



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
12

Folder
4

Naparstek, Arthur J. Trip reports, 1989.

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

CC: HL2
VFL

FAKED TO AH + SF
MINUS CONCLUSION

TO: Morton L. Mandel
NAME
DEPARTMENT/PLANT LOCATION

FROM: Arthur J. Naparstek
NAME
DEPARTMENT/PLANT LOCATION

DATE: 3/2/89
REPLYING TO
YOUR MEMO OF: _____

SUBJECT: BOSTON TRIP REPORT

I left Cleveland at approximately 8:20 a.m. and arrived at Logan Airport at 10 a.m. My schedule for the day included a one-hour meeting with Joseph Reimer from 10 to 11 a.m. which took place, partly in his car and the remainder at his office at Brandeis University, followed by a two-hour meeting with faculty of the Hornstein Program at Brandeis. The faculty included Susan Shevitz, Sylvia Fishman and Larry Sternberg. At 1:15 p.m. I met with Josh Elkin and Joseph Reimer and that was followed at 2:30 p.m. with a meeting with Barry Shrage.

I returned to Cleveland via Continental Airlines at 4:30 p.m., arriving in the city at 6 p.m. and at home at 6:30 p.m.

I. Meeting with Joseph Reimer

A. Discussion of paper on the state of Jewish education in North America.

This is Reimer's assignment and we talked about ways of organizing the paper. I indicated that I was not familiar with the body of literature with regard to Jewish education, but felt that there was much to be learned from related subject areas. I asked him if it was true that many regard Jewish education as very difficult to grab hold of, as an amorphous problem that lacks form, and with a very weak data base. Joe indicated this was true.

I said that I felt his major challenge was to put forward a statement on Jewish education in North America that would define the problem in a manner which could stimulate and engage lay leaders as well as educators and intellectuals. I pointed to a number of works in other areas like Michael Harrington's "The Other America" which was used as the basis for having poverty become a national public policy issue and stimulated scholars, foundation executives, politicians, and government officials to take action. This is the type of paper, monograph or book, that is needed on Jewish education.

Joe was intrigued when I outlined the aspects of "The Other America" and several other reports of a similar nature. We drew parallels, and if you are interested, I will develop the outline for you.

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

II. Meeting with Susan Shevitz, Sylvia Fishman, and Larry Sternberg

Please refer to the attached minutes of the meeting which put forward the issues that were raised. In summary, the key issue that may be of most interest to you is the affirmation by Shevitz, Fishman, and Sternberg that an implementation mechanism is a sound strategy. Shevitz indicated that she has completed a survey of 75 years of Jewish education in the United States, and what had been lacking in many reports and commission studies of the past had been an implementation mechanism.

There was also agreement that senior personnel is an important area to focus on. A third area of agreement was that the vision paper is important. You may want to refer to No. 2 in the notes of the meeting in which Susan Shevitz speaks of the need to create, not only an intellectual base, but a common vision and a common language by which to speak of change in the field of Jewish education.

My assessment of this meeting is that, for me, it was one of the best meetings I have had on the subject. Shevitz, Fishman, and Sternberg are bright, committed to Jewish education, and very knowledgeable. I feel that we could gain a lot by building a team of staff support in the United States and, if we could organize a network of people like Shevitz, Fishman, and Sternberg, we would do well. We need to devise a strategy to involve them in our work. I'll talk with Fox about how we do this.

III. Meeting with Josh Elkin

This meeting occurred over lunch, which I hosted, and dealt with issues of outreach. We reviewed Elkin's letter that was shared with the planning committee. Specifically, we spoke of how best to connect to CAJE. Elkin suggested that he might be the person to call Elliott Spack as he had a good relationship with him.

We also discussed appropriate ways in which the Commission could participate in the CAJE conference in August. Ideas included the following:

- A. A major presentation by the Commission chairman or other top lay leaders of the Commission at a plenary session.
- B. The Commission inviting all interested participants of the conference to a Commission-sponsored activity, which might include a forum in which presentations by different commissioners are made, followed by an informal reception.
- C. Commission-sponsored workshops

We agreed that it would be best to discuss these ideas with the Commission chairman, Seymour Fox and Annette Hochstein, and at the same time, to get a sense from Elliott Spack as to what was possible. Elkin indicated that Elliott did work with the program committee although he very much called the shots on the conference.

IV. Meeting with Barry Shrage

This meeting occurred in Barry's office. As the attached minutes indicate, two points were raised:

- A. College students represent an untapped pool of personnel for Jewish education. Barry is committed to working with college students and believes various programs can be tested in the Boston area.
- B. When I asked Barry about the implementation idea, he responded by putting forward the notion of synagogues as the way in which an implementation mechanism could be organized, that is, through synagogues. Barry was very forceful in arguing for a synagogue orientation to Jewish education. I was impressed with his vision on the subject.

V. Conclusion

I felt the trip was very instructive in that it provided an opportunity to dialogue with academics and practitioners. It also offered a chance to test out the implementation notion, the need for a vision paper, and issues related to a paper that would scan the field of Jewish education in North America. We made progress in each area. I also had a good opportunity to talk with Joe Reimer, who still remains quite concerned about the approach taken by Fox and Hochstein. I ameliorated some of that concern, but a great deal will depend on how our meetings in Israel work out. I briefed Fox on what I understand to be of concern to Reimer and have asked Reimer to identify the issues in writing.

