

MS-831: Jack, Joseph and Morton Mandel Foundation Records, 1980–2008.

Series B: Commission on Jewish Education in North America (CJENA). 1980–1993. Subseries 2: Commissioner and Consultant Biographical Files, 1987–1993.

Box	
5	

Folder 8

Berman, Mandell, 1988-1990.

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

3101 Clifton Ave, Cincinnati, Ohio 45220 513.487.3000 AmericanJewishArchives.org

COMMISSIONER CONTACT SHEET

.

Name	Mandell L. Berman	Assigned toAJN
Mailing	29100 Northwestern Highway	Off. phone 313-353-8390
Address	Southfield, MI 48034	Home phone
Fax		
Comments		·····

e	Nature of Contact/Status	Next Steps/Action Needed
1		
i		i i
t		1
		1
1		
Ì		ĺ
		1
l l		
i		l
		1
1		4
ļ		1
i		i
1		1
ļ		
ľ		
i		Ì
1]

Premier Industrial Foundation 4500 EUCLID AVENUE CLEVELAND, OHIO 44103

July 25, 1988

Dear Bill:

-

As indicated on the telephone, I really enjoyed meeting you. You impressed me with your sense of understanding and commitment to the Jewish community. Your leadership is really appreciated.

We are getting everything in order for the meeting, and it looks like participation from commissioners will be good. As we discussed, we would like you to make a brief statement (from five to seven minutes) between 12:00-12:30 p.m. The purpose of your remarks is to reaffirm the partnership and commitment of C.J.F. I will try to get you Mort's remarks before the meeting so that you will have a sense of what he is planning to say.

Again, it was wonderful to have finally met you, and I look forward to seeing you at the August 1 meeting.

Cordially,

Art

Arthur J. Naparstek President

Mr. Mandell Berman 29100 Northwestern Highway Southfield, Michigan 48034

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN 48109-1285

HAROLD R. JOHNSON, DEAN

September 23, 1988

in the the

Dear Mr. Berman:

Enclosed is a summary description of J.E.F.F. Since we last spoke I have presented a paper on research in Jewish Family Life Education at a seminar on Jewish Family Life Education at the University of Judaism, and read a paper on J.E.F.F. at the CAJE conference in Milwaukee. At those meetings, I also interviewed many of the national experts on the subject. The impressions I now have are based primarily on J.E.F.F. but also on the opinions of the many others I have since talked to in Los Angeles and at C.A.J.E.

I am convinced that J.E.F.F. is a superior example of Jewish Family Life Education. The first and perhaps primary reason is Harlene's skill, creativity and drive: a second is the use of J.E.F.F. committees in each congregation, encouraging the congregations to continue the program. A third reason is L'CHAIM and the monthly community wide programs that Harlene and Art Horwitz are developing. (They seem to be unique and are very imaginative.) The fourth, but not least, reason is design: putting the program in the federation and offering incentives for its adoption.

The difference between programs of Jewish Family Life Education like J.E.F.F. and many adult education or congregation holiday celebration is that J.E.F.F. strives to have the family take practices home and to deepen feelings of pride and pleasure in Jewishness. More usual and more passive activities including synagogue attendance may not be able to get as much impact on home practices and personal feelings as do J.E.F.F. programs.

The paper I am enclosing can be used to spread J.E.F.F. and the general concept to other communities. It will be revised, of course, so that it is useful to other audiences. Any research of this kind is too brief and limited to serve as the final word or as definite authoritative guidance. However it's ideas are strengthened if (as happened here) other experts confirm its validity and accuracy. At my suggestion C.A.J.E. is being asked to sponsor a national conference on the subject to be held at the University of Judaism if funding can be found.

The paper is valuable as a base for other descriptions, since no one else is doing any research of this type. There are descriptions of various programs, but no one has tried to systematically describe <u>how</u> they work. This description is useful to federations and congregations who want to start a program, or to evaluate their own program. It tells them what to look for, what might have been left out of their efforts, which parts of the program may be more central than others.

There are still many questions about Jewish Family Life Education as a genre and J.E.F.F. in particular that are unanswered. What works with whom and what might attract those who are not part of J.E.F.F.'s market now? Is the impact that J.E.F.F. achieves enough? Are there other models that should be added?

Below is a summary of the research paper.

JOY IN JEWISHNESS: A SUMMARY

DOES J.E.F.F. WORK?

What attracted the participants and what did they get out of it? They wanted to maximize their use of time. First they wanted QUALITY TIME with their FAMILY. They also wanted Jewish education, pride or identity. But education alone was not enough for most of them. In that sense, J.E.F.F. and similar programs, which put learning and worship back into the home, are beautifully designed to meet this request.

They also wanted the program to be closely connected to their synagogue. This would give them opportunity to become more integrated into the congregation, get social support for their efforts to make their family life more Jewish.

Finally they wanted a powerful, pleasurable, emotional experience. Joy, fun, and pride.

It is very important in understanding J.E.F.F.'s success to realize that it gives a very high return on the time investment. Participants get both education in home and synagogue practice and pleasure in their identity as well as the family, social and synagogue benefits that formal classes omit. And it is fun, moving and strengthening.

LIMITATIONS

This section is very speculative and is one of the major topics I want to continue to study: who uses J.E.F.F. and who is not attracted? J.E.F.F. and Jewish Family Life Education seem best adapted to a particular kind of Jewish family. People who are rather middle class and traditional in their attitudes toward the family. There are many Jews who don't fit that description, singles, childless marriages, families that place career or success at the center of their lives. They may "want" more Jewishness as much as the J.E.F.F. people. But the added family and social motivation may be absent. Can these people be reached, and what other kinds of people (markets) are out there?

Another limitation is part of J.E.F.F.'s strength. J.E.F.F. tends to offer rather brief programs, a family weekend, congregation Shabbat dinner, a 1-3 part series of lecture discussions. They work because they are oriented to a whole family experience, are high quality, well designed and expertly presented. Attending J.E.F.F. doesn't require great initial investment and risk. It can affect large numbers of people but (for most) in rather limited ways.

This example indicates one of the areas of future research: What works in J.E.F.F.; who are not attracted; why; and finally what other kinds of programs, should supplement J.E.F.F.?

I hope this is useful to you in responding to your question.

