



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 3: General Files, 1980–1993.

---

Box  
11

Folder  
5

Jerusalem meeting, March 1989.

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

---

**Jerusalem Meetings**  
March 7, 1989

Summary of Discussion - March 7, 1989

at the offices of Nativ

Present: AJN, JR, SF, AH, DM

AJN opened the discussion by conveying MLM's expectations of this series of meetings:

1. Building a Team
2. Achieving clarity on the issue of the ii; understanding it and developing it.

For the sake of clarifying misunderstandings and correcting mistaken assumptions, SF offered a brief summary of the development of the Commission, particularly the evolution of his and AH's role. He also described in detail the "m.o." developed by MLM, in the work of the Jewish Education Committee (i.e. research, translation into practice, implementation - all with consultations, forums, input from outside experts, etc.).

It became clear that:

1. While the "m.o." developed in the work of the JEC is not a formally adopted method, it characterizes the work of MLM, SF and AH. Taken for granted by the JEC team, it was never spelled out to the planning group and it is useful to do so now.
2. AJN's, SF's and AH's roles developed in response to the crisis that faced the Commission as it was about to have its first meeting: lack of a director.
3. Because JR entered the process late, he was not party to the common history of the Commission and, in trying to make sense out of the process, made some assumptions that need to be checked during this week.

For the remainder of the morning, discussion focused on the topic of the demonstration site and how that idea led to that of the ii. SF explained the notion of the demonstration site and gave

several examples of possible functions of a demonstration project (in the areas of recruitment, training, profession-building and retention for personnel). He then presented some of the problems and objections raised while developing the demonstration site concept:

- How would it be done? (lack of an implementation mechanism)
- For a practical field like education, a finished product - as implied in the concept of a demonstration center - is inappropriate.
- The problems with the notion of a prototype in Jewish education.
- lack of appropriate personnel to run it.

The views of the demonstration site concept offered by Coleman, Inbar, et al led SF and AH to the realization that an instrumentality for implementation was needed.

AJN cited several advantages and several disadvantages to demonstration projects and outlined the concept of "partialization." He then presented a model for the process of how demonstrations could be developed. This would include the following stages:

- Creating a mechanism for establishing a partnership between the various stakeholders in Jewish education.
- identifying obstacles (legal, political, financial, etc.)
- designing model programs.
- identifying disincentives which create negative preconditions that make the programs impossible.

SF and AH expressed the opinion that this model would probably be useful in addressing the issue of process, however, we are not ready at this point to deal with this process. In the case of Jewish education, we must first deal with creating or inventing the content of what is going to go into the process.

JR suggested that there are some examples of excellent programs that should be built upon rather than bypassed in favor of something completely new.

SF posited three principles that guide the thinking:

1. Refusal to accept the status quo.
2. Recognition of how difficult and complicated the process of changing the status quo is.
3. Recognition of the need for a strong coalition in order to cause systemic change.

Following lunch, AH presented a draft of the ii document which will be discussed in detail over the coming days.

A few of the questions and concerns that were raised are:

- "academic team" or professional advisory board?
- relationship of the staff of the ii to its functions
- the feasibility of the research function
- what is the source of authority of the ii
- monitoring on a micro level the effectiveness of programs
- various stakeholders and publics that need to be addressed
- funding sources - should they be incorporated into the board?
- different implementation needs for different types of communities.



**Jerusalem Meetings**  
March 8, 1989

Summary of Discussion - March 8, 1989

at the M.A.F. Offices in Jerusalem

Present: AJN, JR, SF, AH, DM

Following the previous day's preliminary discussion on the ii, AJN raised several issues that he sees emerging:

- commissioners' involvement in the process of the ii - how to "sell" the ii concept to the Commission
- the job description for the director of the ii
- linkage of the ii to specific content areas.

AH urged that we continue to discuss the ii before addressing these issues. She agreed that we will need to find a strong, capable director, but we must first determine what the ii will be, what it will do and how it will function.

DF reviewed the ii model, offering examples of how it would relate to different content issues in different communities.

AJN raised the questions of what should happen between now and the next Commission meeting and what the agenda of the June 14th meeting should be. It was agreed to return to these questions following further discussion on the ii today and tomorrow.

JR asked several questions about the ii : E.g. What is the theory of change that informs it? Will existing institutions welcome a sudden infusion of new personnel?

AJN introduced the notion of the ii as an "intermediary organization" and described several examples of intermediary organizations with which he has been involved. He noted that the success of an intermediary organization depends to a large extent on the strength of its director.

A lengthy discussion on theory of practice clarified some of the concepts on which the ii is based.

The draft of the ii paper was reviewed in detail. DM will produce the "Rashi commentary" (all remarks relevant to each item discussed) early next week.

Following the lunch break, the list of assignments was reviewed. (Must be continued tomorrow - from item 15.)