Joe is committed to the process, committed to the Commission, and I regard him as a very valuable resource and someone who needs to be supported. He brings a knowledge of the field that is uniquely American, his writing skills are at a very high level and, with direction, I believe he can be a valuable resource.

Note: The air fare was \$86 higher as we were late in committing to the trip and missed the 7 day advance purchase fare.

BENJAMIN S. HORNSTEIN PROGRAM IN JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICE
 Brandeis University, Waltham, MA 02254-9110

Notes of February 23, 1989 meeting at Brandeis University

Present: Arthur Naparstek, Joseph Reimer, Susan Shevitz, Sylvia Fishman, and Larry Sternberg

1. Art began by saying that Mr. Mandel is committed to this Commission's having a workable implementation mechanism and, when asked, gave several examples from his experience of what such a mechanism could look like.

a. A mechanism developed in Cleveland to deal with poverty in the neighborhoods, developed to be catalytic, to work with community groups and connect them with funding sources and provide them with technical know-how and their staffs with professional training.

b. In the famous Flexner report, the mechanism was John Hopkins: the improvements of that medical school set the standard for the profession.

c. During the Nixon years, one person concerned with the functioning of personnel in the Federal government pushed for the creation of the Federal Executive Institute which was a mechanism for intensive, rejuvenating training programs for Federal employees.

2. Art posed the question of whether we can put forward an intellectual base to explain how an implementation mechanism could operate to make a difference. He observed that a report without a mechanism is dead weight, but a mechanism without a report is technocratic fallacy.

Susan Shevitz spoke of the need to create not only an intellectual base, but a common vision and a common language by which to speak of change in the field. The field lacks a cohesive way of viewing itself and operating of its own potential for growth. Larry Sternberg concurred, saying that if the mechanism is the product of a private vision of change, the mechanism will continue, but the sense of mission will be lost. He wondered how it is possible to create a common vision which could outlast the mechanism itself.

Larry Sternberg suggested that at the heart of that vision would be the reconceptualized role of the educator and the program. The role of the educator has to evolve beyond the current part-time, non-professional status if the field is to grow, and the vitality of the program offered in the few short hours we have has to be enhanced if the education is to have effect. Perhaps at the heart of the reform is the creation of the "community

educator" who works full-time in a variety of settings and helps fashion the more effective program. That requires the creation of new education slots and funding to help synagogues create these full-time positions.

Susan Shevitz wondered if it's at all realistic to envision professionalizing the teaching corp. Perhaps we have to aim at a professional core of senior educators and a more dedicated corps of avocational teachers who are trained and directed by the senior educator.

3. Art wondered if it made sense to think of a mechanism like the National Endowment of the Arts (or Humanities) which is centrally administrated but which functions by stimulating activity in the local communities.

Sylvia Fishman responded that what is crucial is to stimulate local activity that requires cooperation between institutions - like JCC's and synagogues - who do not normally cooperate. Susan Shevitz agreed with the goal, but reminded us of the crucial "culture gap" which exists between communal and denominational organizations that so often undermines their efforts at cooperating together.

4. Joseph Reimer asked if there were ways to bridge the "cultural gap." Larry Sternberg spoke of select professionals from each "world" coming together to learn the culture of the other world.

Sylvia Fishman spoke of learning by doing - putting cooperative projects into place teaching the professionals a common language. Susan Shevitz cautioned that each side may need to be prepared in order to work together. Sylvia Fishman saw in the example of the Synagogue council a hopeful sign that differences (in denomination) could be overcome in launching a joint project.

5. Art remarked that he was hearing support for the concept of a central mechanism of implementation. Sylvia Fishman agreed - if it was understood that local communities have real input into the process. Susan Shevitz agreed that working with select communities made sense and that a plan for implementation that broke through the talk was needed. On a community level you had a chance to get organizations to see that cooperation can be in their enlightened self-interest. That is harder to achieve on a national level. Art agreed - saying you need the national body as a funding mechanism, but implementation has to be decentralized.

6. Art asked: What is the intellectual base that could galvanize people to move action and begin to answer questions like how centralized is decentralized should the mechanism be? Susan Shevitz warned of difficulties due to lack of a data base.

Larry Sternberg thought the crucial argument is showing that Jewish education makes a difference in promoting Jewish identity and survival. Sylvia Fishman and Susan Shevitz thought that the crucial intellectual effort is moving the definition of Jewish education from "school" to "community," from providing knowledge to providing a communal context in living as a Jew makes sense.

7. Joseph Reimer asked what the group thought needed to be done in regard to personnel. Larry Sternberg thought two priorities were crucial: full time principals for supplementary schools and Jewish enrichment for JCC workers. Susan Shevitz spoke of need to make Jewish educational field competitive with rabbinate in salary and status so we can compete for the better students. Also, the need to upgrade those in the field by offering salary increments for improved performance and added responsibilities. Larry Sternberg talked of need to get back to youth groups as source of recruitment.