Sincerely

Sydney Bernard Sydney E. Bernard Professor

Professor

1137F

Aug. 20, 1988 DRAFT NOT FOR PUBLICATION OR QUOTATION

JOY IN JEWISHNESS: THE J.E.F.F. PROGRAM

Sydney E. Bernard School of Social Work University of Michigan

I wish to thank Harlene Appelman, Director of the J.E.F.F. program, and Dr. Richard Krugel, Sam Fisher, and Lou Hamburger of the Fresh Air Society for their assistance. Irwin Alterman and Janice Tracht made useful comments on the paper as it developed. Many others, participants and volunteers, consented to be interviewed and allowed me to observe their programs. They provided the information and many of the insights incorporated into this report. I am indebted to them for their cooperation. Errors are mine.

I. INTRODUCTION

A) Jewish Family Life Education

"You are studying one of the hottest topics in Jewish life today," I was told when I asked a knowledgeable professional for information on programs that enhance Jewish identity through family focused education. Why at this time has the family become a major focus for Jewish education? The list of problems facing the Jewish community is long, daunting, and very familiar. Among the most serious is the (presumed) drift away from affiliation with the community and the weakening of pride in one's Jewish identity. Many question the ability of formal Jewish education to adequately transmit the knowledge or create the identity which are vital for Jewish survival. Educators struggle with problems of funding, of technique, but most severely with the parent's disinterest in their efforts. "Make my child Jewish;" they are told, "but not too Jewish."

Leaders search for responses. A very large proportion of Jewish children (perhaps 80%) are enrolled in some kind of Jewish education at some point in their childhood though often very briefly, ending with a pledge of eternal faithfulness at the Bar/Bat Mitzvah ceremony. For most, this exposure is too brief to have the desired impact. The Day School, camping, trips to Israel, though often more powerful, touch only a small proportion of Jewish children. Perhaps the family is the answer. After all, Judaism has always been intensely family centered.

Modern educators believe that family involvement is a vital tool for effective schools. But throughout Jewish history the School -formal education- was only part perhaps the smaller part of education for Jewishness. Education is asked to produce affiliation and identity. They are to graduate Jews who identify with feel pride in, their Jewishness; and who affiliate with, support, join, and work for the secular and religious organizations that comprise the Jewish community.

This may be well beyond the capacity of any school system. It certainly is beyond the power of the system of Jewish education described above. In our recent past, the home, the neighborhood, the workplace, the Shtetl served as far more powerful locations for creating identity, and fostering affiliation.

report7

August 20, 1988

\$

With an economy of effort that any teacher would envy the activities of daily life taught the child and young adult the roles they would adopt, the values they should practice, created powerful feelings of pride, and attachment.

Bock's theory of public and private Jewishness contrasts the roles played by school and family as they try to compensate for the disappearing communities of the past. Public Jewishness, affiliative behavior, can be taught by formal education. At their best schools can produce attendance at services, affiliations with Jewish organizations, political attitudes about Israel and America.

Identity formation requires a relationship. The family and the friendship group may produce personal Jewishness; pride, religious feelings as well overt practices, shared cultural perceptions.

As the Jewish community becomes more dispersed and farther from the immigrant generation and world, formal and informal education are asked to replace the information attitudes and values that earlier generations absorbed from the home, the street and the air. Now the family is asked to enlist in this task.

B) Types of Jewish education

Jewish education is of three types. The new plans shift focus from formal to informal and family education. Formal education comprises day schools, afternoon schools, adult education. Informal education includes weekend and summer camping, Chavurahs, Israel trips. Family and home-based education include holiday workshops, weekend retreats, life cycle series.

Wolfson defines Jewish family life education as all activities, wherever carried out which are <u>designed to achieve</u> <u>Jewish self-sufficiency in the home</u>.* Wolfson argues that Synagogue based family activities should be replaced with or at least supplemented by programs which empower parents to teach their children in their home. Teaching, of course, by example but also by other kinds of educational experiences. (From R. Wolfson "Shall You Teach Them Diligently.") (See Sefer Safari, a J.E.F.F. PROGRAM.)

This paper will focus on one example of family life education <u>Jewish Experiences For Families</u> which is designed to fit that definition. I will focus on the fit between what it

report7

August 20, 1988

offers and what its users wish to receive. We shall see that the participants and the policy makers have different priorities for the program. The difference is related to the ability of each to achieve their goals.

In drawing this comparison I shall describe the design of the program, noting its strengths and areas in which additional resources might be of benefit.

C) Jewish Experiences For Families

"If the program didn't involve my whole family I would not take part." This flat statement from a highly committed volunteer leader and participant summarizes the strengths and the challenge of Jewish Family Life Education and the J.E.F.F. program. When I approached this study I assumed that J.E.F.F. was first and foremost about Judaism. It would teach about Judaism, provide fairly powerful skill development in Jewish practices, instill values of Tzeddakah and social justice. I was correct, all these goals are present. But the major and most powerful goal -the activity that attracts participants- is the opportunity for "quality family time." They want Jewish experiences, of course. They could, after all, have quality time in many settings. Enriching and adding pleasure to the family's Jewish life is important, but that alone would not be enough to motivate participation. The programs must also satisfy the urgent need to experience, enjoy and strengthen family ties.

J.E.F.F. is more than just a way for Jewish families to have good experiences. There are many innovations: a novel program, an unusual setting, the inspirational leadership of staff and volunteers. For the participants, however, family goals are the strongest reason for taking part.

D) The Program

The program began in 1982 within a single Synagogue. In 1986 it was adopted by the Detroit Jewish Welfare Federation, and placed in the Fresh Air Society. That agency provides informal education to the whole community and has a very large and complex set of camp facilities.

The program's major characteristics are:

 a) It is federation funded and based in an agency which is community wide in scope, and potential membership. This allows it to offer both community wide and congregation specific programs.

- b) The bulk of its programs are congregation based and specific to each congregation. It is now (Fall 1988) located in eight, Reform and Conservative, congregations.
- c) It also offers programs which are based in community wide social agencies such as the Jewish Community Center, or the central educational facility, and are directed towards the whole community. These community wide programs are often jointly sponsored by the local independent community newspaper.
- d) It's activities are characterized by "whole-family" participation, and range from: holiday celebrations and workshops, to lecture series, to weekend retreats.
- e) It publishes a monthly 4-6 page newsletter which is inserted in the independent community newspaper. The bulletin covers a variety of in-the-home activities, as well, as articles, games, etc. for all ages.
- f) It is designed to become self-supporting and self-led within each participating congregation, Center, and School.

I will begin the program analysis with a description of the goals of participants, congregations, agencies and community.

