberations.

Florence Melton: I want to support what Sara Lee has just said in very concrete terms. I would like to see the report start out with the condition of Jewish education in North America, then a presentation of the results of the different research papers that spell out how the teachers themselves are dissatisfied, unhappy, and feel incomplete as teachers in their training opportunities. I would like it to present the dissatisfaction of the training centers with their constraints and limitations. I would like to spell out how the communities feel in terms of what's available to them as far as professionalism is concerned and what their problems are with recruitment. All these things should be in the condition of Jewish education. Then, from the research papers which tell the truth about what's happening. Then the vision.

Seymour Martin Lipset: I don't know if it makes any sense or not, but I was associated with another commission on higher education which was chaired by a master of public relations, Clark Kerr. Every report they put out they got on the front page of the New York Times. The way we did it was never having a meeting in New York. They were always released in

84.
Houston, Los Angeles. There's no national news in those places so the New York Times let the papers have reporters there who were dying for stories, whereas in New York they're just overwhelmed with all the other news.

Haskel Lookstein: I always like to speak tachlitically and that Professor Lipset's idea is terrific. I would like to recommend that the report be released in Hawaii.

Concluding comments by Rabbi Isadore Twersky