**Jerusalem Meetings**  
March 9, 1989

Summary of Discussion - March 9, 1989

at the offices of Nativ

Present: AJN, JR, SF, AH, DM

The day began with a review of the summaries of the previous days' discussions. Corrections were made.

The group then resumed the item by item review of the assignment list. (See amended list.) Some of the issues that were discussed in detail are:

- the nine local commissions and how they should be related to
- the relationship of the Commission with the various denominations, in light of their roles in Jewish education, their histories and internal structure
- JESNA's possible sensitivity to the ii concept and its potential role in relation to the ii.

The remainder of the morning was devoted to discussing the final report. AJN presented the draft of an outline in which several of the notions which had previously been considered as separate papers are incorporated (e.g. the state of the field, best practice). Background papers for the report could be commissioned and each might represent in its own right a significant contribution to the field of Jewish education. All agreed that this was a useful model. AJN and JR will prepare a second draft outline for circulation among this group.

Following lunch, SF described what he saw as some of the potential limitations of ii and suggested that we need to consider what other activities might supplement it. The ii, of necessity, will not be able to serve all purposes. We must be careful that important matters related to Personnel and the Community are not lost in terms of the macro goals of the Commission. (To be discussed at the working dinner on Thursday evening.)

**Jerusalem Meetings**  
March 9, 1989

Summary of Discussion - Evening of March 9, 1989

at "Eleh Mah" Restaurant

Present: AJN, JR, SF, AH, DM

AJN raised the question of how to bring the commissioners up to date and best convey to them the concept of the ii. He believes that their first impression of the ii will be critical and we should seek to minimize misunderstandings. Various suggestions were made as to how the commissioners might be able to offer input before the meeting of June 14th.

It was decided that prior to the meeting of March 30th, a draft of the letter that will be sent to the Commissioners will be sent to the Senior Policy Advisors for review. The letter will trace the development of the staff's thinking since December 13th (i.e. from the enabling options to the notion of demonstration to the concept of the ii). Verbal briefings should also take place (AJN/Ariel, JR/Woocher, SF/Rotman).

Various formats of the June 14th meeting were discussed.

SF expressed concern that a strategy for dealing with the foundation heads has not yet been developed. AJN will discuss the issue with MLM and HLZ.

The issues of Personnel and the Community, as distinct from the ii, were again raised. JR reiterated the point made earlier in the day that even if the ii is entirely successful, it may not completely answer the needs. SF urged against early closure on the possibility of task forces. AH suggested that a simulation of the ii might be useful at the next meeting of this group.

Jerusalem Meetings  
March 10, 1989

## COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA

Revised Assignment List

---

COMMISSION INVOLVEMENT

1. Design checklist for commissioner contacts -

TP VFL 2/9/89 (immediately)

2. Decide on the nature of contacts with commissioners before the 6/ meeting -

TP PLANNING GROUP 2/9/89 3/29/89

3. Arrange a meeting of MLM with Bronfman and Crown, and/or SF/AH to get their reaction and suggestions to implementation concept

TP MLM 2/9/89 3/29/89  
AJN  
SF

- a. Propose regional meetings to occur in April or May, chaired by Bronfman and Crown to consider implementation concept with oth commissioners

MLM 2/9/89

- b. Set up regional meetings of commissioners to consider the implementation proposal.

AJN 2/9/89 agenda for Senior  
VFL Policy Advisors

4. Draft letter to commissioners from MLM summarizing activities to date, and notifying of regional meetings.

TP AJN 2/9/89 3/15/89

- a. Process letter through policy advisors

TP AJN 2/9/89 3/30/89

- b. Send letter to commissioners

TP VFL 2/9/89 4/5/89

5. Convene a meeting of commissioner educators  
TP JR 2/9/89 Early April
6. Convene meeting of MLM with Twersky, Lipset, heads of 4 seminari  
SF or AH.  
Pre- AJN/SF 2/9/89  
mature

#### OUTREACH/PUBLIC RELATIONS

7. Discuss the issue of CAJE and the denominations. Develop a strategy.  
TP Planning Group 2/9/89 3/29/89
8. The commission's partners (JWB, JESNA) should convene groups of people who can contribute to the work of the Commission.  
TBD AR/JW 2/2/89 TBD
9. Create a short piece (pamphlet, brochure, etc.) describing the Commission's work, members, staff, goals to precede a larger outreach effort.  
TP AJN/FBC 2/9/89 3/25/89
10. Firm up list of formal and informal education institutions (with help from Alvin Schiff, Leonard Rubin) including priorities, timetable and method of contact.  
JR 2/9/89 3/15/89
11. Prepare for meeting with Federation executives in April. MLM presentation.  
AJN 2/9/89 4/9/89
12. Develop a plan for maintaining contact with the nine local Commissions on Jewish education. (see Joel Fox's Analysis)  
TP Planning group 2/9/89 3/15/89
13. Determine appropriate ways to involve leaders from the three denominations (e.g. Syme, Abramson, orthodox, someone from Torah U'Mesorah) -subsumed under #7 above.  
TP AJN/HLZ/SF 2/9/89 3/31/89

