

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 13

Folder 5

Planning Group book, February 1989-May 1989.

Pages from this file are restricted and are not available online. Please contact the <u>American Jewish Archives</u> for more information.

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

PLANNING GROUP BOOK

COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA

.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUBJECT

SECTION NUMBER

.

Minutes	1
Assignments	2
Checklists	3
Key Papers	4
Communications	5
Operating Principles	6
Master Schedule Control	7
Commission Staff	8

NOTE: The contents of each section are to be updated before each meeting of the Planning Group. A master copy with all accumulated documents will be kept at the Premier office.

Section	<u>Page</u>
Four-month Plan Annette Hochstein Seymour Fox	1
"Options" Paper Annette Hochstein Seymour Fox	14
"Tentative Concept" Herman D. Stein	29
"A Cautionary Note on the Personnel Agenda" Joseph Reimer	31
"Proposal on Approaches to Training Issues" Davíd S. Ariel	36
"Feedback on Options Paper" Arthur J. Naparstek	40
Memo on Commission Task Forces Jonathan Woocher	41
"Priorítles for the Commission" Henry L. Zucker	43
"Liaison Between the Commission on Jewish Education in North America and Educational Constituencies" Jonathan Woocher	46
List of Informal Jewish Education Settings	50

MINUTES COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA DECEMBER 13, 1988 AT UJA/FEDERATION OF JEWISH PHILANTHROPIES NEW YORK CITY 10:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.

<u>Attendance</u>

Commissioners:	Morton L. Mandel, Chairman, Mona Ackerman, Ronald Appleby, David Arnow, Mandell Berman, Jack Bieler, Charles Bronfman, John Colman, David Dubín, Stuart Eizenstat, Joshua Elkin, Eli Evans, Max Fisher, Alfred Gottschalk, Arthur Green, Irving Greenberg, Robert Hiller, David Hirschhorn, Carol Ingall, Henry Koschitzky, Mark Lainer, Norman Lamm, Sara Lee, Seymour Martin Lipset, Haskel Lookstein, Robert Loup, Matthew Maryles, Florence Melton, Donald Mintz, Charles Ratner, Harriet Rosenthal, Alvin Schiff, Ismar Schorsch, Peggy Tishman, Isadore Twersky, Bennett Yanowitz.
Policy Advisors and Staff:	David Ariel, Seymour Fox, Rachel Gubitz, Annette Hochstein, Stephen Hoffman, Virginia Levi, Arthur Naparstek, Joseph Reimer, Arthur Rotman, Carmi Schwartz, Herman Stein, Jonathan Woocher, Henry Zucker.
Guests:	Jason Cury, Stephen Solender
Not Present:	Maurice Corson, Lester Crown, Irwin Field, Joseph Gruss, Ludwig Jesselson, Lester Pollack, Esther Leah Ritz, Lionel Schipper, Harold Schulweis, Daniel Shapiro, Isaiah Zeldin.

I. Introductory Remarks

Mr. Mandel called the meeting to order at 10:15 a.m. He welcomed the commissioners and announced the addition of three new commissioners: Ronald Appleby, Joseph Gruss, and Lionel Schipper.

The importance of commissioner involvement in the process was emphasized so that the outcomes of the Commission's work truly reflect the views of commissioners. In its work the Commission is defining Jewish education in the broadest sense, to include both formal and informal education, and is looking at ways in which Jewish education can help to build a meaningful Jewish continuity.

Mr. Mandel reviewed several key points about the Commission process: It is a partnership between JESNA, JWB, CJF, a private family foundation, and carefully selected lay and professional leaders of the Jewish community in North America. He reiterated his resolve that the Commission belongs to the commissioners. After the first meeting of the Commission on August 1, 1988, the Commission staff was charged with the responsibility of preparing methods and materials that would help the Commission narrow the focus of its work. In so doing, it would be necessary to carefully obtain the views of the individual commissioners, help define and coalesce the wishes of the Commission as a whole, and keep all policy options open for the commissioners themselves to decide.

It is expected that the outcome of the Commission's work will be very much more than a report--rather, there will be a set of recommendations that, when implemented, should promote positive change. Several commissioners, including the Mandel family, are committed to investing in Jewish education in response to an overall plan set by the Commission. It is hoped that other foundations, institutions, and communities will also respond to the Commission's recommendations by finding areas upon which to focus their support.

Mr. Mandel then reviewed the agenda and the background materials prepared for the commissioners.

II. Presentation by Annette Hochstein, Research Consultant to the Commission

A. <u>Remarks</u>

Ms. Hochstein elaborated on the background materials and the enclosed executive summary. She emphasized the distinction between programmatic and enabling options. The enabling options emerged as pre-conditions for any across-the-board improvements in Jewish education.

What characterizes the enabling options is that almost all the other options need them or can benefit from them. Upon analysis, we find that three enabling options emerge as pre-conditions to any across-the-board improvements in Jewish education. We find that almost all the options require a heavy investment in personnel; that they all require additional community support; and that most need substantial additional funding. These options--dealing with the shortage of qualified personnel, dealing with the community as a major agent for change, and generating additional funding--are also interdependent. Dedicated and qualified personnel will affect the attitude of community leaders. On the other hand, if the community ranks education high on its list of priorities, more outstanding personnel will be attracted to the field.

The interrelationship of these options, the dependence of other options on them, suggest that they may be the best way to affect the field of Jewish education in a significant, across-the-board manner.

B. <u>Discussion</u>

Support was generally expressed by commissioners for first dealing with enabling options, in view of the fact that all programmatic initiatives would also depend on the availability of personnel and community interest and support. At the same time, some commissioners felt that the broad overarching concerns for personnel and community should be applied to specific programmatic areas. Several commissioners felt that some of the programmatic options are of immediacy and importance, and should be dealt with at the outset.

Regarding personnel, there was wide agreement that this topic needs to be dealt with immediately. Issues were raised, such as whether there is sufficient knowledge about what is required to train personnel in Jewish education. Some professions have approached the issue of training through demonstration projects, developing one institution well so that others would follow. There may also be effective models in place today which should be analyzed and replicated. Research on case studies of successes or failures in this area could inform the work on the various enabling conditions.

Regarding community as a priority, the importance of the role of community leaders in changing the climate for Jewish education was emphasized.

The issue of research and evaluation was discussed. A number of commissioners spoke for the value of research. Others stated that research is not an immediate priority. A paper articulating a vision of the future of Jewish education was urged. Various other models for the Commission work were mentioned. These included commissioning one or more experts from within or outside Jewish education to describe the state of Jewish education.