8. Art asked what is the body of knowledge that would help guide the mechanism for change. Susan Shevitz suggested commissioning a series of paper in which people would lay out their theories of change, their hypothesis for change which could be tested against the results of the "experiments" of implementation.

* * *

Barry Shrage added several points that afternoon.

1. College students represent a pool of untapped personnel for Jewish education.

2. Crucial to success of implementation is cooperation between universities, communal agencies and synagogues to help synagogues maximize their educational effectiveness beyond the supplementary school.



Brandeis University

Philip W. Low
School of
Near Eastern and
Judaic Studies

Benjamin S. Hornstein
Program in Jewish
Communal Service
617-736-2990

Waltham Massachusetts
02254-9110

February 21, 1987

TO: Arthur Naparstek

FROM: Joseph Reimer

RE: Outreach to Formal Educational Community

I am reporting on my conversations last week with Alvin Schiff, Jon Woocher and Josh Elkin on Commission plans to outreach to educational organizations operating in the "formal" sphere.

1. There are three essential bodies that have to be reached: the central agencies, the denominational bodies and the educator organizations.

2. Schiff suggests two approaches are possible: calling one big meeting to which you invite delegates from all three bodies or a more individualized approach where each of the three are approached differently and separately. He and Woocher agree that though the second is more time consuming, it is more effective if the goals are (1) to get people on board and (2) to get their input into the planning process. The big meeting would only really allow for us to report to them.

3. Both agree that for Central Agencies, the organization is BDF and the contact person is Gene Greenszweig. They suggest calling him and following his lead, though two scenarios are possible: calling a special meeting of bureau heads from the big cities and/or working through the June meeting in Florida. These people are important because they still control access to schools in local communities. We want their cooperation as well as input and advice on implementation.

4. With the educators both agree that the primary organization is COJED (of which the other organizations are members) and the contact person is Hy Campeas. Schiff suggests sending letter to Campeas (who, by the way, works for Schiff in N.Y.) and allowing him to invite the constituent organizations to send their reps to a meeting with us that COJED would sponsor (following option #1 on p. 14). This does not include the right-wing Torah Umesorah (p. 4) - but Alvin thinks they are not partners to our process.

5. Woocher believes that CAJE needs its own treatment - as Elkin suggested in his letter. He thinks the best way to proceed is to set up a meeting with Eliot Spack and Betsy Katz and work out with them one best options for contact.

6. The denominations are most time consuming because each one needs to be approached separately. Schiff suggests beginning with the presidents (commissioners) and have them choose denominational reps to come to a meeting. But he admits that is tricky because especially with Reform, but also with Conservative, the denominational organizations (UAHC, United

Arthur Naparstek
P. 2, February 21, 1989

Synagogue) are quite autonomous. Woocher suggests one on one meetings with their directors; but how to get right balance is tricky. E.G., Elkin called Schorsh to tell him about his letter and Schorsh thought it premature to move on this since there isn't enough to report yet. Since Elkin wasn't thinking of just "reporting," it is a different perspective that the presidents of seminaries may have.

7. Woocher and Schiff will attend meetings where we think their presence will be beneficial.



TO: Morton L. Mandel
NAME
DEPARTMENT/PLANT LOCATION

FROM: Arthur J. Naparstek
NAME
DEPARTMENT/PLANT LOCATION

DATE: 4/12/89
REPLYING TO
YOUR MEMO OF: _____

SUBJECT: TRIP REPORT - APRIL 5-10, 1989

APRIL 5

I. Commission on Jewish Education in North America - Meeting of Commission Educators

Commissioners present: Jack Bieler, David Dubin, Josh Elkin,
Carol Ingall, Sara Lee, Alvin Schiff

Staff and advisors: Seymour Fox, Annette Hochstein, Joseph Reimer,
Jonathan Woocher, Arthur Naparstek

A. Joe Reimer chaired the meeting and put forward the steps which moved us from enabling options to an implementation mechanism. All the commissioners present responded positively to the idea of an implementation mechanism. Seymour Fox presented the idea of the implementation mechanism as a way of thinking about how to initiate and manage change in partnership with a community action site. Reaction to Seymour's presentation was uniformly positive with several questions raised and discussed. For your information, I believe, these are the key questions:

1. How will the implementation mechanism not become a national agency or a threat to existing national agencies?
2. Who will represent the community in negotiations with the implementation mechanism?
3. Will the implementation mechanism use its limited funds more effectively by generating matching funds?
4. Doesn't this model assume an ideal community will be selected and worked with? Wouldn't it be better to start with a number of communities hospitable to developing this type of personnel?
5. How do you get the implementation mechanism started? How do the board and the advisors get into the act? When does funding facilitation come in?
6. To whom is the implementation mechanism accountable?
7. Isn't it natural that it be more than a mid-wife, that it also be a generator of rigorous, practical thinking and that it spell out principles and implementation?

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

8. Shouldn't the implementation mechanism also be spawning academic positions to have people ready to study and evaluate the process.