- II. GOALS
- 1) PARTICIPANTS' GOALS

Participants had many and diverse goals:

- a) quality family time
- b) making Jewish experiences pleasant and enriching
- building skills for enjoyable home practices
- d) finding friends for selves, and children
- e) integrating more deeply into congregational life
- f) finding a like minded group to reinforce family values and life-style

report7

August 20, 1988

They considered the following goals less important for the J.E.F.F. program and few participants reported them:

- g) learning about Judaism, deepening one's religious experience,
- h) practicing Tzeddakah or addressing social justice concerns
- THE CONGREGATION'S GOALS
- a) provide an platform upon which the Synagogue will build to deepen participants Jewish practices, knowledge and commitment,
- b) enrich and energize the life of the congregation,
- attract and retain members, attract and strengthen participant's commitment to the congregation
- coordinate and enrich family style activities carried out in other congregation programs.
- build teen and adult post-Bar/Bat-Mitzvah involvement in Jewish education.
- f) train lay leadership for the congregation.
- 3) GOALS OF THE AGENCIES AND THE FEDERATION
- a) J.E.F.F. will serve as a pipeline bringing participants into Fresh Air Society and other Federation agency programs.
- b) increase the visibility of Federation agencies services to congregation members.
- c) demonstrate a successful partnership between the congregations and the Federation.
- 4) GOALS OF COMMUNITY WIDE PROGRAMS
- a) pluralistic Judaism; to bring together a very wide variety of community members
- expand people's concept of Judaism to include outdoor experiences, or community level religious ceremonies, or small group Tzeddakah activities, all under neutral, social agency or non-denominational auspices

report7

August 20, 1988

 demonstrate values that increase participant's pride in Jewish identity

III. J.E.F.F. PROGRAMS

A) HOW DO PARTICIPANTS DESCRIBE J.E.F.F.?

J.E.F.F. is described in very similar terms by almost everyone. It is "fun, pleasurable, exciting, involving, unembarrassing, hands on, low skill requirements, educate by doing."

- B) THE ELEMENTS OF A SUCCESSFUL PROGRAM
- 1) A successful program includes:
- a) whole-family activities
- b) effective use of time in meeting multiple participant goals
- c) Initial "hooks" for participation are pleasure from and with children and/or direct invitation from a friend
- d) Children learn by seeing parents model desired behavior
- e) teaching families by peer example
- f) non-threatening
- g) people move at own pace
- h) comfortable
- i) easy skill level
- j) group participation
- k) much active participation during the program
- follow-up take home activities are incremental, simple, and easy to carry out
- m) children participate but do not dominate, adult time is provided
- n) staff, including child care staff are very skilled
- repeated use is facilitated by providing extensive information about a pre-scheduled series

7

report7

August 20, 1988

- p) providing extensive advance information about the level of skill or religious practice in the program allows participants to determine that they will feel comfortable at the program. This process may be the most effective means of securing groups whose members are "homogenous" in these areas. Examples would be sponsorship within a particular congregation, and by members whose approach to practice and to leadership is known to the audience that is desired.
- q) program first for the younger ages as that age is most amenable to combined parent child activities, there are few reported successes with parent-teen programs.

2 Key components: motivation, impact, leadership

Family time is the most potent motive for joining the programs. Participants felt that WHOLE FAMILY programming is the most important component. Families have very little time for interaction. (A recent study reports that two earner families average 16 hours/week of leisure time. Down from 26 hours about 10 years ago.) If a program can produce family time, and Jewish time and Synagogue time at the same time it will attract many. However they felt that if the WHOLE FAMILY component was lacking the other benefits may not be sufficient to attract many participants. For example a Sunday morning Purim program for parents was attended by 20 people from a congregation of BOO families. The idea that parents will stay on Sunday morning while their children attend Sunday School did not work in this case (though other programs like this have been more successful).

Though family time is the primary program attraction, the greatest impact some thought was produced by the combination of: (a) Jewish themes, (b) experiential activity, and (c) multi generational events.

Another factor -leadership- the Director's skill and creativity, was usually identified as the most important component leading to the <u>adoption and initial success</u> of the program. The quality of the J.E.F.F. committees and other factors in each congregation soon determined continuing effectiveness. The leadership role adopted by congregation staff and members was reported to stimulate wider use of family programs in the congregation and may produce additional congregational creativity and innovation.

report7

August 20, 1988

- C) PROGRAM TYPES
- Intensity of Involvement and Depth of Impact.
- a) Large numbers, low intensity, low impact:

Most congregation programs are designed to touch a large number of people, rather briefly and with low intensity. The congregation Purim party is an example. From 50-100 families come to a morning of child centered activities using the Purim theme. The design requires some parental activity with the children. In time a substantial number of fathers, as well as, mothers will begin to participate with their children.

b) small numbers, high intensity, high impact:

The second type, the weekend retreat at Camp Tamarack, is of very high intensity and impact but for a much smaller group. The impact and carry-over is most powerful and most visible here. Often the J.E.F.F. committee has attended a retreat together, and becomes the J.E.F.F. committee in order to bring the program's benefits to the rest of the congregation.

c) <u>large numbers, low and repeated intensity, uncertain</u> impact:

A third type, the program series, such as the three Shabbat dinners at Congregation Beth Shalom, offers greater intensity than a single effort yet touch larger numbers than a retreat. It is not clear whether this model achieves greater impact than a set of unconnected events. Since these programs are more difficult to carry out than single events it is useful to determine to what extent the extra effort is rewarded.

IV. DESIGNING THE PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

A) EXPERIENTIAL ACTIVITIES

All programs have a great emphasis on learning by doing. Participants have an immediate feeling of accomplishment and satisfaction. They learn best what they themselves have done. This gains commitment and strengthens identity. It does much less to transmit complex information about the meaning of the practices nor stimulate motivation to learn more about them. Ideally the experience focuses on tools and skills which the participant will soon carry out with little time for explaining more complex meanings.

report7

Many of those interviewed felt that J.E.F.F. was appropriately limited to these high impact experiences. But programs often tried to add information and deepen practice through at-home follow-up. Home practices are modeled during the program. Program themes and the context in which they are presented, using costumes, wall decorations, handouts, all try to add information and skills to the experience itself. The effect of these efforts is not known and is an appropriate subject for research.

B) EXAMPLES OF USEFUL TOOLS AND PRACTICES include a Shabbat home practice kit distributed to each new participant at a Shabbat dinner program. It includes an audio tape of the home service, 3x5 cards of the service keyed to the tape, recipes, memory cards, and at each dinner, every family is given a gift of Shabbat candles as a program signature.