After lunch, Mr. Mandel summarized the discussion. He noted that there was consensus to first explore the enabling conditions.

He noted the importance of describing successful programs at the same time that we are examining Jewish education critically.

In response to a question, the chairman indicated that every effort should be made to help commissioners pursue the areas of their own interest, within an overall plan for the improvement of Jewish education in North America.

III. <u>Presentation by Dr. Seymour Fox, Consultant to the Commission, on the</u> <u>Option Paper on Personnel</u>

A. Remarks

Dr. Fox provided an overview of the enabling option of personnel. He reported that no attempts have been made to approach the problems of

personnel from all four aspects that have been identified-recruitment, training, retention, and profession-building. The potential impact of responding to these elements simultaneously could be very significant.

At present, there is no clear plan for recruiting personnel to the field of Jewish education. Training institutions suffer from a lack of teachers and funding. There are not twenty full-time professors of Jewish education in North America today. A first step on the road to more effective personnel would be to prepare the teachers of teachers. Such an effort could begin with little delay.

One key to improved retention would be to systematically increase salaries and benefits of those involved in Jewish education. In addition, a multi-directional ladder of advancement should be developed so that the most effective teachers have an opportunity to rise within the profession. Some might move into administrative positions but others would be encouraged to continue to teach while rising in the profession, possibly in the role of master teacher.

One possibility is to devise a plan for developing improved personnel and establish several demonstration centers through which to implement this plan. Then, when we have a better sense of what is effective, we could move to implement it in other areas.

B. Discussion

In discussing the scope of the personnel crisis, several views were expressed: While some felt that top management (i.e., the institution director) was the nerve center or critical area which should be addressed first, others felt that teachers were a higher priority. Others cautioned against an either/or approach in favor of finding the right persons for a variety of educational roles including professional and avocational teachers, family educators and others. The "lead-teacher" concept, recommended by the Carnegie Commission, might help alleviate the either/or dilemma. Innovative ideas such as laboratory schools, mentorships, peer coaching and field-based training were suggested. The problem of teacher shortages in smaller communities which do not have the resources of the larger communities also should be considered.

The following issues concerning professionalization were discussed. The question of why the field of Judaic Studies is attracting many more people than Jewish Education was raised. Judaic scholars should be brought into the enterprise through summer institutes and resident scholar programs. Regarding salaries, some felt that higher salaries, benefits and possibilities for professional development were primary. Some, citing the experience of communities such as Toronto, indicated that higher salaries alone, without improved recruitment, are not sufficient. Others felt that salaries for The suggestion was made to establish a national endowment fund for salary enhancement for teachers and a pension, or menu-based benefits program for Jewish educators, similar to programs for university faculty. It was also suggested that while empowerment of teachers could be achieved through the professionalization of the teaching field, this may cause a problem for some administrators.

of new technology was suggested to help make teachers more effective.

A number of broad issues for the field were discussed. Training programs should also take into account new conceptions of roles for Jewish educators, including family education and the need for training in management and human resource development. Programs should consider the implications of eliminating the barriers between formal and informal education and between pre-school and elementary school. The role of Israel in training personnel was raised.

IV. <u>Presentation by Mr. Henry Zucker, Consultant to the Commission</u>, on the issue of Community

A. <u>Remarks</u>

Mr. Zucker noted that the following issues were synthesized in one option paper: "To Deal with the Community--Its Leadership and lts Structures--as Major Agents for Change in Any Area; and to Generate Significant Additional Funding for Jewish Education." This enabling option is significant in a number of areas: Greater involvement of high level lay leadership is indispensable to change the climate in each Jewish community and to increase support for Jewish education. Because funding drives the system of Jewish education, innovation depends on a major increase in funding. Mr. Zucker referred to the growth of Jewish community endowment funds and family foundations as possible sources for new funding. He also noted that the structure and networks of Jewish educational institutions and agencies could be re-examined in light of the new situation. This reflects a desire throughout the Jewish community to do more in Jewish education and to get better value for the money spent.

B. <u>Discussion</u>

In the discussion that followed, the issue of the community climate was considered from several points of view. Some felt people undertaking leadership positions should be encouraged to engage in Jewish learning. Examples of growth in Jewish leadership education were cited as support for the view that adult Jewish education is instrumental in improving community support for the enterprise. Jewish studies professors and Jewish educators were cited as resources in this area. Others felt that the dissonance between what



parents believe and what the schools teach must be addressed. The lack of grand visions in the manner of Franz Rosenzweig and Martin Buber within Jewish education was raised. It was noted that while identity is an important goal, measurable and substantive learning should also be a prominent goal.

The issue of whether better funding is the primary impetus to progress was discussed. One commissioner related that the large expenditure of funds for Jewish education in Toronto was not sufficient to enable the community to reach its goals. Another commissioner questioned whether Toronto's experience is illustrative. He suggested that while Toronto invested more in Jewish education, it did not pay teachers as much as in general education. In addition, other factors or variables might have been at work.

Mr. Mandel thanked Ms. Hochstein, Dr. Fox, Mr. Zucker and the commissioners for their contributions.

He announced that the next meeting will be held June 14, 1989, at UJA/Federation in New York.

V. Concluding Comments

The chairman made the following comments about procedure: The consensus which emerged throughout the meeting supports the approach of exploring the enabling options of personnel and community. The Commission is committed to exploring the enabling options without predetermining the outcome. The suggestions of the commissioners will be solicited and will be carefully considered between meetings. There have been a variety of suggestions for shaping the next stage in the Commission's work including task forces or other forms of small working groups of commissioners and other individuals. At the same time, it is important to preserve the ability of the Commission as a whole to reach its decisions. These issues will guide the work of the Commission in the next six months. The Commission staff will remain in close contact with the commissioners in formulating the next steps.

The meeting concluded with an inspirational D'var Torah delivered by a commissioner, Rabbi Ismar Schorsch, Chanceller of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

Mr. Mandel adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.

MINUTES:	Senior Policy Advisors Commission on Jewish Education in North America
DATE OF MEETING: DATE MINUTES ISSUED:	December 14, 1988 January 10, 1989
PRESENT :	David Ariel, Seymour Fox, Rachel Gubitz, Annette Hochstein, Stephen Hoffman, Virginia Levi (Sec'y), Morton L. Mandel, Arthur Naparstek, Joseph Reimer, Arthur Rotman, Carmi Schwartz, Herman Stein, Jonathan Woocher, Henry L. Zucker

I. Introduction

At an earlier meeting, Senior Policy Advisors set three goals for the Commission meeting of December 13:

- A. To develop a clearer focus for a Commission agenda.
- B. To develop a sense of how to organize in order to accomplish that agenda.
- C. For participants to continue to feel good about the work of the Commission.