B. As much as the Commission has agreed that an implementation mechanism is the logical outcome of the Commission, several also voiced a concern about the relation of the implementation mechanism to the life of the Commission. In the words of David Dubin, Sara Lee, Alvin Schiff, all indicated that the implementation mechanism was important, but within the context of best practice and vision. It was the consensus that the Commission needs to proceed on two parallel tracks: toward an implementation mechanism, but also spelling out more clearly the substance of the personnel and community issues in the context of best practices and vision. Several suggestions were made:

1. We may need a task force or subcommittee to study the substance of the personnel and community issues.
2. That study may be needed to reflect a section of the final report.
3. We may want to use part of the June 14th Commission meeting to start the conversation about the substantive issues on community, personnel, and the relationship to programmatic options. There were several comments, again Dubin and Lee, who felt that the June 14th meeting should deal with both strategy and substance, strategy being the IJE, substance being personnel and community as stated above.
4. We may also want to consider putting forward a paper on best practices. It need not be specific best practices, but a universal alternative practices, a vision of what is possible to be done, what kind of educators could be produced. That might be an appropriate paper for the June meeting.

II. Meeting with Annette Hochstein and Seymour Fox

Seymour and Annette asked to meet with me concerning the budget for the Israel office. I indicated that it was my hope we would have a meeting on the budget with you the next day, at which time we might be able to make a decision with regard to several of the outstanding items.

Seymour is very concerned that the writer be employed as quickly as possible. We agreed that further discussions on the budget would be taken up directly with you on the following day.

APRIL 6

I. MIG Meeting Impressions

I thought the meeting could not have gone better. It was a very wise strategy to open it with personal statements. Not only did it make the meeting go more effectively, but it also helped me to understand my own relationship to Jewish education in that I can now connect what we are trying to do to my own personal life as well as professional life. I made an attempt at doing that, as you recall, in my presentation to the Wasserstrom committee at CJF on April 10th.

In any event, I thought the meeting was excellent. The flow was natural and MIG seems to be a logical outcome from everything that's gone before. I was very impressed.

II. Meeting with Seymour Fox, Annette Hochstein, AJN and MLM

I felt that we did not come to closure on the budget issue as it relates to the Israel office or the overall Commission budget. I will work with Michael Albanese in trying to develop a format that better puts forward the budget so that you are able to take a decision on key issues. In any event, I believe we have to resolve both the Israel office aspect of the budget as well as the overall pattern of expenditures.

Following the meeting on the budget, you began talking about some of your thoughts related to the Commission process. You indicated that an overall objective had to be a strategic marriage of programmatic options with the interests of individual commissioners. You spoke about finding champions for programmatic options, and that the initiative on Jewish education or the implementation mechanism would help that commissioner or individual implement and execute that programmatic option. That would be one major thrust and outcome of the Commission and a second would be policy implications related to the various demonstration or implementation programs that were developed.

You talked about five major discoveries evolving from the Commission:

- A. The issue of preconditions and programmatic options.
- B. IJE as an implementation mechanism.
- C. IJE as a mechanism to involve research, planning, and best practices, and to link enabling options to the programmatic options.
- D. Looking at national and international organizations so they can be improved and made better.
- E. Linking to the future of the federation movement.

I felt all of that was very helpful.

III. Meeting with Seymour Fox, Mike Sviridoff and Art Naparstek

Seymour and I met with Mike Sviridoff at the Arnold & Porter offices in Midtown Manhattan. Mike spoke of intermediary organizations and identified five major areas in which they have been developed: literacy, police, drugs, welfare, and manpower. He spoke about the intermediary as an instrument that can test ideas and execute. He talked about various strengths and weaknesses. I will, in a separate memo, put forward some of the ideas that Mike spoke about, and also other ideas that I received from Peter Szanton in my meeting with him on Monday, April 10.

Most importantly, Seymour asked Mike if there had ever been an intermediary in education. Mike indicated there had not been and felt there needed to be. He also indicated that Peter Goldmark, the new president of the Rockefeller Foundation, is developing an intermediary in education. Mike felt we were on the right track and that an intermediary could be used in Jewish education.

APRIL 7I. Visited Sites

During the morning I visited the American Jewish Committee and the 92nd Street Y and met with staff at both organizations. The AJC is okay for our meeting but not great. It does have breakout rooms and a decent general meeting room. However the major problem would be in terms of serving lunch in which lunch would then have to be served in the room that we meet in. 92nd Street Y is not appropriate as it is too busy and we may not have control over our meeting space.

II. Meeting with Jim Gibson of the Rockefeller Foundation

Met with Jim Gibson to discuss Cleveland's poverty initiative and the role of Rockefeller. Jim asked me how I saw the poverty initiative in Cleveland developing. I spoke with Jim about the role Neighborhood Progress, Inc. could play in developing a means of dealing with poverty in the city. As you may recall, we established a poverty center at the Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences before I left. The center will operate much like NPI operates in relationship to Cleveland Tomorrow in that the center will provide data to help move strategies. The Rockefeller Center is funding the center.

I spoke with Jim about developing a strategy for poverty in Cleveland that would see a neighborhood as a system and that, in effect, community organizations or community development corporations would be expected to manage the neighborhood systems. The question of how do you manage those systems needs to be answered. We would, in effect, begin a process of training through NPI, the directors of the CDCs and the

community organizations so that they would develop the skills to manage the systems. The poverty center would put forward the analysis needed so we would be able to identify the component parts of the system that are necessary in order to deal with the problems of poverty.