C) MONITORING, FEEDBACK AND ACCOUNTABILITY: At present neither the overall J.E.F.F. program nor any of its congregation programs have developed routine feedback devices. The committees review their efforts informally. However they would be helped if each had some tools which combined aspects tailored to their own congregation and program and others which fed into an overall monitoring and improvement system.

V. SETTING

A) CONGREGATION CENTERED PROGRAMS

Most J.E.F.F. programs are i particular congregations. Each is expected to develop an operating committee of congregation members. The extent of volunteer or staff leadership varies. Smaller congregations with fewer staff have more extensive volunteer leadership. It is very important that the Rabbi be supportive but need not be personally involved in it's development or operation. Programs may do best in Synagogues that are child and family oriented. Multi-congregation programs are being developed at this writing. (See "Sefer Safari" below for an example.)

Participants are very clear that linkage to a specific congregation is important. Part of their motivation comes from their wish to contribute to their congregation or to become more closely integrated into its life. Thus, they will go to a community wide "non-denominational" program such as the November Havdalah service at the J.C.C. but are less likely to attend a program in a Reform Temple if they are Conservative, or vice versa. They are least likely to attend a program in an

report7

August 20, 1988

Orthodox Synagogue. In discussing their Jewish identity most described themselves as "cultural or ethnic but not religious." This seems to reflect the idea that religion is limited to formal worship service and is not shown by Jewish practices outside the congregation or prayer experience. (Note these conclusions are very tentative as they are based on discussion with a relatively few people in each congregation.)

Participant's reported that congregation's benefited by the training and stimulation of lay leadership; cost-free availability of a highly experienced programmer/consultant, and the creation of Chavurah friendship groups. The latter served the social needs of their members and were a source of creativity and leadership for the overall congregation. It is noteworthy that even in large and program-rich congregations J.E.F.F. offered opportunities for a "niche" their participant's had not found elsewhere in the congregation. The primary attractions for the overall congregation were the provision of additional resources (the programmer and some funds) and J.E.F.F.'s ability to tailor its assistance to the goals and capacities of each congregation.

B) COMMUNITY WIDE PROGRAMS

A series of community wide programs have been developed stimulated by the extensive cooperation of the local independent Jewish newspaper. Programs are built around seasonal themes and are offered almost every month. The newspaper offers a monthly multi-page insert ("L'CHAYIM") on Jewish family activities. A community wide "Havdalah" service included Rabbinic leadership for the worship service and a professor of astronomy to demonstrate the use of telescopes as an elaboration of the search for the first star marking the end of Shabbat. A Chanukah program required that participants bring a contribution to a public social service food bank. In January the "Sefer Safari" program had families read children's books drawn from their congregation's library. This program combined a community wide focus with the cooperation of many separate congregations. These programs attract hundreds of people often in family groups and include orthodox and non-orthodox participants. Their design illustrates "informal Jewish education*. It includes an experiential component (all required some "Jewish" action of the participants) require no entrance fee — and reach out to a very diverse audience.

C) INTER ORGANIZATION ISSUES

J.E.F.F. is linked to three organizational levels: the

report7

Federation, for funding through a matching grant from a foundation: the Fresh Air Society, (F.A.S.), for administration (in cooperation with the Jewish Community Center and the United Hebrew Schools): and the various congregations, who implement the programs. A fourth community wide level has been developed including total community and multi-congregation programs.

At this point J.E.F.F.'s administrative structure is under review. It might become a free standing program within the Federation or remain under the administration of the F.A.S. Remaining under F.A.S. would facilitate administrative functions but the alternative might maximize J.E.F.F.'s flexibility and responsiveness to its own programs within the congregations and the community.

At the congregation level the J.E.F.F. committees are responsible for introducing or enhancing family programming. They too have to decide whether to choose the speed and flexibility provided by independent operation with the risk of resentment and resistance from other congregation committees which offer family programs. The J.E.F.F. committees interviewed chose to act independently encountering some resistance and resentment. In the case we reviewed, the J.E.F.F. committee reported that they were successful in allaying complaints produced by their independent stance. They report that other programs: Sisterhood, Men's Club are now providing more family programming.

Integrating J.E.F.F. programming with the School curriculum is of primary importance. A Holiday program for example, would be enhanced if the parent's activities were linked to the curriculum provided their children. For example, if a J.E.F.F. Purim program for parents is being held during school hours, the relevant classes, e.g., 2nd-4th grades, could be released to participate with their parents. One Temple builds the J.E.F.F. schedule into its school curriculum at the beginning of the year. It would be important in congregations (and some do), that the congregation J.E.F.F. committee, the parent J.E.F.F. staff, and the school staff, plan together before the school year starts.

VI. PARTICIPANTS

There are no common threads in the background or early life experiences of the people interviewed which explain why they choose to become more involved in their Jewishness while others do not. One theme did recur. Many women spoke of

report7

August 20, 1988

having a "warm" feeling about Judaism, the Synagogue or Jewish education derived from childhood experiences. Often these derive from feelings about their grandparents. It is possible that some parents hope that J.E.F.F. can provide their children with the warm "grand-parent" experience they value from their own childhood.

Participants tend to be very family oriented. In describing how they differ from the less affiliated they spoke of their family as a tight web of satisfying relationships and responsibilities. They contrast their families with others who (family theory suggests) see the family as a place to maximize <u>personal</u> individual growth and development, perhaps slighting or avoiding the difficulties and satisfactions derived from intensive family experiences. (Since I did not interview non-participants these ideas are highly speculative.) The persons I spoke to often related these family style differences to income - the more affluent are less family oriented, or to region, East Coast residents are less, midwesterners are more family oriented.

In general, wives are likely to be the driving force behind family involvement. However, the father is often highly involved in the family activities. His involvement in Jewish home practices is stimulated by the interaction with the children during program activities. For example one person spoke of the pleasure her husband found in singing at the Shabbat dinner program and his wish to continue this at home.

VII. CONCLUSION

A) PRODUCING QUALITY PROGRAMS

J.E.F.F. is highly labor and quality intensive. Each program should be of high quality in order to achieve adequate impact in a brief period and to attract the relatively underaffiliated who are the prime target. Providing quality programs is very dependent on the skill and dedication of a relatively few people in each congregation, (the J.E.F.F. committee), and on the Director alone in the parent program. Its development and expansion may require a major emphasis on training to enhance the skills and expand the number of staff and volunteers.