In the discussion which took place on December 14, there was agreement that goals A and C above were accomplished at the December 13 Commission meeting. The focus of this meeting was to move toward a plan for organizing to accomplish the Commission's agenda. The pages which follow summarize the points made by Senior Policy Advisors at this follow-up meeting.

II. Format

The morning session of the Commission meeting was excellent. It was felt that more time might have been given to lunch, where constructive conversations were taking place and Commissioners were beginning to network. In the future we should consider varying the format for the afternoon.

III. Enabling Options

There was a mandate to pursue personnel and community, accompanied by a concern for finding ways to integrate programmatic options. It was suggested that we might look at each programmatic option as it relates to personnel and community. It was also suggested that a study of the two primary options should include a research component. It was felt that the community option requires further clarification and definition. It may be that any lack of enthusiasm for the concept of community reflects an assumption that it is a "given," rather than less support for the option itself. A look at community should include input from the Bureau system and Federation planners. Some smaller communities might become laboratories to experiment with new approaches.

We have two parallel priorities -- one to address individual interests of commissioners and a second to pursue our main thrusts, personnel and community.

IV. Programmatic Options

In addition to developing an approach to dealing with personnel and community, we should work on a plan to examine programmatic options. In looking at programmatic options, we might wish to develop: (1) the road map concept; (2) the matchmaker concept -- finding people to finance initiatives; and (3) a means for evaluation on a continuing basis. Furthermore, we might look at good practices within a programmatic area and identify key factors for success.

V. Involving Commissioners

All commissioners who were present at the December 13 meeting should be contacted for debriefing as soon as possible. Those who were not present should be called and briefed on the outcomes of the meeting.

In light of the Commissioners' confidence in the work of the staff, commissioners might be inclined to rely too heavily on staff and to participate less themselves. We must work to retain the involvement of commissioners. We can accomplish this goal by continuing to listen to them through interviews, focus groups, forums and task forces.

It was noted that personnel and community are interrelated. If we establish task forces to study each area, we should ensure that there is a means of communication between them.

We might hold a series of meetings hosted by commissioners in various parts of the country to get additional input and provide an opportunity to stay involved. Each meeting might be on a different aspect of the Commission's work and each commissioner would be invited to participate in one of the meetings. It is suggested that MLM would chair these meetings. We know that some commissioners have a specific agenda in mind. We might approach them and ask how the commission process can serve their goals, thus engaging them in the process.

With respect to possible representation of other groups on the Commission, it was felt that our general approach should be to include them in the research and writing process rather than adding more commissioners. Consideration will be given to replacing Rabbi Zeldin, possibly with Rabbi Sheldon Zimmerman, if Rabbi Zeldin continues to show minimal interest.

VI. Copyright

We will not copyright our working documents. We will either indicate on them that they may be reproduced with appropriate credit, or we will mark them "Draft. Do not reproduce."

The options paper series will be revised and completed. AJN will work on the matter of copyright.

VII. Commission Public Relations Strategies

We need a communications/PR strategy. We should identify publics and inform them about the Commission. A newsletter of highlights which actually quotes commissioners should be considered. All press releases should include a standard paragraph defining the Commission. We can use JWB, JESNA and CJF mailing lists for this. In addition, MLM should plan to meet with the CJF board in January, 1989.

VIII. How To Proceed

There is a need for research as expressed at the Commission meeting. The basic question of proof that there is a link between Jewish education and Jewish continuity should be studied. We might consider commissioning occasional papers on a variety of topics. When a vision paper is written, it should be useful to every denomination.

The Commission's purpose is to engage in producing change. We will need to address the strengths and weaknesses in the array of structures which currently comprise Jewish education. We need a paper on the status of Jewish education in North America, and possibly another which restates our goals as set forth in our design document and shows where we are one year after it was written. We might take a dual approach to organizing the Commission process as follows: (1) Contingency approach -- temporary groups such as forums and focus groups which provide temporary leadership roles for some commissioners, parallel with (2) Non-contingency groups such as task forces which exist for the life of the Commission and provide more long-term leadership roles for others.

The nine local Federation commissions on Jewish education currently in existence could provide models to help advance Jewish education. Perhaps a position paper can be written which will suggest how to accomplish this. We should develop a plan within the context of JWB. JESNA and CJF that will define the roles of these organizations in our work. If we decide to add staff, we should hold a seminar for them so that everyone takes the same approach and understands the rules.

Life After the Commission:

We are committed to concluding in the spring of 1990. We should consider the possibility of a "successor mechanism" as a way of keeping initiatives going.

IX. Moving Toward a Final Report

It is not too soon to begin to develop an outline for a final Commission report, as a means of focusing the efforts of staff in the interim. The final report should include an assessment of the current state of American Jewish education and visions for the future, as well as a case history study which might be done as an independent document edited by a single individual or committee, but would be written by a number of authors.

X. Next Steps

- 1. A proposal for life after the Commission -- due by June.
- 2. A design for setting forth alternative approaches, including a definition of the issues and alternative solutions.
- 3. A paper stating the outcomes which we seek:
 - a. systemic change
 - b. published papers
 - c. a broker-process to link issues with potential funders
- 4. A public relations plan to include:
 - a. communications
 - b. a definition of each public and the outcomes we seek with each

- 5. Case studies -- models within Jewish education that could be adopted by all. This might include looking at individual aspects of programs rather than highlighting an entire program. It might be somewhat less politically sensitive than selecting a small number of projects and identifying them as the successful ones. This project might be done with an editor and multiple authors.
- 6. A plan to move ahead. In order to determine whether we require more staff, we should write a paper outlining outcomes and how we envision organizing to achieve those outcomes. This should be done by January 13.
- 7. Research -- this should be added to the list of desired outcomes. We will decide later what can be done.
- 8. Following the next Commission meeting, staff will meet for approximately one hour that evening to plan an agenda for the next day. Senior policy advisors will be asked to meet the next morning to evaluate and debrief. Staff will meet that afternoon and perhaps the next day to plan for the future.
- 9. Staff were encouraged to use their own judgment in sharing Commission materials with others.

MINUTES:	Commission Steering Committee		
DATE OF MEETING:	May 2, 1989		
DATE MINUTES ISSUED:	May 11, 1989		
PRESENT:	Morton L. Mandel, Chairman, Stephen H. Hoffman, Arthur J. Naparstek, Herman D. Stein, Henry L. Zucker Virginia F. Levi (Sec'y)		

e.

