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	Folder
6	3

Koschitzky, Henry, 1988-1989.

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

COMMISSIONER CONTACT SHEET

Name Henry Koschitzky

Assigned to

Mailing Address 1 Yorkdale Road, #404
Toronto, Ontario M6A 3A1

Off. phone 416-781-5545

Home phone

Fax

Telex

Comments

Date	Nature of Contact/Status	Next Steps/Action Needed

MORTON L. MANDEL 4500 EUCLID AVENUE • CLEVELAND, OHIO 44103

June 13, 1988

Dear Mr. Koshitsky:

The Mandel Associated Foundations is in the process of organizing a Commission on Jewish Education in North America. The Commission will function in cooperation with the JWB and the Jewish Education Service of North America, Inc. (JESNA) and in close cooperation with the Council of Jewish Federations (CJF).

The purpose of this Commission is to bring together the best lay and professional minds we can assemble to make a positive impact on the quality of Jewish education in the United States and Canada.

We believe that Jewish education needs a great deal of improvement if it is to make its appropriate contribution to the constructive continuity of the Jewish people. We believe that our Commission has a good chance to bring about important results, because North American Jewish leadership is now sufficiently concerned to make this a high priority, and because there are important new financial resources available for Jewish education if we show how these resources can be utilized to good effect.

I hope that you will serve as a member of this Commission. The Commission will meet four to six times over a period of eighteen months to two years. It will have the benefit of a professional staff and consultants who will do the research directed by the Commission, and staff the Commission and its subgroups. The first meeting of the Commission is scheduled to be held on August 1 in New York City.

write

Thus far, everyone we have asked has agreed to serve, namely Mandell Berman, Jack Bieler, Charles Bronfman, John Colman, Lester Crown, David Dubin, Stuart Eizenstat, Joshua Elkin, Eli Evans, Max Fisher, Irving Greenberg, Robert I. Hiller, Carol Ingall, Mark Lainer, Norman Lamm, Sara Lee, Seymour Martin Lipset, Robert Loup, Matthew Maryles, Florence Melton, Donald Mintz, Lester Pollack, Charles Ratner, Harriet Rosenthal, Esther Leah Ritz, Alvin Schiff, Ismar Schorsh, Dan Shapiro, Isidore Twersky, and Bennett Yanowitz.

I know that you can be an important participant in the work of the Commission, and I hope that you will wish to participate.

Cordially,

MORTON L. MANDEL

Mr. Henry Koshitsky
57 ~~Yordowns~~ Drive YORK Downs
Downsview, Ontario
Canada M3H 1H7

6/27
Call after 10 am

416-781-5545

6/27 He will serve + send a letter to that effect.
We are to send him invitation to Aug. 1 meeting. He is not certain he can come on Aug. 1 but will try his best.

Yes
letter sent
6/28

MORTON L. MANDEL 4500 EUCLID AVENUE • CLEVELAND, OHIO 44103

June 13, 1988

KOSCHITZKY

Dear Mr. ~~Koshitsky~~:

The Mandel Associated Foundations is in the process of organizing a Commission on Jewish Education in North America. The Commission will function in cooperation with the JWB and the Jewish Education Service of North America, Inc. (JESNA) and in close cooperation with the Council of Jewish Federations (CJF).

The purpose of this Commission is to bring together the best lay and professional minds we can assemble to make a positive impact on the quality of Jewish education in the United States and Canada.

We believe that Jewish education needs a great deal of improvement if it is to make its appropriate contribution to the constructive continuity of the Jewish people. We believe that our Commission has a good chance to bring about important results, because North American Jewish leadership is now sufficiently concerned to make this a high priority, and because there are important new financial resources available for Jewish education if we show how these resources can be utilized to good effect.

I hope that you will serve as a member of this Commission. The Commission will meet four to six times over a period of eighteen months to two years. It will have the benefit of a professional staff and consultants who will do the research directed by the Commission, and staff the Commission and its subgroups. The first meeting of the Commission is scheduled to be held on August 1 in New York City.

Thus far, everyone we have asked has agreed to serve, namely Mandell Berman, Jack Bieler, Charles Bronfman, John Colman, Lester Crown, David Dubin, Stuart Eizenstat, Joshua Elkin, Eli Evans, Max Fisher, Irving Greenberg, Robert I. Hiller, Carol Ingall, Mark Lainer, Norman Lamm, Sara Lee, Seymour Martin Lipset, Robert Loup, Matthew Maryles, Florence Melton, Donald Mintz, Lester Pollack, Charles Ratner, Harriet Rosenthal, Esther Leah Ritz, Alvin Schiff, Ismar Schorsh, Dan Shapiro, Isidore Twersky, and Bennett Yanowitz.

I know that you can be an important participant in the work of the Commission, and I hope that you will wish to participate.

Cordially,

MORTON L. MANDEL

Mr. Henry ~~Koshitsky~~ KOSHITZKY
57 ~~Yordowns~~ Drive YORK DOWNS
Downsview, Ontario
Canada M3H 1H7

H. Koschitzky
57 York Downs Drive
Downsview, Ontario
M3H 1H7

June 27, 1988

Mr. Morton L. Mandel
4500 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44103

Dear Mr. Mandel:

Thank you for the invitation to take part in the Commission of Jewish Education.