B) WHO PARTICIPATE

From my interviews it seems that the program has the greatest impact on people who are:

j

- (a) family oriented
- (b) beginning to be interested in greater Jewish practice but whose current level of practice, knowledge and skill is limited, (very knowledgeable and very disinterested people may not be attracted)
- (c) feel somewhat lonely or need a group who share their interest in Jewish practices and
- (d) will support their family lifestyle. They feel that they make demands on their children and on each other which differ from other members of their congregation and the overall community.

C) DESIGNING PROGRAMS

At the participant level the task is to design a series of programs which facilitate the participants ever deepening involvement in Jewish practices and education. In this design J.E.F.F. would provide a complete set of family programs for every level of Jewish practice included within the congregations goals. Another design model would not use J.E.F.F. as the vehicle for this extended and deepening involvement. The Synagogue would provide the extended family education with J.E.F.F. serving as entry and launch point. A participant spoke of using the Midrasha (the community's adult education institution) as the source of further education.

Under either model it is important to develop a program repertoire which can be provided repeatedly, in some rational sequence and over a considerable period. What is the appropriate level of "learning" provided in each program. How much repetition is desirable, how should programs of different levels of difficulty be packaged, how can participants be made aware of the program's difficulty so that they are neither bored by nor frightened away by the program? Each single program event (except weekend retreats) tends to have a relatively shallow impact and its impact may be lost unless further programs are available. It will take repeated efforts over some time before a congregation can be expected to be self-sustaining or that the effect can be seen on a substantial number.

D) PROGRAM EVALUATION AND IMPROVEMENT

The program does not yet have means for each J.E.F.F. committee to become self correcting. the program should

develop feedback and monitoring tools for each congregation and for J.E.F.F. itself. They could be tailored to particular congregations and could be linked to other records which would be developed for the parent program. They would specify goals for each event, monitor changes in the program and the response of participants. Ultimately it might be possible to show which program variations work best in different congregations, and to classify participants in some programmatically meaningful way.

A complete picture of the program would distinguish goals and impacts at the individual, family, congregation, and community levels.

In the long run it might be possible to see common patterns in the participants paths to stronger identities and deeper affiliations. From this could come program designs that are sensitive to differences between participants and between congregations. Such designs can help not only to improve J.E.F.F. but move congregations and communities to become more able to help Jewish families enrich their Jewish experiences.

Research

J.E.F.F. is widely recognized as a successful example of Jewish Family Life Education. Parts of the program can be found in other communities and in many synagogues. The New York Board Of Jewish Education is proposing an extremely ambitious program to make Synagogue based Jewish education "family-based". J.E.F.F is unusual (a) in its location within a group of Federation agencies, (b) the explicitly - community - wide component and (c) in this systematic research on the program and its participants.

The research reported here raises three questions.

IMPACT

What is the program's impact on participants, sponsoring congregations and the wider community. Is feeling good enough? A) Must the impact on participants be limited to "feelings" about one's identity or will J.E.F.F. evolve into a complete vehicle for solving identity and affiliation problems. Two major theories Full-Service or Pass-Through are proposed. In addition some see a ceiling which no level of effort will overcome.

(A) FULL SERVICE sees J.E.F.F. now as an initial entry point which as the program develops will move families to deeper

August 20, 1988

J.

involvement with their congregation and ultimately with the wider Jewish community. Feelings must and will evolve and deepen into action and knowledge.

(B) Conversely The PASS - THROUGH theory argues that this can occur but will be carried out by congregations or by other community agencies with J.E.F.F. limited to the entry gate role.

(C) A more somber argument suggests that some - many - most Jews do not want and can not be drawn more deeply into affiliative behavior. Most efforts at stimulating identity and affiliation have been inadequate. So too there may be a limit to J.E.F.F type programs which will not be easily overcome despite the quality of the leadership, cleverness of the program design, or the amount of resources.

Research on these issues involves observing the impact of the program on a variety of specific families in a number of settings to follow the process through which they do or do not deepen their involvement. What motivates them, what aspects of programs or of their life experiences enhance or reduce their affiliations? The families should include participants and non-participants within a variety of congregations. Also non-affiliated who attend community wide events would be included.

A long term review of the development of a program in one or more congregations would assist in answering questions of strategy and impact.

Feed back forms and procedures would enable committees to improve their performance and if aggregated can show the development of the overall program. The forms should be easily administered and interpreted and amenable to use by committees and the overall program.

1149F SEB/r1 8/22/88

1.7

WHILE YO	II WEDE AWAAV
M_Barb OF_Berm	Biec mis acip.
PHONE NO	PLEASE CALL
CALLED TO SEE YOU	WILL CALL AGAIN
WANTS TO SEE YOU	RETURNED YOUR CALL
RUSH	et him

between Concourse D E E

new file



Federations, Inc. 730 Broadway, New York, NY 10003/212 475-5000

Cable: Councilfed, New York

OCT 2 0 1988



Office of the President Mandell L. Berman

October 17, 1988

Mr. Art Naperstek Premier Industrial Corporation 4500 Euclid Cleveland, Ohio 44103

Dear Art:

I'm looking forward to seeing you for lunch at the Detroit Metropolitan Airport on Tuesday, November 1.

In the mean time, I enclose a copy of a study by Professor Bernard at the University of Michigan School of Social Work on the Jewish Family Life Program which we are running here in Detroit out of the Fresh Air Society (our Jewish camping program).

As you will see, if you take the time to read the sixteen pages, and I hope you will, JEFF is a Detroit program which was begun at Congregation Shaarey Zedek by myself and another friend. I funded it myself for some three additional years, I endowed it, and than gave it to the Detroit community via the United Jewish Charities holding company here at our federation. As you can see from the material, it is now in use in nine conservative and reformed congregations in Detroit, and it is, at the moment, successful beyond any thing we originally hoped would happen.

Raising the profile of this program on a national level is something that I would hope we could discuss at our luncheon as well as seeking out other programs of this kind which have been modeled, and we know are workable for replication by other religious institutions and federations and their agencies.

Mr. Art Naperstek October 17, 1988 Page Two

It seems to me that of the many directions that the Mandel Commission can go this is the direction that will get us the quickest results.

I look forward to seeing you on November 1, the Israeli election date.

As you know, Mort will be speaking here in Detroit on November 8, our own National election day, and I will be introducing him.