Introduction

The group was reminded that the purpose of this committee is to manage the process of the Commission in a timely way. MLM will serve as chair. AJN will chair in MLM absence. AJN and HLZ will prepare the agenda. VFL is responsible for follow up.

- I. The minutes and assignments of April 4 and the Master Schedule Control were reviewed. The following meeting dates and times were set:
 - A. June 8, 4:00-5:30 p.m.
 - B. July 5, 1:30-3:00 p.m.
 - C. August 7, 4:00-5:30 p.m.
 - D. September 5, 1:30-3:00 p.m.

II. Upcoming Meetings

Assignment

- A. The Steering Committee reviewed a proposed agenda for the May 7 Commission Planning Group meeting and suggested additions.
- B. A meeting of the Senior Policy Advisors was set for Thursday,
- June 15, 8:30 to **bl:30** a.m. at JWB to debrief following the June 14 Commission meeting. The Planning Group will meet on Tuesday, June 13, 1:30 to 5:30 p.m. at HUC. VFL will confirm these meetings with the appropriate people.

wit channe

III. Commission Assignments

The ongoing list of Commission-related assignments to staff was reviewed. VFL will update this list and send it to MLM on a weekly basis.

Commission Steering Committee May 2, 1989

It was suggested that Berman, Mintz and Yanowitz should become more deeply involved in Commission activities. It was suggested that they might be added to the Senior Policy Advisors, that they might meet in a small group with MLM, or that a dinner meeting might be held prior to each Commission meeting to update them on Commission-related activities. No conclusion was reached, but it was agreed that this topic should be discussed at the next Steering Committee meeting.

It was agreed that HLZ will serve as point man for contact with local federations and that SHH will work closely with him on this.

IV. Rolling Outline of Final Report

Joe Reimer's memo of April 28 proposing papers to be prepared for a final report was reviewed. This is to be discussed in more detail among the Planning Group on May 7. It was suggested that a vision paper might serve as a rationale for the IJE and other mechanisms which will make up the implementation component of the Commission's outcome. VFL will distribute a memorandum from MLM to Seymour Fox listing possible outcomes to committee members.

V. Communication/PR Strategy

It was agreed that the PR Committee should be put on "Hold" and that the Commission Steering Committee would oversee PR in the future. A section will be added to the Steering Committee factbook on communications to include minutes and assignments. AJN will write to PR Committee members noting that communication/PR is under way and that the committee will be called together again as needed.

The committee reviewed Paula Berman Cohen's memorandum of April 24 entitled "Communication Strategy: News Media." It was suggested that B'nai B'rith and Hadassah be removed from the list of organizations to be contacted. It was also suggested that the list of communities to be targeted be expanded. HLZ will propose a more complete list. When appropriate, articles sent to local community newspapers should profile commissioners from those communities.

Assignment The next step with respect to this proposal is to develop a list of activities to be undertaken immediately. AJN will work with PBC on this.

A draft for a General Brochure on the Commission has been received and Assignment will be distributed to members of the Steering Committee who are asked to return them to VLF with comments by May 12.

Assignment

Assignment Assignment

Assignment



Commission Steering Committee May 2, 1989

æ,

MLM indicated that he has been asked to meet with members of the local Assignment Los Angeles Commission on Jewish Continuity. It was noted that such a meeting would be very useful and MLM was encouraged to schedule it, if possible.

> A presentation on Commission activities has been arranged to occur during the CAJE annual meeting to be held August 14 through 17 in Seattle. AJN will meet with Elliott Spack in New York on May 4 to set an exact date for the presentation. It was suggested that AJN and Alvin Schiff might make a joint presentation. AJN will seek David Ariel's advice on this.

VI. Next Meeting

Assignment

The next meeting of the Commission Steering Committee is scheduled for Thursday, June 8 at $4+90^\circ$ p.m.

MINUTES:	Planning Group Meeting Commission on Jewish Education in North America	
DATE:	March 29, 1989	
DATE MINUTES ISSUED:	April 17, 1989	
PRESENT:	Morton L. Mandel, Chairman, Seymour Fox, Annette Hochstein, Virginia F. Levi (Sec'y), Arthur J. Naparstek, Joseph Reimer, Herman D. Stein,	
COPY TO:	Henry L. Zucker	

I. Introduction

\$

The chairman welcomed planning group members and reviewed the agenda for the day. This was followed by a brief review of minutes of the planning group meetings of February 7-9.

In a report on activities since the last meeting, it was noted that work has focused on the issue of implementation in preparation for this meeting.

II. The ii Concept

Much of the day was spent in careful review of the paper proposing "An Instrumentality for Implementation."

- A. The following general issues were raised:
 - 1. Semantics

Discomfort was expressed with the use of the terms "instrumentality for implementation" and "demonstration center." The alternatives which were suggested and agreed upon, for the present, are "initiatives for Jewish education" (IJE) and "community action sites."

- 2. The need for "bottom-up" along with "top-down" management should be clearly stated. This assumes that the major focus of the IJE is to work with service institutions and communities to help them decide upon their needs and goals. It is important to be aware that these needs will vary by institution and community. The goal: to help each be the best it is ready to be.
- 3. It is important to reflect in this document an intent to optimize the full potential of all existing institutional resources (JWB, Brandeis, CAJE, etc.).

- Community can be defined to encompass the "enlarged federation family": the local federation, congregations and other bodies.
- 5. How do we know that there is interest in the services of the IJE? We might consider building in a pilot project so that a design might be tested before the entire project is launched.
- A clearer sense of the organization and related costs is needed.
- 7. It would be useful to identify potential sources of resistance and to develop strategies to overcome the resistance.
- 8. This concept is dependent upon finding an effective leader.
- 9. The IJE is an "intermediary organization" capable of convening groups that might not otherwise come together. It should have the power to leverage funding. It should assist with program design, monitoring and evaluation.
- 10. It is not yet clear whether the IJE will be able to provide funding. It may operate on the prestige and ability of the board, the staff, and their ideas. It was noted that if the IJE were responsible for fundraising on an ongoing basis, this might detract from its central purpose.
- 11. In the organizational design it was suggested that the term "professional advisory board" replace "academic team."

B. Introductory Remarks

As a preface to a careful review of the concept paper, SF and AH made the following remarks:

- 1. The concept paper assumes that the issues of personnel and community must be approached on the local level. It also assumes that there are currently no known programs which, if replicated, could solve the problems in the field. The strategy is to approach the problems locally and demonstrate that there are things that can be done to improve the situation.
- 2. It is assumed, further, that there are talented people who, under the right circumstances, could be encouraged to contribute and get involved. However, they must be identified and brought together to take action. It is believed that no local community or existing organization could bring this talent together, but that this is a role for IJE.