In an earlier conversation, I talked with Tom Cox about this idea of managing the system on a neighborhood level. Tom truly does believe in it, but did indicate that many of the neighborhood actors in Cleveland did not see themselves as managers. There is not the conception of managing neighborhood organizations in relationship to problem solving.

Further, I pointed out that Cleveland lacks a sense of cohesion in that data does not inform decisions. For the most part, decisions related to poverty in Cleveland are made on whim or intuition and that we do not have a data base that provides us with any guidance. Thus, I concluded with Jim Gibson that NPI could serve as a means to serve community development corporations, their staffs and boards in helping to manage systems in the neighborhoods so as we may be able to deal with all income issues.

Jim was very positive about my presentation and would like to come to Cleveland at some point in the near future, possibly to meet with you, Tom Cox and others. Further, sometime in mid-June, Peter Goldmark will be visiting Cleveland and if we decide to get involved in the area of neighborhood approaches to dealing with poverty, it would be appropriate for us to set up a meeting on the subject between you, Goldmark and others. You and I need to discuss what my involvement will be.

III. JWB Convention

I attended the Friday evening opening sessions of the JWB Convention and shared with you my thinking about that evening. I was impressed with Art Rotman's cultivation of both the lay and professional leadership in his network. Rotman is absolutely brilliant in putting it together. The sense of community at the JWB meeting was much stronger than at any other comparable meeting I've been to in the Jewish world i.e., CJF or, for that matter, even the JESNA meetings that I've attended. I really believe Art has done a brilliant job in developing a sense of community in his network. He pays attention to detail. I was impressed that he had signed Zev Heimowitz to be my host and Zev was never more than several feet away from me throughout, not only that evening, but through the weekend.

APRIL 8

- I. I attended the JWB convention in the morning, spending time at the workshop on issues of fundraising. Steve Solender was the presenter. Steve did a fine job in presenting the position of federations in

relationship to JCCs. In summary, Steve detailed the problems of federation fundraising, that there was an expectation of flat campaigns for the coming years and the impact that would have on agencies. He detailed other problems federations are having in relationship to the responding to crises i.e., the JDC problem, the Russian Jewry problem, the whole a Jew issue. An us and them atmosphere evolved in the meeting between the problems as represented by directors of the JCCs and Steve's presentation of the problems of federations.

Following the meeting I spoke with Steve about beginning to look at the issues of federation/JCC relationships in a different way. One, by having lay leaders from JCCs move to leadership positions in federations and, two, by beginning to see the JCC as part of a system of service delivery agencies within the community. By initiating a strategic planning process, issues of cutback could be handled in more effective ways, the reason being that environmental factors could be factored into the relationship between federations and agencies.

II. Meeting with Seymour Fox

I spent the afternoon in a meeting with Seymour Fox debriefing on Commission activities. We reviewed what took place at the Jewish educators meeting and the short meeting with you. Fox is concerned that the budget questions get resolved quickly and that you speak with Bronfman as soon as possible. We set up tentative dates and deadlines for assignments. The key to those deadlines and assignments are that all commissioners that will be seen are seen by May 1st, that we decide that the paper for the June 14th meeting be written by June 1st with writing to start by May 14th, that the letter informing commissioners of progress be sent out by April 20th.

III. MLM Presentation

I returned to the JWB convention at approximately 4 p.m. and was in the audience during your presentation. As I told you, I thought it went very well and the informal responses and feedback from the audience were quite positive.

APRIL 9

- I. I attended the JWB meeting and worked with Henry Hecker to make sure that the photographer would be there and worked with his assistant on a press release based on your presentation of the evening before. Following the Mendel Caplan presentation, I left the hotel and flew to Washington, D.C. with Philip Wasserstrom. There is nothing to report on my time with Wasserstrom.

II. Dinner Meeting with Federation Executives

I was somewhat disappointed with the limited response you received. Only four executives spoke up. We need to follow up. I will talk to HLZ about it next week.

APRIL 10

I. Breakfast meeting with Warren Schmidt

Warren Schmidt is a former faculty member of mine at the University of Southern California's Graduate School of Public Administration. One of the more creative academics I have come in contact with, he has actually won several Academy Awards for films he has made on subjects of value. In any event, he is involved in poverty-related issues in Los Angeles and as he was in Washington, we decided to meet to compare notes on what was happening in Cleveland and models that have been developed in Los Angeles that might be applied to Cleveland. He had a number of ideas that we will be able to use.

II. Wasserstrom's Committee on Jewish Identity and Continuity

I attended the 10:30 a.m. meeting and made the presentation. I don't think there is anything significant to report.

III. Lunch Meeting with Peter Szanton

Peter Szanton is the resource person Mike Sviridoff suggested I meet to discuss intermediaries. I was impressed with Szanton who is currently a private consultant. He had been an associate director of the Office of Management and Budget. He was also president of the New York City Rand Institute in the late '60s and early '70s.

We had a very detailed conversation with regard to intermediaries and the role the intermediary can play in Jewish education. I will be preparing a separate memo on the subject for your consideration as well as for Seymour's and Annette's attention. I've already briefed Annette on the meeting.