Cordiall/9 Mandell L. Berman

MLB/bh

Call use ne tuning pls (after Oct. 29th)

(513) 353-8390

ART I gave your of light info to Berman's pecretary for rip tomerrow. Siaa

m

meet as Northenest Club acress from Innkeeper's hovel Deleveen Concourse DEE

Commission on Jewish Education in North America Towards the Second Meeting Interviews of Commissioners

- 1. Commissioner: Bill Berman
- 2. Interviewer: AJN
- 3. Date: 11-1-88
- 4. Spirit: Keen interest positive and enthusiastic
- 5. Setting: U.S. Air V.I.P. lounge at Detroit Metro airport
- 6. Duration: 3 hours
- 7. Commissioner's current stand
 - A. Personnel: less than important, somewhat ambivalent about it.
 - B. Community: Yes (but with a particular orientation).
 - C. Programmatic Options: Does not believe that every option should be weighed equally, in fact, he felt several were frivolous.
- 8. Summary: Berman is totally committed to the notion of community as a way in which the Commission should develop its program and recommendations. He feels the major problem in the Jewish community is disaffection. Jewish people, he claims, have too many options, thus they break away from the community. Focus of the entire interview was on the community. Bill Berman offered the following comments:
 - I. Personnel
 - A. Personnel is less important. Youngsters will stay in school regardless of teachers because parents will keep them there.
 He does not believe that personnel is the key issue although he does come around as he talks and ultimately ends up identifying personnel as important, but not a requisite or

enabling condition. He believes that the Jewish people are disaffected from the Jewish community. As families assimilated, options opened up and personnel in Jewish institutions have failed to stimulate children and adults.

- II. Community
 - Α. Community should come first. He defines community in the context of structures through which we could reach those who are marginal or are outside the system. He pointed out that prior to 1968, federations saw themselves as health and welfare organizations, and Jewish education was out of the mainstream. Since 1968, federations see their role as protecting Jewish education. He added that someone needs to pay for Jewish education and leadership is needed to begin to build the system. I pressed Bill on exactly how it could be conceptualized and how it would work. He pointed out that what is needed is a system of networks that can organize parents, organize leaders, organize support systems around schools. He felt that in cities where the Jewish community is not particularly organized but is a growing city, like San Jose, California, the major challenge is finding the networks and building a sense of community. Without a framework, this cannot be accomplished. It is just not federation. The community must be defined in functional and structural terms. Only through such structures can we get a issues of leadership and finances. Further, he pointed out that through the

federation structures, nine Jewish education commissions have now been established. This new development should be assessed.

×

III. Programmatic Options

He indicated that not every option mentioned by a Commissioner should carry equal weight. He felt we needed to come up with 5 to 8 major option areas, and under each option, begin to find working models that could help us move along. He saw the programmatic options as tools that could be used. In other words, his major question is what are the tools to reverse the disaffection, what is causing the disaffection and what are the major tools to reverse it.

IV . Data: He does not believe that we are using data in the best possible way, and feels that we should be using the National Jewish Data Bank at CJF. That data would give us a much better sense of how to deal with the problems.

Mr. Berman will attend the meeting on December 13.

MANDELL L. BERMAN

29100 NORTHWESTERN HWY., SUITE 390 SOUTHFIELD, MICHIGAN 48034 TELEPHONE (313) 353-8390

December 6, 1988

Mr. Art Naparstek Director Commission on Jewish Education in North America 4500 Euclid Ave. Cleveland, Ohio 44103

Dear Art:

Thank you for your letter of November 30. Yes, I will be seeing you on December 13.

I'm enclosing some recent statistics on the J.E.F.F. program in Detroit which may be of interest to you. You will note that the program is now serving in excess of 1500 families.

We are very proud of it. It is a program now seven years old that is clearly working.

I attended a meeting recently of the committee of the Federation which coordinates the program. It was attended by more than 50 person representing each of the Temples and Synagogues currently using J.E.F.F. The mood of excitement and pleasure at having such a tool available to them was pervasive.

J.E.F.F. clearly replicable by most large Federations in other communities. The problem, of course, is that the program director, Harlene Appleman, would have to train staff here in Detroit to out reach to other cities.

As we know, there are no"easy solutions" to any of the issues that we are going to be dealing with next week. However, this program seems to be working, and it probably should be one that we take a hard look at, among so many others that are in place, or being tested in all of the areas you have listed in the meeting material.

Cordially,

Mandell L. Berman

MLB/bh



of Jewish Federations, Inc.

730 Broadway, New York, NY 10003/212 475-5000 Cable: Councilfed, New York

Office of the President Mandell L. Berman

January 25, 1989

Mr. Arthur J. Naparstek Commission Director Commission on Jewish Education in North America 4500 Euclid Avenue Cleveland, Ohio 44103

Dear Art:

I was delighted to receive Maurice Corson's letter on the issue of Educational Services for Jewish students on the campus.

Most of his comments, of course, are to the point. He is certainly correct when he says that the issues of appropriate funding for Hillel Foundations in North America has been limited to some extent by B'nai B'rith's limited funding capacity. However, as Dr. Corson knows, at this point Federations supply more than 50% of the limited dollars that are being spent today on campus programs while it would be my guess that B'nai B'rith spends less than 25%. The problem has always been that Federations tend to support programs close to their own communities, and those campuses which are distant from Federations, Cornell is always the best example, have tended to be either under funded or not funded at all.

The Council of Jewish Federations using a committee that I cochaired five years ago spent three years examining this subject, and in the process tried to get what we felt to be vital, necessary funding for the B'nai B'rith office in Washington, so that the 100 or so Hillel Foundations could be appropriately programmed and staffed. We simply were unable to accomplish this, in part because of the concern expressed by some Federations relative to the ability of the Hillel B'nai B'rith national organization to appropriately handle the funding.

I would, however, point out to Dr. Corson that there are distinct differences between the variety of campus programming even among the better funded campuses such as Harvard and the University of Michigan. As good as the Harvard program is, I think that the leadership there would agree that for the most Mr. Arthur J. Naparstek January 25, 1989 Page Two

part they tend to direct their programming towards the committed students on campus. At Michigan, as I have pointed out so many times, we direct our programming to the uncommitted students, and we are satisfied that by doing that we have been able to reach about two-thirds of the estimated six thousand Jewish students on the Michigan campus. Consequently, when we take a look, as I hope we will, at the variety of existing campus programs, we certainly should consider the variety of approaches that are available to reach the uncommitted on these campuses.

I enclose a copy of the most recent University of Michigan Hillel January and February events calendar that is illustrative of the kind of programming being done there.

As busy as I am, I would be delighted to do what ever I can to be helpful to you, Art, and to the Wexner Foundation should they be prepared to take a more intensive look at the whole issue of fragmented programming for Jewish students on campuses in North America.