F

f. . .

3. This would not be a simple dropping of "generic programs" into communities, but a process which would be carefully tailored to each community involved, and involve the community heavily.

C. Assumptions

- 1. The field of Jewish education is complex and vast. Efforts at innovation must be undertaken at the local level.
- 2. There is no single community where a prototype can be implemented and fine-tuned for general application. Instead, there must be constant on-line fine tuning in a number of locations. This calls for close monitoring and evaluation. It is the purpose of the IJE to build the prototype and of the community action site to serve as the means of fine tuning and later dissemination.
- 3. The purpose of the IJE is to facilitate the development and testing of programs but not to become a service-delivery organization.

D. Other Issues

- The IJE dealing with personnel and community is a means to reaching our goals. By the nature of this endeavor, the programmatic options will be involved. Personnel will be developed for specific programs.
- Is personnel, by its nature, capable of change only over a long period? It is believed that through a stronger recruitment process, new energy can be infused into a community relatively quickly.
- One goal is to identify selected local problems and seek national solutions for them.

The foregoing discussion accompanied a careful review of the concept paper. Suggestions were made for revision of the paper which were incorporated in a rewrite prepared for presentation at the senior policy advisors meeting of March 30.

E. <u>Tentative Timetable</u>

The following is a possible timetable for implementing the IJE concept:

June 1989 - Commission meeting - general agreement to the IJE concept.
 November 1989 - present the final paper on the concept and the beginning outcomes of a director search.
 February 1990 - present the director to the Commission.
 June 1990 - first report of the IJE director; first meeting of the IJE board.

Planning Group Meeting March 29, 1989

III. Commissioner Contact

The group discussed the nature of contact to occur with commissioners prior to the June 14 meeting. It was agreed that the commissioners should be given a sense of the issues and we should determine if we have consensus on the general concept of the IJE.

- A. Charles Bronfman and Lester Crown have agreed to host regional meetings in New York and Chicago, respectively, on May 8 and 9.
- B. In addition, a meeting of commissioners who are Jewish educators is scheduled to take place on April 5 in New York. Depending on the outcome of this meeting, participants may be asked to attend regional meetings, as well.
- C. At these meetings and in any contacts with commissioners, it will be important to test their views without manipulating them.
- D. The nature of the interaction at these meetings and in one-on-one meetings with specially identified commissioners was reserved for discussion with the senior policy advisors on March 30. It was agreed that a draft talk sheet would be developed by no later than April 15 by SF and AH and would include a list of items to discuss, items not to discuss, and potential risks. In addition to members of the planning group, our representatives from JWB, JESNA, and CJF should review and approve this document.
- IV. Preparation for March 30 Meeting of Senior Policy Advisors

The agenda for the March 30 meeting of senior policy advisors was reviewed and revised in light of this meeting.





MINUTES:	Senior Policy Advisors Meeting
DATE:	March 30, 1989
DATE MINUTES ISSUED:	April 17, 1989
PRESENT:	Morton L. Mandel, Chairman, David Ariel, Seymour Fox, Annette Hochstein, Stephen H. Hoffman, Virginia F. Levi (Sec'y), Arthur J. Naparstek, Joseph Reimer, Arthur Rotman, Herman Stein, Jonathan Woocher
GUEST:	Herbert Millman
COPY TO:	Carmi Schwartz, Henry L. Zucker

I. <u>Review of the IJE Concept</u>

A. <u>Underlying Assumptions</u>

There was extensive discussion of the underlying assumptions to the draft concept paper.

- 1. It was suggested that work at the local level and significant change at the national level must occur simultaneously. The paper should refer to continental service agencies and to the possible relationship of IJE to JWB, JESNA, Yeshiva, Brandeis, etc. The ways in which the continental and local bodies interact to create interventions and support systems should be spelled out more clearly.
- 2. The document implies that North American Jewish education is in a steady state. It was suggested that this is not the case, but that a dynamic environment already exists as evidenced by the existence of local commissions on Jewish education. Does the IJE have maximum impact by plugging into processes already under way, by starting at the beginning in communities not already engaged, or through some combination? It was noted that, because the IJE would not be a service providing agency, it would be in a position to <u>select</u> locations where it could serve as an effective resource.
- 3. The mission of the IJE is to stimulate and catalyze. One approach is to get things going on a local level and withdraw when a local effort can become self-sustaining. In light of this approach, the IJE should develop entities (e.g. commissions) that include existing relevant institutions in local communities; the local federation should generally be dominant.

- 4. The IJE should function at the national level, while working on the local level to develop prototypes or models which can be applied elsewhere. It will not provide regular service on the local level. It will work closely with national organizations for diffusion purposes (application of lessons learned in one city to others). The IJE is intended to help identify local problems and seek national solutions.
- 5. We should anticipate counter-assumptions and deal with them in advance. One such assumption might be that the denominations or training institutions are a sufficient means to solving the problems of personnel and community.
- 6. We must assume that the existing network of institutions in America has neither the money nor the existing capacity to bring about the outcomes we seek. In addition to a written report, an outcome of the Commission should be a way to enhance the likelihood of implementing goals for Jewish continuity: an institution to seek resources and help implement change locally. This body should be free to experiment and innovate in local communities, in conjunction with federations, and link appropriately to denominations. The IJE's role must be unique.

The IJE is a means of mobilizing the resources of the Commission. It must establish an effective working relationship with current national bodies. The document should indicate how this would work while noting that there is much happening at present.

B. Bringing About Change

A discussion of the section of the concept paper entitled "Bringing About Change" yielded the following suggestions:

- 1. It would be useful to always include a time frame within which the IJE would work with a given local community.
- Many commissioners retain strong interests in programmatic options. It would be useful to build a statement into the paper explaining the link between the IJE approach and the programmatic options.
- 3. In defining a community action site, discussion turned to the question of whether the IJE should consider working with just one institution in a city. The conclusion was probably not--that the key to change is to create a mechanism to work locally under the leadership of the federation--and that working with a single institution would dissipate IJE's energy. However, the concept of working with a single institution will be kept on the books as a possibility.