Szanton, who is Jewish and currently consults with the Federation in Baltimore, could be a valuable resource for us. I was very impressed with the meeting.

IV. Meeting on National Service

Later in the afternoon I met with the Mikulski staff on national service, developing an agenda for the first meeting of our advisory committee. I will be chairing a committee that will be made up of the

following: Don Kennedy, president of Stanford University; Dan Thursz, director of the Council on Aging; Sondra Grey from the Independent Sector; Jan Rivitz of the Strauss Foundation in Baltimore, Alice Shabecoff of the Clearinghouse on Neighborhoods; Dr. Ethel Richardson from Baltimore, Dr. Antonio Pantoza from Puerto Rico; Peg Rosenberry from the National Association of Service and Conservation Corp.

The National Volunteer Service Program has caught hold in Congress and there are a number of bills that have been introduced. Nunn, McCurdy, Mikulski, Kennedy, Pell, Dodd, Peneta, Moynihan, Bumpers and Graham all have bills in national services. I am attaching a matrix which explains all the various bills that the Congressional Quarterly put out in March. We are clearly on the cutting edge of this very important issue and, I believe, that the Mikulski bill will be the key. Mikulski's leadership will provide the Senate with an overall bill that combines all the others.

AMERICAN JEWISH
ARCHIVES



ARTHUR J. NAPARSTEK - SCHEDULE

Sunday, March 5, 1989

4:00 p.m. ARRIVE BEN-GURION AIRPORT

Monday, March 6, 1989

9:00 - 4:30 p.m. JNF site visits

Dinner: AJN/Seymour Fox

Tuesday, March 7, 1989

7:00 - 8:00 a.m. J. Reimer

8:00 - 2:00 p.m. AJN/SF/AH/J. Reimer

2:00 - 3:00 p.m. AJN/Barry Holtz (MAF offices)

3:15 - 4:15 p.m. AJN/Moshe Rivlin (JNF)

5:00 p.m. AJN/Professor Nehemia Levtzion (Open University)

6:30 p.m. Barry Chazen (Laromme Hotel)

Wednesday, March 8, 1989

7:00 - 8:00 a.m. J. Reimer

8:00 - 4:00 p.m. Working day

4:30 p.m. Israel Katz

Dinner: AJN/Mike Rosenak

Thursday, March 9, 1989

7:00 - 8:00 a.m. J. Reimer

8:00 - 4:00 p.m. Working day

10:15 a.m. AJN/Professor Walter Ackerman

4:30 p.m. Israel Katz

7:30 p.m. Working dinner

Friday, March 10, 1989

7:30 - 8:30 a.m. Budget meeting with SF and AH
8:30 - 10:00 a.m. AJN/Don Scher (JWB offices)
10:00 - 2:00 p.m. Continuation of working meetings with SF/AH

Dinner: Annette and Shaul Hochstein's home

Saturday, March 11, 1989

7:00 - 10:00 p.m. Dinner with SF



TO: Morton L. Mandel
NAME
DEPARTMENT/PLANT LOCATION

FROM: Arthur J. Naparstek
NAME
DEPARTMENT/PLANT LOCATION

DATE: 3/15/89
REPLYING TO
YOUR MEMO OF: _____

SUBJECT: TRIP REPORT TO ISRAEL
SUNDAY, MARCH 5 THROUGH SATURDAY, MARCH 11, 1989

Sunday, March 5th

Arrived at Laromme Hotel at approximately 6 p.m. Shortly after arrival, I met with Seymour Fox and Annette Hochstein to review the agenda for the week. The agenda was not fully developed and we had an opportunity to fill it in on Sunday evening. I asked to see Ackerman, Holtz, Rosenak, Katz and Chazen. Monday was to be an open day as Seymour and Annette both teach at that time, thus I was able to schedule the meetings with the Jewish National Fund to collect information for Jack Mandel on the program he is interested in at Jabotinsky Park.

Monday morning

Left for Jabotinsky Park at 9 a.m.

Impressions:

Jewish National Fund is restoring a Roman theater in Jabotinsky Park in Shuni. Linked to the theater is a youth camp for youngsters from Israel and abroad. Jack has indicated an interest in the youth camp and asked me to evaluate the program and find out as much about the JNF projects as possible.

I was favorably impressed with the work that is going on at the Jabotinsky Park. The archaeological project, coupled with the youth camp, offers a great opportunity for youngsters. Parenthetically, the youth camp will be able to serve 300 young people from Israel and abroad at any one time. This project brings together the past, the Byzantine era in Roman and in Jewish history. This is an area of Israel in which 250,000 Jews lived and it is thought that Rabbi Akiva is buried close by. Further, the archaeological dig will continue for another twenty years. It is considered to be one of the richest they have found in recent times. JNF has dedicated a full-time archaeologist to work on site. My conclusion is that this project brings together Jewish education for youth through the archaeological dig, with a youth camp and a museum celebrating the formation of the Irgun. Although it is an excellent project, it is hard to evaluate in the absence of a policy and a system of priorities, therefore it's difficult for me to make a definitive recommendation.