I should add that I have been interested since assuming the Presidency of the Council to try to re-focus staff and committee interest on the college campus programming issue. Because of the whole variety of other priorities at the Council that are taking so much of our time, we have not been able to do that as yet.

The Council, however, is the place where the profile of the issue should and can be raised, and I plan to do that just as soon as we can re-prioritize our activities once some of these international pressures abate.

Cordially. Berman

MLB/bh

cc: Carmin Schwartz Maurice Corson, D.D. INTERVIEW WITH MANDELL L. BERMAN

ARTHUR J. NAPARSTEK APRIL 28, 1989

The interview began with a review of where we were at the end of the December 13th meeting. I reaffirmed that the Commission came to consensus on the personnel and community options as enabling and preconditions in relationship to the others. I asked Bill if he had the same understanding of the Commission with regard to the conceptual framework. Berman indicated that he was in agreement, that he felt there was a consensus with the framework.

Berman also agreed that the challenge for the next meeting of the Commission is to answer the question of how to bring about significant across-the-board change through personnel and the community. Berman felt very strongly about implementation. He stated that only a report by the Commission would not be sufficient, that implementation of some type was necessary and that he felt it had to take place on the local level. I asked him if he thought a demonstration program would make sense. He agreed that demonstrations would make sense only if they build on what was currently working in the field.

Berman is of the strong opinion that there is much good that is going on and the Commission needs to identify those "best practices" and build upon them through demonstrations. I asked him how the community could grapple with such issues as in-service training, the recruitment of educators, etc. He indicated that the key on the local level has to be through negotiations with the federations. He did not believe we could create new mechanisms locally, but instead had to use existing organizations. We may use local surrogates that are then picked by the federation.

I asked him how we would diffuse innovation. It was at this point that he began to discuss the need for some type of national initiative that could begin to coordinate and identify local programs and provide opportunities for innovation, monitoring and evaluation. We moved from there to a discussion of establishing a mechanism on a national level that would begin to meet these needs.

I raised the question with Berman that if a mechanism were to be established, it will be necessary to deal with the following issues. I asked for his opinion on these issues:

 What are the criteria for choosing a community action site? Here Berman feels very strongly that we need to identify successful programs. Excellence is the strongest criteria.

- 2. Berman feels that key to the success of a national mechanism will be money. He believes that \$5 million per year for five years should be raised. However, if a locality were to become involved in the program, it would have to raise matching funds. The matching funds, in effect, would become a part of the criteria for selection. Thus, criteria would be programs that currently exist, and offering matching funds. To the issue of how do we guarantee projects of the quality the Commission aspires to, Berman suggested that a monitoring and evaluation program be established through existing organizations on the national level such as JESNA or JWB, that through the evaluation process quality would be ensured and that the national mechanism, in effect, would not become the policeman of the programs.
- 3. To the question of how will negotiations with the existing institutions in the community be conducted, Berman suggested that guidelines need to be developed by the national organization and constantly refined by the board so that negotiations will be guided by these guidelines.
- 4. To the question of what kind of local mechanism will need to be established to run the community action sites, Berman responded that local federations are the key.
- 5. To the question of how will a central mechanism work with local communities and help them rise to their full stature without imposing something on them from the top down, Berman felt that the mechanism around evaluation and monitoring can do that.

In conclusion, Berman felt that the national mechanism should work with existing programs and enrich them through the leveraging and matching strategies, that these programs in turn should be evaluated and monitored by national organizations like JESNA and JWB, and that through that evaluation and monitoring a diffusion process should be initiated throughout the country so that replication could occur.

The remaining part of the interview dealt with his suggestions related to the June 14th meeting. He felt very strongly that there is a need to excite people and get them to buy into the process in the June 14th meeting. He felt that we should come to some degree of closure on our strategy for how the Commission will work from June 14 through June 1990. He felt that there is a need for commissioners to receive material prior to the meeting, that everything should be organized in advance, and that the key part of the meeting should be through small groups, that each small group should have a chair (not a permanent chair), nor should these small groups become permanent subcommittees but at least chairs for the day.

Berman felt that the June 14th day should begin with a brief overview by MLM from approximately 10:00 a.m. to 10:45 a.m. From 10:45 a.m. until 2:00 p.m. we should meet in small committees of subgroups, and at 2:00 p.m. reconvene for a full meeting. Prior to the June 14th meeting, chairs need to be selected, people should be assigned to the small groups, and each commissioner should receive written material that gives a sense of direction for the meeting. BY JON WOOCHER

BB cees the work of the Commission as having two foci:

- identifying promising ways of dealing with Jewish identity issues -- this has largely been done in the development of the materials thus far (though not in detail at the programmatic level)
- 2) focusing dollars to implement these ideas

This does not really require another major "study" of Jewish education.

The Commission's role is to excite and educate the leadership who can make a difference, i.e., individuals and foundations, and bring them up to speed.

BB sees the implementation process as requiring that a pool of several million dollars be created which would be used to leverage leadership buy-in on the local level. A pool of \$5 million could be expended at \$1 million per year for infrastructure and grants over a 7-8 year period. If the model was working, the funders could be asked to contribute again to continue the process.

Four or five key areas should be selected, e.g., family education, campus work, teacher training. The programs with the highest potential in these areas should be identified. Local sources (federation and others) should be approached with the offer of matching funds for a period of time to implement these programs. The programs should be monitored, and if they are successful, the local community should take them over.

The Commission or successor must be in the local communities to get the buy-in and should draw from what is being done in the field to find the high potential programs. Its role should be to stimulate the further development of such programs, but not to operate them.

BB believes that creating new institutions to carry out the implementation is wrong. Existing institutions are starving for money and leadership.

The Commission has to be the funding arm and come up with the money to leverage community action. It may need a subsidiary with a small staff to implement this, or might put such staff into JESNA, which has the grass-roots links with the communities.

The federations are looking to make this happen. We should work with them to identify the programs to be developed and the buyin.

Program monitoring should come from a non-denominational, nonpartisan source. JESNA is the best possibility, or, if the

programs are Center-based, JWB.

To set standards for programs to be funded, representatives of the funding sources should meet together with some experienced people in the field. The emphasis should be on funding programs that are working already.

BB will not be at the next meeting (he'll be in Hungary). He recommends that operational options to implement the overall concept of CAS be presented, and that there should be discussion about these. The key is to give the Commissioners who will need to come up with the money feel that they are making the implementation decision so that they will buy-in.