Senior Policy Advisors Meeting March 30, 1989

- 4. It is clear that the IJE will need to fully evolve over time. Our responsibility at present is to clarify the initial design and framework and to be as clear as possible regarding goals.
- 5. There is overlap between some of the proposed responsibilities of IJE and much of what JWB and JESNA (and others) currently do. In clarifying the role of IJE, we should apply the test of where its contribution can be unique. It was suggested that a paragraph be added to the document indicating that it is understood that "engineering" must take place among IJE and JESNA, CJF, JWB, and others. In addition, key institutional leadership should sit on the IJE board.
- 6. The issue of scope must be considered further. It was felt that the IJE should have sufficient resources and capital to develop initiatives on the local level. In addition, structured means should be developed (i.e. seminars, programs, communications, data collection and analysis) to enhance diffusion.
- 7. While there are no models for the IJE within the field of education, we are aware of similar intermediary organizations such as LISC and the Enterprise Foundation which have successfully implemented similar concepts in other fields.
- C. <u>Next Steps</u>

Assignment Participants were asked to review the remainder of the document and to submit comments to AJN. In addition, group members were encouraged to consider competing models and to submit them in writing to AJN for dissemination and review.

II. Involvement of Denominations in the Work of the Commission

- Assignment A. JW will prepare a list of the critical groups within each denomination, the major players, and their roles. This will be sent to AJN.
 - B. <u>What is our Objective</u>?
 - We should be in communication with each denomination so that when the IJE is working in a community, each denomination might participate appropriately. While the federation serves a convening role and IJE staff and service institutions help shape the process, important content might be provided by the denominations.

Senior Policy Advisors Meeting March 30, 1989

> 2. The denominations are heavily involved in the area of personnel because that's where most of the children are. While the process of change in the denomination world is sometimes slower than within federations, if we can encourage a competitive atmosphere, we might create a climate in which denominations would move more quickly.

C. What should be done?

Assignment It was suggested that MLM along with JW or AR meet with Lamm, Schorsch, and Gottschalk. Each leader should be asked to help develop a mechanism to involve that denomination. Lamm should be asked how we can approach Torah U'Mesorah.

III. Final Report - Rolling Outline

A. General Outline

A proposed outline for a final report was reviewed and discussed. It was agreed that a document on vision is important as a rationale for the IJE concept. A review of the state of the field provides a sense of urgency and emergency. The issue of Jewish education as a vehicle for Jewish continuity belongs at the forefront of the document.

B. Commissioning Papers

The first section of the report might be called "Jewish Gontinuity at Risk." In this section, the link between Jewish continuity and Jewish education should be established. Work might begin on this first section of the report after the June Commission meeting. JR will draft a thought piece on alternative scenarios for the content of the final report. This will be reviewed by internal staff and then distributed to senior policy advisors for critique. It should be completed by June.

Assignment JR requested that policy advisors review Exhibit 4--"Commissioning Papers"--and provide him with feedback.

IV. PR Status Report

Assignment

A. It was noted that we have engaged Paula Berman Cohen to coordinate public relations efforts and have established a PR Committee comprised of David Ariel, Paula Berman Cohen, Stephen Hoffman, Virginia Levi, Morton Mandel, Arthur Naparstek, Charles Ratner, Bennett Yanowitz, and Henry Zucker. Senior Policy Advisors Meeting March 30, 1989

Assignment

Assignment

Assignment

It was suggested that the June Commission meeting should be an "event." We should begin now to establish links with such publications as <u>Moment</u>, the <u>New York Times</u>, and the <u>Wall Street</u> <u>Journal</u>. MLM will arrange for Premier's PR representative to work with PBC in establishing contacts with the <u>New York Times</u> and the <u>Wall Street Journal</u>. MLM will consider calling Herschel Blumberg and Paul Berger in an effort to interest <u>Moment</u> in the Commission.

B. Interim Letter to Commissioners

A draft letter to commissioners was reviewed. It was suggested that such a letter, to go out by April 15, should serve as an invitation to regional meetings and an update on activities since the December 13 meeting and should refer to a possible Commission outcome in the form of an implementation mechanism. AJN will rewrite the letter.

C. Content of Small Group Meetings

It was noted that Charles Bronfman and Lester Crown have agreed to host regional meetings in New York and Chicago, respectively. In addition, commissioner educators are scheduled to meet in New York on April 5. Following an extensive discussion, it was concluded that the concept paper should not be distributed prior to these meetings. Staff will share the issues and emerging assumptions, but not the conclusions. The purpose of the meetings should be to get input on major questions and to provide participants with a sense that there will be something beyond the Commission.

Commissioners should be engaged at the regional meeting and should have a sense that we are approaching a recommendation which we intend to make at the June Commission meeting.

The letter inviting commissioners to the regional meetings should be on Commission letterhead, should invite all people to either meeting, and should be accompanied by an outline of the issues under consideration. Confirmation letters would come directly from Crown or Bronfman.

[Note: It was subsequently felt by Commission leadership that such meetings are premature and will be deferred.]

1

V. Commissioner Contact

Assignment Group members assigned to contact individual commissioners will submit a written report on each such contact. VFL will keep a master book on all commissioner contacts and will bring it to each meeting.

Assignment The group reviewed the list of commissioners and determined which should be contacted individually prior to the June 14 meeting. A summary of those decisions is attached.

VI. <u>Outreach</u>

A. <u>Progress Report</u>

Assignment A memorandum by JR setting forth a list of organizations in need of contact and recommendations for the nature of that contact was reviewed. This will be presented to the Public Relations Committee.

B. <u>Educators Meeting</u>

It was agreed that at the April 5 meeting of educators the issues and emerging assumptions discussed at this meeting would be reviewed, discussed, and further refined.

VII. Tentative Dates for Future Commission Meetings

It was agreed that we would tentatively plan Commission meetings to occur in October 1989 and February 1990. Two possible dates for the Assignment next meeting are October 4 and (second choice) October 11. VFL will reserve the space and check these dates with our group of critical participants.