On our return from Shuni, we stopped off to visit Jack's project in Independence Park. I arrived at Independence Park at approximately 2:30 p.m. and spent an hour there. I was very impressed with the architectural design of the Mandel section of the Park. It is beautifully laid out with a nice view of Jerusalem. We returned to Jerusalem at approximately 4:30 p.m.

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

Monday evening dinner with Seymour Fox

The meeting with Seymour Fox on Monday evening at Benny's Restaurant can best be characterized as honest and candid. Seymour and I both indicated there have been problems in the past and it was our goal to transcend these problems. Seymour, as is true with me, wants this to succeed. Seymour made it clear that he is the intellectual guru for you in Jewish education. However, he sees himself playing that role with regard to MIG much more than MINA. He indicated that he did not want to be as heavily involved in Jewish education in North America as he is, but when Perry Davis washed out, Seymour took on that responsibility.

My response to Seymour's presentation was as follows: I assured him of my support through you for him. I told him that it has been difficult for me to be effective as I did not believe he has respected my opinion. He responded that you had given him the signal that, as I was not particularly expert at Jewish education, my role was one to move paper and manage the process in administrative terms. I indicated that I did not have a problem with that, nor did I have a problem with being in a reflective and learning posture with regard to Jewish education. However, I felt that much of what we were doing was dealing with methodology as we discussed demonstration, innovation, and diffusion strategies, and in creating mechanisms for change. None of the meetings dealt with Jewish education. I asked him whether he was aware that much of my past work and experience has been in that area. He said he has now realized that is true and felt that he would be much more open to my inputs.

Tuesday morning breakfast with Joe Reimer

Joe arrived on Monday evening. When I met with him Tuesday morning for breakfast, he was quite anxious and indicated that he did not understand the ii. I realized two things about Joe, (1) he has not had experience with implementation and, (2) he has not had experience beyond the university. Further, Joe has pursued Jewish education from a psychological perspective, but not as educationist or a community-oriented professional.

We spoke about the melding of his experience with what was occurring and, although he is somewhat skeptical, at the end of our breakfast, he felt that it was worth his investing heavily in this week so that he could get as much out of it as possible. We reviewed the schedule of the week's activities that was already in place and I invited him to all my meetings with the aforementioned individuals.

The first meeting of Joe Reimer, Annette Hochstein, Art Naparstek and Seymour Fox

Please refer to the summaries of the meetings. The full protocol or minutes of the meetings will be coming within a week. However, for now the summaries will give you a sense of what was covered.

The most important issue from the perspective of this report is that I decided it would be best if I chaired the meetings much as I had done when I was in prior leadership positions. I asked that, in addition to a complete set of minutes, we had a summary prepared and that summary would be read each morning to determine if the general issues and themes raised the prior day were agreed upon by everyone. What does not come through in the minutes but was very apparent in the first three hours of our meeting was how angry Seymour Fox was with Joe Reimer. He indicated that Joe's letter really upset him and, given the relationship of the two over the past years, he would have felt better had Joe talked to him face to face.

By 11 a.m. we had moved beyond everyone's discomfort with each other and began to work on a number of the issues related to the development of the program. I introduced, at one point during the day, the notion of the parachute concept, that ii was parachuted in with no process. In other words, we moved from the demonstration idea to the ii idea, but with no process in between.

My impression of Seymour during this period in our discussions was that he was listening and open; impression of Annette Hochstein, that she was analytic and supportive. The meeting carried on till 2 p.m. and, as the summary of the minutes suggest, we made some progress toward a better understanding of ii, but more importantly toward team building.

Meeting with Barry Holtz

At 2 p.m. I met with Barry Holtz, who knows Joe Reimer and has high regard for him. I indicated that I wanted to test out some ideas. I asked him what he thought was some of the key issues confronting Jewish education. Barry said that implementation was the key issue and must be addressed in creative ways. Much of the meeting was spent on elaborating the ii concept.

Meeting at the JNF

At 3:15 p.m. I met with Moshe Rivlin, World Chairman of the Jewish National Fund, and Shlomo Ariav, Deputy Chairman, and Avram Tailman, Project Director for the Diaspora.

Moshe Rivlin, very astute, did his homework, knew about you and Jack, did not know very much about Joe. He spoke about the project in Jewish education terms and in historic terms. He indicated that this project would bring together the whole idea of youth camping with archaeological excavation in a very important place in time and in geography. In time, it brings together the past with the present. The Roman Theater will also have a museum celebrating the role of the 1948 patriots. This was the place that many of the activities were carried out during the war of independence. For example, in the buildings around the Roman Theater, planning took place which lead to the breakout of the political prisoners of ACCO. Again, we need a policy to guide our involvement, otherwise we are reacting.

Meeting with Nehemia Levtzion, President, Open University

At 5 p.m. I went to Hebrew University at Ramat Aviv and met with Nehemia Levtzion on how an Open University can serve Jewish education. Seymour Fox set up the meeting. They have well over 14,000 people enrolled in the Open University which uses television and is innovative in two ways: it comes to apply an educational method never before tried in the field of Jewish in-service training, and it attempts to create a genuinely joint Israeli-North American venture in the field of Jewish education. Barry Chazen is the project director. I don't believe we can use the Open University at this time.

