



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 2: Commissioner and Consultant Biographical Files, 1987–1993.

Box
6

Folder
27

Shapiro, Daniel S., 1988-1991.

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

COMMISSIONER CONTACT SHEET

Name Daniel S. Shapiro

Assigned to AR

Mailing Address Schulte, Roth & Zabel
900 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022

Off. phone 212-758-0404

Home phone _____

Fax _____

Telex _____

Comments _____

Date | Nature of Contact/Status | Next Steps/Action Needed



AN

Premier Industrial Foundation

4500 EUCLID AVENUE

CLEVELAND, OHIO 44103

July 25, 1988

Dear Dan:

It was great to see you, and thank you for the delicious lunch. With regard to Tamar, I was able to follow up with Rena and several colleagues in the Cleveland community. She should have a good week.

Everything is coming together for our meeting on August 1st. It looks like participation will be good to excellent. Again, I look forward to seeing you next Monday and participating in what could be a very important event in the North American Jewish community.

Cordially,



Arthur J. Naparstek
President

Mr. Daniel S. Shapiro
Schulte, Roth & Zabel
900 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022

COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA

Interview with Commissioner Dan Shapiro

Date of Interview: April 27, 1989
Location: Dan Shapiro's office
Interviewer: Art Rotman

Duration: 1 hour

General observations: While not familiar with the field, Dan is very committed to the importance of ensuring Jewish continuity, and accepts fully the premise that a well-educated Jewish community will ensure such Jewish continuity. Dan is a good listener, and expresses himself clearly and succinctly. Because of this, the interview covered material which ordinarily would have taken much longer.

Re: June 14, 1989 meeting: DS will be at the meeting.

DS was not at the last meeting. The early part of the interview was spent in reviewing the decisions of that meeting. DS understands and accepts the distinction between the enabling and programmatic options. He also accepts the priority of dealing primarily with the enabling options.

DS has been past president of Federation in New York City. He is familiar with the work of the Gruss Fund which has considerable resources. The Fund has, according to DS, done significant work in raising the salaries and benefits of teaching staff in the New York City area, primarily in day schools and, to a lesser extent, in secondary schools. DS recognizes that efforts in this area are helpful, but that they are not sufficient to achieve the goal of the commission in ensuring Jewish continuity. DS raised the question as to the "time frame" of the work of the commission. He feels that since one cannot foresee easily a span of more than about five years, the commission should work within a targeted time frame of 3-5 years.

AR described the work of the commission set up by the Federation in Cleveland. DS is not unfamiliar with the communal scene in Cleveland, as he is originally from that city and visits there frequently. At several points in the interview, DS made reference to translating the type of approach taken by the commission in Cleveland to the New York City situation. DS finds that the fund for Jewish education in New York City is "narrow-based." It has not successfully involved

community lay leadership. We spent some time discussing the possibility of setting up some instrumentality (the IJE) in New York City. DS stressed that he could only see it effective if it involved all the major players, including the Gruss Fund, the Federation top leadership, synagogues, day schools, Ys, etc.

Properly done and with a sound process of involving all concerned and particularly with the "bait" of additional Foundation funding, DS felt that much could be done. He suggested that IJE be established in one of the geographic areas, for example, Long Island, and once success has been demonstrated there, move on to other areas in the City until the entire New York area is covered.

DS feels strongly that work on the community option is the highest priority. Not only would the other options "not work," but even the "personnel piece" would not be effective unless the top community leadership became involved. In order to get the participation of this leadership, there would have to be a high-profile and dramatic start to the work of the IJE.

In discussing the community option, DS cautioned that we not pay too much attention to "lip service." It has been his experience that there is much talk about Jewish continuity and Jewish education, but that these are not necessarily accepted as "fundamental principles."

After a discussion of some time, DS, at the end of the interview, indicated that he was still "fuzzy" on how we might grapple with the personnel issue. He understands that work needs to be done in raising salaries, benefits, and providing training experience. He also knows, as in any other enterprise, that the senior personnel determine the course of events. However, he is not sure that these efforts will in and of themselves create the body of well-motivated, well-educated and effective personnel which are needed.

DS pointed out that the IJE concept would only work if financing could be obtained from a "joint venture" of several foundations. In the light of New York's lack of success in the UJA Campaign, he was not sanguine that the community apparatus could come up with any funds for the purpose.

Summary: DS looks forward to the June 14 meeting, and hopes that the foundations represented on the commission will become involved in a significant way, as their participation is crucial.



16 EAST 26th STREET . NEW YORK, N.Y. 10010-1579

September 28, 1989

Date of Interview: September 27, 1989

Interview with: Daniel Shapiro

Location: New York City

Interviewer: Art Rotman

Duration: 45 minutes

North American Commission on Jewish Education

Daniel Shapiro, New York City. Duration: 45 minutes

Shortly before the interview started, Dan Shapiro had determined that it would not be possible for him to attend the next meeting. While he was still interested in providing his input, I could not help but detect less of an interest in the meeting itself, since he knew he would not be there.