4/4/89

м,

Commission on Jewish Education in Worth America Contacts from 12/14/88 - 6/14/89

Name	Assignment	Post-Commission Meeting Contacts	Comments	ļ
1. LAY LEADERS		 		
Mona Ackerman -Fdn	AJN - 1	Phone call 1/89.		i i
Ronald Appelby	AJN - *	Phoned end of Dec. JR will see in Toronto.		i i
David Arnow	JR - 2*	AH saw 2789. Will call 4/89.		i i
Mandeil Berman	AJN - 1	AJN will see before regional mtg.	1	i i
Charles Bronfman	SF - 1	jSF saw 2/89. HtM saw 3/89. Will chair regional mtg.	1	i i
John Colman	KLZ - 2	HLZ will catt.		i
Maurice Corson - Fdn	HLZ - 1	HLZ will see.		i
Lester Crown	SF - 1	SF saw 2/89. MLM saw 3/89. Will host regional mtg.		i
Stuart Eizenstat		Het in Jan.		í
Eli Evans - Fdn	RLZ • 1	HLZ will call or see.		i
Irwin Field	AR - 2*	JR will see.	· 	i
Max Fisher	HER - 1	Should be seen - by MLM?		í
Joseph Gruss		MLM will see with A. Schiff.		i
Robert Hiller • Fdn	8LZ - 1	HLZ will see.		i
David Hirschhorn	HLZ - 1	SF saw 4/3. HLZ will call.		İ
Ludwig Jesselson	AH - 1	MtM will urge to see AK in Jerusalem,	l	i
Henry Koschitzky	JR - 2	SF saw Z/89. JR will see.		i
Mark Lainer	JR/AJN-2	JR will see.		i i
Robert Loup	AH - 2	AH will call 4/89. JR may see in CO.		i
Monton L. Mandet	E AH	lox l	1	i i
Matthew Maryles	[AJN - 2	Phoned end of Dec. AJN may see.		i i
florence Melton	A8 - 1	AH will try to see 4/89.		İ.
Donald Mintz	AR + 1	No plan.	1	İ.
Lester Pollack	AR ~ 2	¥o plan. (1	l
Charles Ratner	\$F - 1	\$a₩ 2/89, ₩ill call 4/89.		1
Karriet Rosenthal	AR - 2	Ko plan. (1	1
Esther Leah Ritz	AH/AR-2	AH saw 2/89. Will see 4/89.		1
Lionet Schipper	[AJR - *	JR witt see. (1	1
Daniel Shapiro	S - NLA	AR will see.		ł
Peggy Tishman	AH/AJN+1	AJN will see.	, I	ĺ
Bennett Yanowitz	§ AJN + 1	Ko plan.	i l	

.

.

* = needs special treatment; i = top priority; 2 = less critical to see now

4/4/89

. - - -

Commission on Jewish Education in North America Contacts from 12/14/88 - 6/14/89

Name	Assignment	Post-Commission Meeting Contacts	Comments	l
II. PRES, HIGHER JEWISH ED	 			1
Alfred Gottschalk	, HLH/SF-1	Called 2/89. Will see 4/89.		ı I
Norman Lamm	HLH/AH-1	AH will see 4/89.		i
Ismar Schorsch	*	AH will see 4/89.		1
Arthur Green		JR will see.		1
	İ	j		Ì
<pre>III, SCHOLARS/EDUCATORS (1)</pre>	1	1	, 	i
Seymour Martin Lipset	SF - 1	Saw 2/89. Will see 4/89.		İ
	Ì	l l		İ
IV. JUDAIC SCHOLARS (1)	l			í
Isadore Twersky	SF • 1	Saw 2/89.	1	i
	l	1	1	i
V. JEWISH EDUCATORS (7)	I	1		İ.
Jack Bieler	JR - 2	Will attend educators' meeting - 4/5/89.	1	i i
David Dubin	AR - 2	Will attend educators' meeting + 4/5/89.	1	ĺ
Joshua Elkín	JR - 2	Will attend educators' meeting - 4/5/89.		İ
Irving Greenberg	JR - 2	JW will see.	1	ĺ.
Carol Ingall] JR + 2	Will attend educators' meeting - 4/5/89.	1	1
Sara Lee	SF - 1	Called 2/89. Saw 4/89. Educators' mtg. 4/5/89.		1
Alvin Schiff	AJN - 1	Will attend educators' meeting + 4/5/89.		ļ
		1		
VI. RABBIS	I	l		ĺ
Naskei Lookstein	AJN - 1	AH saw 1/89. AJN may see.		
Harold Schulweis	JR - 2*	[JR will see.		ŀ
Isaiah Zeldin	[JR - 2*	JR will see.	l	ł
	1	1		

.

.

PREMER INDUSTRIAL CORPORATION

.

NE MARKENET BARRIE POLICE HE ES of this form for a functions, species,

.

☑ ASSIGNMENTS

-

ACTIVE PROJECTS

D RAW MATERIAL

FUNCTIONAL SCHEDULE

1940 MEY LOWIN PRINTED IN U.S.A.

Senior Policy Advisors for Commission on FUNCTION Jewish Education in North America

.

SUBJECT/OBJECTIVE

Assignments ____

*

3/30/89 4/28/89

3/30/89

6/1/89

JW

MIM

J₩ AR

A hear of a formal second of P is P 2 Y		ORIGINATOR	Virginia F.	Levi	D	ATE 4/17.	/89
NQ.	DESCRIPTION		PRORITY	ASSIGN(1) TO (INITIA(S)	DATE ASSIGNED STARTED		COMPLETED OR REMOYEO DATE
1.	Decide on the nature of contact with commissioners before the 6/14 meeting.		TP	MLM AJN	2/9/89	4/21/89	
2.	Draft position description for of implementation mechanism.	r head	TP	AJN	2/9/89	TBD	
3.	Prepare proposal for implement mechanism (IJE).	tation	TP	SF AH	2/9/89	5/22/89	
4.	Convene meeting of MLM with T Lipset, heads of 4 seminaries	SP	AJN SF	2/9/89	TBD		
5.	Redraft options papers on personnel and community in light of implementation proposals and outline of final report.		SP	SF AH HLZ	2/9/89	5/22/89	
	Prepare outline for a vision paper. (Part of IJE mission statement)		SP	SF	2/9/89	5/22/89	
7.	The Commission's partners (JWB, JESNA) should convene groups of people who can contribute to the work of the Commission.		RP	AR JW	2/2/89	TBD	
8.	Commission a paper on the significance of Jewish continuity in the context of Jewish education.		RP	TBD	2/9/89	TBD	
9.	Draft a best practices paper.			TBD	2/9/89	TBD	
10.	Review IJE concept paper and submit comments to AJN. Consider competing models and submit in writing to AJN.			Sr. Policy Advisc	4	4/28/89	

- Prepare list of critical groups and 11. players within denominations and send to AJN.
- Meet with Lamm, Schorsch, and Gottschalk 12. to develop a mechanism to involve the denominations.

PREMIER INDUSTRIAL CORPORATION

. .

ι

Page 2

ETE MANGENETIT MANDAL POLICE NO. 8.5 POR CONCLUMES ON THE COMPLETION OF THE FORM FOR & FUNCTIONAL REALISE

.