Meeting with Barry Chazen

At 6:30 that evening back at Laromme, I met with Barry Chazen. Barry is involved in a range of different activities. As a teacher and consultant, he is involved with the Open University, he is also serving as a consultant to JWB. Barry indicated that he initially was skeptical of the idea of the Commission, but now feels that it is extremely important. The theme of the Commission's importance was reemphasized a number of times during the week as many of the Jewish educators in Israel believe that the lay leadership of the Jewish Agency is not capable of doing what needs to be done in the education field. Barry felt that the issues of Jewish education should focus on implementation, innovation and the diffusion of knowledge. He repeated many of the arguments we have heard in the past around the lack of profession, etc.

Wednesday morning breakfast with Joe Reimer

Joe, who had dinner with Seymour Fox the evening before, indicated that he had straightened a number of things out with Seymour. He also indicated that he had not been completely direct with me, and that he is much more concerned about whether he can fulfill the requirements needed for a successful tenure decision at Brandeis. You may recall that I spoke with him early on about how the Commission work through the reports would help him in his tenure decision. He felt that, given the direction of the Commission, he would be unable to do that. Further, he had been working on the psychological aspects of Jewish education and did not think that he would be able to combine the work of the Commission with his current work. I indicated that I felt it could be worked out. We agreed to develop a plan.

Wednesday meetings with Fox, Hochstein, Naparstek and Reimer

We made a conceptual breakthrough on the issue of ii when I put forward the notion of intermediary organizations and how it works. I pointed to Cleveland Tomorrow, LISC, etc. Much of it began to fall into place at that point. Seymour talked about how he is now developing a theory behind the theory related to the ii. I believe his notion of the theory of ii is around issues related to innovation, implementation theory and the development of demonstrations. I am not sure what the theory behind the theory is however. What is of importance is that Seymour feels the ii is the culmination of his academic work and wants to do writing on the subject.

Meeting with Mike Rosenak

Joe Reimer and I had dinner with Mike Rosenak. It was a wonderful dinner. We talked about a number of the underlying assumptions related to ii. I believe Rosenak is the best thinker in this area.

Thursday morning breakfast with Joe Reimer and Group Meeting

He sounded very positive about the prior day's discussions and the dinner with Rosenak. It was an extremely positive breakfast. The meeting that day was when we all came together on where we were going with the ii. We reconciled the implementation strategy with the strategy related to a final report.

Seymour, toward the end of the morning, stimulated the group by challenging a number of the underlying assumptions of the ii. I must say I was impressed with his presentation at that point. The meeting ended approximately 3 p.m and we left feeling it all came together.

Meeting with Walter Ackerman

Walter Ackerman came into Jerusalem to meet with the Fellows program, thus giving Joe Reimer and I an opportunity to talk with him about the work of the Commission. He indicated that he had not been close to Commission work during the past several months, in fact had not had any briefing since late fall at which time the framework was being put together around enabling options and programmatic options. He reaffirmed what others had said about the state of Jewish education in North America, that it was in very serious trouble and he could see nothing optimistic on the horizon except for what might come out of the Commission.

I asked him if he thought an implementation mechanism as we are developing it made sense. He strongly felt it did, but that it would have to reach into communities throughout the United States for it to be effective. Serving on a national level would not be enough, it had to be linked directly to community process as it related to congregational schools, day schools and the bureau system in many cities.

He went on to talk about how quality of those going into the JTS program had declined over the years. He shocked me with the statement that when he was in sixth grade, he passed tests in Hebrew and Judaic studies that current candidates for the seminary could not now pass. I asked if he was exaggerating and he said he was not.

In summation, the discussion with Ackerman was very positive. He reaffirmed the notion of ii, but made it very clear that we are going to have to link it to the communities in a very direct kind of way. He also reiterated that money is not really the issue in Jewish education, but getting the process going and leveraging and catalyzing as many dollars as possible would be much more helpful.

Meeting with Israel Katz

I then went into a meeting with Israel Katz but there wasn't anything new in that meeting other than what Hank Zucker wrote to you in his memo.

Evening Dinner Meeting

That evening at 7:30, Fox, Hochstein, Reimer and I gathered again for a working dinner and we began to review the assignments that had been identified in the meetings that were held in Cleveland. The dinner, in effect, served as somewhat of a celebration as we felt that we really had come over some difficult times and, in fact, had gone a long way toward team building.

Friday morning

Met with Fox and Hochstein at 7:30 a.m. on the budget. As the budget will show, they are beginning to stretch the limits and I constantly urged them to reconsider a number of items. They promised to do so and to send me a revised edition of the budget. I will share this with you when we get together.

Meeting with Don Scher

At 9 a.m. I met with Don Scher. Don was the most explicit about the Jewish Agency. He felt that MINA is very critical, it is the only game in town. He spoke of how serious your loss to the Agency is, and that nobody is really taking up the slack in terms of putting forward a lay perspective. Consequently, professionals have nowhere to go. The Scher meeting went quite well and he is certainly supportive and in our corner.

Friday evening

I had dinner with Annette Hochstein and her family and again she reiterated how positive she felt the day went.

Saturday evening

I had dinner with Seymour Fox and he reaffirmed how positive it all went as well.