Presnetation of position papers will bore many of the participants. They are interested in making something happen.

NOTES ON MEETING WITH MANDELL BERMAN -- 1/24/90

prepared by Jonathan Woocher

I reviewed the draft recommendations with BB. He commented in general terms on a number of areas.

- 1. BB is concerned about not competing with existing institutions in the implementation process. He urges that existing national agencies and organizations be used to the maximum extent possible.
- 2. It will be important to look closely at existing model programs in an attempt to understand what makes them work. This will be critical in guiding further experimentation.
- 3. BB believes that the campus will be a critical arena for promoting Jewish continuity and reaching out to the uncommitted. He urges that this be reflected in the report.
- 4. BB sees the process of getting communities to provide matching funds for local projects as critical. We must sell programs to endowment fund directors who know which philantrhropic funds and supporting foundations may be interested. The federation will have to use its clout to get access to these funds for implementation.
- 5. Evaluation must be institutionalized in the implementation process. BB urges that JESNA be used in this regard.
- 6. With respect to the mandate and functions of the implementation mechanism, BB believes that community action sites, promotion of research, and personnel are enough of a challenge. He is extremely wary of the implementation mechanism trying to involve itself with the programmatic arenas. He believes it should do less, but do it well.

In general, BB emphasizes the importance of early and visible successes. This will attract the additional money needed. The successor to the Commission will need a PR program to keep a flow of money coming.

BB will not be able to attend the meeting on 2/14.

MANDELL L. BERMAN

29100 NORTHWESTERN HWY., SUITE 370 SOUTHFIELD, MICHIGAN 48034 TELEPHONE (313) 353-8390

February 2, 1990

Mr. Morton L. Mandel Premier Industrial Corporation 4500 Euclid Cleveland, Ohio 44103

Dear Mort:

I wanted to write to you to make certain that you know that I will not able to attend your Commission meeting in New York on the 14th.

I discussed this with Hank Zucker, and as you may of heard, I will be in Israel by that time because of the earlier Jewish Agency meetings that have now been called because of the immigration crises.

Please know how sorry I'll be to miss both the meeting and the special luncheon that you were kind enough to invite me to attend. I know the work of the commission has come to a crucial point in its deliberations, and I think you should know that I am very supportive of the tentative conclusions that I understand you have arrived at.

I'm enthusiastic about the idea of model programming in especially identified communities. I would, however, encourage you to leverage the commission money with the idea that each community would pay a proportion of the cost of any model program, and would eventually agree to pay the full amount of the program after a certain trial period, should the program proof to be successful, and is integrated into the programming of that Federation. Obviously, the goal would be to have a program that could be replicated by communities across the country. Mr. Morton L. Mandel February 5, 1990 Page Two

My secondary concern is that the commission should not overlook the college campus. There are a whole variety of very special model programs that should be examined, tested, and then replicated.

Again, apologizes for not being able to join you and the committee at this very important meeting on the 14th.

Cordially,

-

Mandell L. Berman

MLB/bh

Dictated but not read.

4/30/90 HLZ-MLM received a copy of this in his mail this morning. He gave approval over telephone, and I signed. This is a copy f need it. Betsy

MORTON L MANDEL

4500 EUCLID AVENUE CLEVELAND, OHIO 44103

122

April 30, 1990

Dear Bill:

I appreciate your very warm letter regarding the work of the Commission on Jewish Education. I'm sorry you can't make the meeting on June 12, but please keep sending us your ideas.

I'm glad to have your comments about the facilitating mechanism. As you know, we have been committed from the beginning of the Commission's work to be pro-active. In other words, to see that if the Commission does a good job its recommendations would be followed up vigorously.

We certainly do not intend to set up a large new organization or to interfere with what any existing organization is doing. As you say, our thrust is to "energize the system," to bring together the doers in Jewish education with the funders and the funding system.

I'm glad you feel about Steve Hoffman as I do. I'm going to share your letter with him. No doubt he'll want to talk with you sometime about plans for the Commission follow up.

Warm regards and all the best.

Sincerely,

MORTON L. MANDEL

Mr. Mandell L. Berman 29100 Northwestern Hwy., Suite 370 Southfield, Michigan 48034

APR 2 4 1990

MANDELL L. BERMAN

29100 NORTHWESTERN HWY., SUITE 370 SOUTHFIELD, MICHIGAN 48034 TELEPHONE (313) 353-8390

HLZ-me shald Answer this

April 18, 1990

. . . h

Mr. Morton L. Mandel Chairman Commission on Jewish Education in North America 4500 Euclid Avenue Cleveland, OH 44103

Dear Mort:

My apologies for not responding sooner to your letter of March 2, which enclosed the minutes of the meeting of the Commission on Jewish Education of February 14, in New York.

Again, I'm sorry to say that I will not be able to be with you at your Commission meeting on June 12, because I've already accepted a speaking engagement at the APIAC policy conference at lunch in Washington on that day.

In the meantime, let me congratulate you, Mort, on what you've accomplished with the Commission thus far. You have not only done what you set out to do originally, which was to energize a much broader cross section of American Jewish leadership on the issue of Jewish education, but also you have focused the discussion down to the four elements listed in the plan. And focusing the issue clearly, is something that this question has always needed because of the whole panoply of fragmented ways that the issue has been addressed up to now. Mr. Morton L. Mandel April 19, 1990 Page Two

And, of course, I fully support the recommendations of the plan.

Not surprisingly, I've had serious concern about the facilitating mechanism, not only because of my fear that it could duplicate the work of existing organizations in the field, but because it may not be as successful as it could be without the direct involvement in the process of the organizations which have already struggled for so many years with the disparate issues involved.

However, when I read on in the minutes of the February l4th meeting that the facilitating mechanism is envisioned as having an advocacy role rather than that of a service provider, and will have as its primary purpose "helping only to energize the system", I'm reassured. I'm further reassured by the choice of Steve Hoffman as the interim director planning the structure, and the mission of the facilitating mechanism.

As you know, I have immense respect for Steve, and even though I can't make the June 12 meeting, I hope to be in touch with him soon to discuss my concerns.

Let me add, that I'll be leaving my responsibilities at CJF in November of this year, as you know, and I assure you now that if I can be helpful to you or your staff I will make myself available not as a "chief", but, if necessary, as a "brave", in any way that I can be helpful.

Again, my good wishes and a belated Chang Smeach to you and yours.

Cordially

Mandell L. Bérman

MLB/bh