#### ASSIGNMENTS RE OUTCOMES AND IMPLEMENTATIONS

14. Prepare proposal for implementation mechanism (ii).  
TP SF/AH 2/9/89 3/26/89

15. Draft a working outline for the final report.  
TP AJN/JR 2/9/89 DONE
16. Commission a paper on the significance of Jewish continuity in the context of Jewish education. (subsumed under 15)  
RP 2/9/89 TBD
17. Draft a best practices paper (subsumed under 15)  
TBD 2/9/89 TBD
18. Job description for head of ii.  
AJN 2/9/89 3/29/89
19. Redraft options paper on personnel and community in light of implementation proposals and outline of final report.
20. Prepare outline for a vision paper. (part of ii mission statement)  
SP SF 2/9/89 TBD
21. Plan a production schedule for all staff work.  
TP VFL 2/9/89 3/15/89
22. Schedule meeting of Planning Group on 2/29/89. Location TBD.  
TP AJN/VFL 2/9/89 3/29/89 done
23. Schedule meeting of Senior Policy Advisors for 3/30/89, 10:00-4:00 Location TBD  
TP AJN/FVL 2/9/89 3/30/89 done

**Jerusalem Meetings**  
March 10, 1989

Your notes for Monday

1. The assignment list was revised in light of the meetings in Jerusalem.
2. The outline for the final report was enthusiastically endorsed (see minutes of March 9th and attached outline). AJN and JR will prepare a second draft.
3. Strategies for dealing with the denominations, CAJE, local commissions need to be determined. (see minutes of March 8, 9th.)
4. Contacts with the commissioners before June 14 to be discussed with the Planning Group (see item 2 on assignment list.)
5. Were Bronfman and Crown asked to chair regional meetings? Was the meeting with Bronfman set? (see item 3 on assignment list.)
6. JR is arranging a meeting of educators on April 5th or 6th. (See item 5 on assignment list.)
7. Should the commissioner contact sheets be included in the books given to the Senior Policy Advisors?
8. Joel Fox's paper was discussed. SF spoke to Hank SF will write to Joel with the following comments:
  1. The denominations were not given their proper due as deliverers of services; the central role of the Federations in Jewish education is developing but is not yet a reality.
  2. Some of the descriptions of programs may have been overstated.
9. Preparation for meeting with Federation executives
10. Budget for Israel Office

**Jerusalem Meetings**  
**March 10, 1988**

**Outline for Final Report**

**I. Jewish Education at a Crossroad**

- A. A changing Jewish community
- B. Who are we loosing?
- C. Requirements of Jewish continuity
- D. What is the proper basis of Jewish education?

**II. What is the State of the field?**

**III. The Opportunity**

- A. Wave of Consciousness in the Diaspora
- B. Wave of Programs and Innovation  
(see Joel Fox paper)

**IV. Best Practises**

- A. One vision - What is one ideal scenario for the next Millenium

**V. One Plan**

**One New Framework:**

enabling options	--->	personnel community	--->	programmatic options
---------------------	------	------------------------	------	-------------------------

**VI. Implementing the Plan (Innovation Model)**

- A. Innovation through
  - 1. Partialization
  - 2. Prototype based on a partialization process

**VII. Conclusion**

**Jerusalem Meetings**  
March 9, 1989

INTERNAL

Notes on the denominations

SF: I think that at the next set of meetings in America we should consider, in light of our discussions about the i.i., what the role of the denominations is going to be.

It may have been appropriate up until this point to have the denominations represented by the leaders of the training institutions or the institutions of higher learning. But as we move toward any conception of implementation, we must keep in mind that the deliverers of services are essentially the denominations plus Torah Umesora.

I am suggesting that we decide what contact has to be made by the Commission with the denominations so that they are on board before we announce any kind of implementation activity. One approach could be for MLM to meet individually with each of the institutions of higher Jewish learning and ask them that question. Appropriate staff should be with MLM at that time so that the full role of the lay organization and/or education commissions be considered.

With the orthodox movement an interpretation will have to be offered to Lamm who may see turning to Torah Umesora as undercutting centrist orthodoxy. This is a more complex problem but we can't avoid it because Torah Umesora controls most of the day schools of the orthodox movement.

**Jerusalem Meetings**  
March 10, 1989

**Suggested Agenda for Meeting of the Senior Policy Advisors**  
March 30, 1989

- I. Progress Report (December 13th - June 14th) -  
From Enabling Options to Implementation
- II. The Commission
- III. P.R. and Outreach
- IV. Funding