Continuing Mechanism

Shapiro recognizes that there should be a continuing mechanism to monitor and coordinate the efforts in the individual communities. At some point in the interview, he felt that the Commission should be that continuing entity, since it had worked so well up to now and since the group was so cohesive. At another point in the interview, he felt that to do so would be to run the risk of creating another national coordinating agency, which would be duplicating the work of the existing national agencies. After discussion back and forth, he finally came to the conclusion, which he would like to recommend to the Commission, that it continue, but meet only once a year in an "overseer" capacity. The actual responsibility for the coordination should be assumed by a separate operating entity with its own Board of Directors, with fewer members than the current Commission and associated with JESNA and JWB in the same way as the Commission. This operating board would meet perhaps three or four times a year and would have responsibility for hiring staff and for making ongoing policy decisions. It would take guidance from the successor to the Commission and keep the "large overseer" Commission informed.

Community Action Sites

The approach of having demonstrations in particular communities appeals to Shapiro. He suggested that we limit it to no more than two or, at the maximum, three such sites. The incremental value beyond that number decreases and there is the risk of the entire structure becoming unwieldy. Care should be taken to provide a geographic spread so that the sites are not all concentrated in one area. Consideration should also be given to size of community, with at least one site amongst the larger communities, such as Boston, and another in a mid-size community, such as Buffalo or Rochester. We should also be careful to insure that there is a spread in relative "sophistication", avoiding the most sophisticated and developed communities and, on the other hand, avoiding as well those that are at the other end of the spectrum in sophistication and development. There should be sufficient understanding and infrastructure in place so that the Community Action Site would not have difficulty in getting established; on the other hand, to select a community which had highly developed infrastructure would mean selecting a community which is atypical and difficult to replicate. Consideration should also be given to the potential for local community financial support, since he assumes that such support would be a requirement.

Based on his New York experience, Shapiro suggests that we make every effort to involve the Orthodox, even though this might be difficult. He was very interested to hear about the prospect of Mort Mandel and Rabbi Norman Lamm, convening a group of the Orthodox re the work of the Commission. Efforts should be made to involve all elements in the community, recognizing, of course, that it may not be possible to bring in some of the more extreme groups.

Summary

Dan Shapiro is very positive about the work of the Commission. He feels that it is an excellent group and is pleased to be a part of it. He thinks that the potential for making a major breakthrough is there but cautions that there is a great deal of difficult work before this can be achieved.



15 EAST 26th STREET - NEW YORK, N.Y. 10010-1579

January 17, 1990

Date of Interview: January 16, 1990

Interview with: Daniel Shapiro

Location: New York City

Interviewer: Art Rotman

Duration: 40 minutes

Daniel Shapiro had a number of questions which he hopes will be answered by the draft of the final report and/or by the discussion at the next Commission meeting.

Implementation Mechanism

- Would the mechanism be connected with any one organization or would it be freestanding? Dan's own opinion is that it would be better if it were freestanding, which would give it the independence it needs. The only drawback he sees is that there would be the fear in some people's eyes of establishing a new national agency. Since it is intended that the staff be small, he does not see this as a realistic fear.
- What will the governance of the new continental entity be? Dan would lean towards having two separate lay groupings. One would be a grouping similar to the current Commission with that kind of representation. The actual day-to-day operations would be overseen by a much smaller Board, which would include, perhaps, no more than about ten people, plus representatives of CJF, JESNA and JWB. The larger group could meet about once a year and a smaller group as necessary. Since much of its function would be as overseer, it might be called a "Board of Overseers".
- What authority would the new entity have in its relations with the demonstration communities? Dan acknowledged that, in view of the fact that funds would not be available for dispersal, the only "clout" would be "moral suasion", but Dan did not see this as a problem.

Community Demonstration Sites

- How many sites would there be and would an attempt be made to include larger as well as smaller communities as well as different types of communities?

Program Options

- Dan feels the demonstration sites should be encouraged to take up some of the program options (with varying sites perhaps taking up varying options).
- How would it be determined which option would be taken up by which site?

If Dan were to be in a position to make a determination at this time, he would select three program options, in order of priority:

1. The Israel experience he feels is probably the most significant way of insuring Jewish continuity. He speaks from personal experience because of the involvement of one of his sons in such an experience at the Weizmann Institute.
2. Day schools.
3. Supplementary schools. Dan knows that there is a lot of question about the future of supplementary schools and their effectiveness. Nevertheless, he doesn't believe that we should give up at this time. The challenge would be to find an appropriate way of making the supplementary schools more attractive and effective.

Dan looks forward to the meeting of the Commission at which these and other questions will surely be answered. It is his feeling that the Commission has provided a unique structure for diverse elements to be involved and he hopes that, in whatever emerges from the work of the Commission, this feature continues to be preserved.

cc: Henry L. Zucker
Stephen H. Hoffman

file

TO: Morton L. Mandel
NAME
DEPARTMENT/PLANT LOCATION

FROM: Virginia F. Levi
NAME VEL
DEPARTMENT/PLANT LOCATION

DATE: 1/24/91
REPLYING TO
YOUR MEMO OF: _____

SUBJECT:

Dan Shapiro would like to talk with you about our invitation to serve on the board of the CIJE. He indicated that he might be talked into it, but is feeling overcommitted and concerned about the time this might require. He is happy to be supportive and to remain in the group that will hear an annual report, but is uncertain about this additional commitment.

Please call him at (212) 758-0404.



I
N
T
E
R
-
O
F
F
I
C
E

C
O
R
R
E
S
P
O
N
D
E
N
C
E