As soon as you have more details concerning the August 1 meeting, I would appreciate hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

Henry Koschitzky

TO: HLZ
NAME

DEPARTMENT PLANT LOCATION

FROM: HLZ
NAME

DEPARTMENT PLANT LOCATION

DATE: 8/5/88

REPLYING TO
YOUR MEMO OF: _____

SUBJECT:

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

Steve Ain and John Fishel should be thanked for their suggestions of Canadians to serve on the Commission, and they should be told of the participation of Koschitzky and Bronfman. Also, we should clear with them about the suggestion that Lionel Schipper of Toronto be added to the group. Seymour Fox will ask some Canadian educators about Schipper and other possibilities and will let me know, and then I will be in touch with Ain and Fishel and probably Bronfman.

72752 (8/81) PRINTED IN U.S.A.

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW WITH
HENRY KOSCHITZKY

ARTHUR J. NAPARSTEK
JUNE 1, 1989

The purpose of this interview was to bring Henry Koschitzky up to date on developments since the December meeting of the Commission.

Henry indicated, at the start of the interview, that he would be unable to attend the meeting as unavoidable business plans have now come up. However, he reiterated that he is very committed and interested in Commission activities and looks forward to getting all the information.

I reviewed with him the progress since the last meeting. Henry agreed there was a strong consensus following the second meeting, particularly as it related to personnel and community. However he pointed out that many of the commissioners had different priorities related to personnel. Although all agreed with personnel, some saw personnel only in the context of day schools. Others saw personnel in the context of early childhood or family programs, etc. He went on to say that people tied personnel to their own pet projects. Somehow or other the Commission will have to reconcile that problem.

Henry is very supportive of an implementation strategy which flows from a national mechanism. However his concept is somewhat different in that he would prefer the Commission initiating national programs as opposed to developing a mechanism which, in turn, would develop programs. In fact, Henry has a program in mind that he is interested in. It relates to recruiting Schlichim from Israel who would work in communities. It's a complex program and Henry believes it could serve Jewish education in Israel as well as providing the opportunity to meet a short-term need in the day schools of America.

The point in Henry's telling me of the program was not as much about the program but about the notion of creating generic programs that will meet different types of needs in the personnel area. If a mechanism is developed, Henry feels strongly that it should not be service-oriented, that it should be catalytic and leverage funds and specifically, deal in terms of creating opportunities for new personnel not, in effect, stealing personnel from one community to another.

Henry is very supportive of Commission work. He would prefer to work in samll groups on specific aspects of the Commission agenda. A task force approach and/or small group meetings during Commission convenings would be appropriare from his point of view.

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

TO: Henry L. Zucker
NAME
DEPARTMENT/PLANT LOCATION

FROM: Virginia F. Levi
NAME
DEPARTMENT/PLANT LOCATION

DATE: 9/28/89

REPLYING TO
YOUR MEMO OF: _____

SUBJECT: HENRY KOSCHITZKY

Joe Reimer has not yet been able to meet with Henry Koschitzky, but in talking with him on the telephone to set up the appointment learned that Mr. Koschitzky may not be able to attend the Commission meeting. He has to go to the Jewish Agency meeting in Israel and has not yet decided whether he will go on the 23rd or 24th of October. Joe indicated that Koschitzky thinks it would be more convenient for him if he goes on the 23rd, assuming he can arrange a flight. Joe also indicated that he thought Koschitzky could be convinced to postpone his departure for a day, but does not feel that he has the clout to do so.

Do we feel that Mr. Koschitzky's presence is sufficiently critical to merit a phone call? If so, who should make that call?

72752 (8/81) PRINTED IN U.S.A.

JOSEPH REIMER OCTOBER 19, 1989

INTERVIEW WITH HENRY KOSCHITZKY

Mr. Koschitzky was glad to meet and have the opportunity to speak about the Commission. He is clearly heavily involved in and thoughtful about Jewish education.

1. While he favors the community action approach and believes the Commission should set its own clear priorities and find communities with developed infrastructures and starts in those priority areas, he has questions about funding. Who, he wonders, will be willing to fund efforts in someone else's community? He can see funding a unique national institution (like Yeshiva University), but not projects in another community.

2. He believes it appropriate for the Commission to maintain a focus on personnel which is, he thinks, the most pressing generic problem in Jewish education. Yet, based on his Toronto experience, he wonders how to overcome the economic disincentives of living on an educator's salary. He realizes that universities do overcome these disincentives, but can schools? He thinks we should seriously consider - especially for day schools - setting up a more extensive shaliach system in which we invest in the training and economic well-being of Israeli educators who, as part of their careers, would be placed for a 5-year teaching shlichut in a North American community. He has thought through a possible way to structure such a program. He is not optimistic about developing a sufficient number of native North American Jewish educators.

3. He tells me of recent efforts to develop a Jewish education program at York University in Toronto. He wonders if this is a good idea, or whether we ought not to invest more heavily in existing programs in the U.S. which are currently underutilized in their expertise of training Jewish educators.

4. Mr. Koschitzky reminds me that in this conversation, when he speaks of Jewish education, he is primarily thinking of day school education. He believes this to be an ongoing dilemma for the Commission: that the impressive members of the Commission come with their own agendas and tend to refer back to them. In the third meeting, after the focused discussions in small groups about CAS, he was surprised to see people in the plenary refer back to their previous agendas.

5. As for any continuation of the Commission after June, 1990, Mr. Koschitzky believes it will depend on the projects initiated. He predicts that they will appeal to certain commissioners more than others and those will wish to continue involvement. Perhaps the whole body can reassemble on occasion to hear reports on those projects. But it will work better to have an ongoing group that is smaller and more homogeneous in focus.