X ASSIGNMENTS □ ACTIVE PROJECTS

CI RAW MATERIAL

Senior Policy Advisors for Commission on Jewish Education in North America FUNCTION

1 4

SUBJECT/OBJECTIVE Assignments

_ _ _ _ _

RAW MATERIAL
FUNCTIONAL SCHEDULE
73090 (REV. 10/86) PRINTED IN U.S.A.

1	
ORIGINATOR	Virginia F.

73890 (REV. 10/86) PRIVITED IN U.S.A.		ORIGINATOR Virginia F. Levi			DATE 4/17/89		
NO.	DESCRIPTION		PRIORITY	ASSIGNED TO (INITIALS)	DATE ASSIGNED STARTED	DUE DATE	COMPLETED OR REMOVED DATE
13.	Draft a thought piece on alternative scenarios for final report to be reviewed by internal staff and distributed to senior policy advisors.			JR	3/30/89	TBD	
14.	Review 3/21 memo on "Commissioning Papers" and provide JR with feedback.			Sr. Policy Adviso		4/28/89	
15.	Arrange for Premier's PR repr work with Paula Berman Cohen lishing contacts with the <u>New</u> and the <u>Wall Street Journal</u> .		HLM	3/30/89	6/1/89		
16.	Consider calling Herschel Blu Berger to interest <u>Moment</u> in		MLM	3/30/89	6/1/89		
7.	Redraft letter to commissioners to provide update on activities since December 13 meeting.			AJN	3/30/89	4/20/89	
18.	Prepare master book on all commissioner contacts to bring to each meeting.			VFL	3/30/89	4/30/89	
19.	Contact commissioners individually prior to June 14 meeting.			Sr. Policy Advisc		5/5/89	
20.	Present list of organizations contact to the Public Relation	in need of ons Committee.		AJN	3/30/89	4/3/89	
21.	Reserve space for tentative (meetings in October 1989 and with group of critical partic	check dates		VFL	3/30/89	4/14/89	
22.	Develop a draft talk sheet to of items to discuss, not to o potential risks.	o include list discuss, and		SF AH	3/29/89	4/14/89	
*							

Mona Riklis Ackerman, New York, NY David Arnow, New York, NY Mandell L. Berman Southfield, MI Jack Bieler, Silver Spring, MD Charles R. Bronfman, Montreal, Que., Canada John C. Colman Glencoe, IL Maurice S. Corson, Columbus, OH Lester Crown, Chicago, IL David Dubin. Tenafly, NJ Stuart E. Eizenstat, Washington, DC Joshua Elkin, Newton, MA Eli N. Evans, New York, NY Irwin S. Field, Norwalk, CA Max M. Fisher, Detroit, MI Alfred Gottschalk, Cincinnati, OH Arthur Green, Wyncote, PA Irving Greenberg New York, NY Joseph Gruss New York, NY Robert I. Hiller, Baltimore, MD David Hirschhorn, Baltimore, MD Carol K. Ingall, Providence, RI Ludwig Jesselson, New York, NY Henry Koschitzky, Downsview, Ont., Canada Mark Lainer, Encino, CA

Norman Lamm, New York, NY Sara S. Lee, Los Angeles, CA Seymour Martin Lipset, New York, NY Haskel Lookstein, New York, NY Robert E. Loup, Denver, CO Morton L. Mandel Cleveland, OH Matthew J. Maryles, New York, NY Florence Melton, Columbus, OH Donald R. Mintz, New Orleans, LA Lester Pollack, New York, NY Charles Ratner, Cleveland, OH Esther Leah Ritz, Milwaukee, WI Harriet L. Rosenthal, South Orange, NJ Alvin I. Schiff, New York, NY Ismar Schorsch. New York, NY Harold M. Schulweis, Encino, CA Daniel S. Shapiro, New York, NY Margaret W. Tishman, New York, NY Isadore Twersky, Cambridge, MA Bennett Yanowitz, Cleveland, OH Isaiah Zeldin, Los Angeles, CA Ronald Appleby, Q.C. Toronto, Ont., Canada Lionel H. Schipper, Q.C. Toronto, Ont., Canada

PREMIER INDUSTRIAL CORPORATION

ASSIGNMENTS Planning Group for Commission on □ ACTIVE PROJECTS FUNCTION Jewish Education in North America RAW MATERIAL SUBJECT/OBJECTIVE Assignments FUNCTIONAL SCHEDULE A 2.U IN COTINNY JORNAL VOR DESK ORIGINATOR DATE Virginia F. Levi 1/24/89 COMPLETED OR REMOVED DATE ASSIGNED DATE NO. DESCRIPTION PRIORITY ASSIGNED TO (INITIALS) DUE DATE VFL 10/10/88 1. Update a page for each commissioner, indicating contact person, strategy for contact, summary of contacts to date, and future contact. 10/10/88 2. Consider establishing task forces. Team VFL. 10/10/88 3. Maintain complete file of all Commission-Ongoing related correspondence in Foundation office, and circulate to planning group. Gather list of materials on Jewish education Staff 10/10/88 Ongoing 4. to be sent to commissioners; design a label for such collection. (Need adequate check system: JR, SF, AR) Consider creating an executive committee--Team 8/2/88 part of organization. 6. Draft vision paper for consideration after SF 8/2/88 12/13 Commission meeting. 7. Draft case studies paper for consideration SF 8/2/88 after 12/13 Commission meeting. 8. Decide by phone on the need for a third task AJN/ 10/12/88 force to deal with programmatic options. SF/MLM 9. Decide on permanence of task forces, and MLM 10/12/88 issues of effectiveness connected with them. 10. HLZ/ 10/12/88 Develop a plan for initiating and maintaining contact with constituent federations. SH/CS 11. Develop a plan for initiating and maintain-DA/JW 10/12/88 ing contact with constituent formal education groups. 12. Develop a plan for initiating and maintain-AR/? 10/12/88 ing contact with constituent informal education groups.

PREMIER INDUSTRIAL CORPORATION

.

T

X ASSIGNMENTS □ ACTIVE PROJECTS

73010 (RCV LOANS) PRINTED IN U.S.A.

D FUNCTIONAL SCHEDULE

RAW MATERIAL

Т

Planning Group for Commission on FUNCTION Jewish Education in North America

SUBJECT/OBJECTIVE

ORIGINATOR

Assignments

-T

Virginia F. Leví

Т

Т

OATE 1/24/89

Т

NQ.	DESCRIPTION	PRIORITY	ASSIGNED TO (INITIALS)	DATE ASSIGNED STARTED	DUE DATE	COMPLETED OR REMOYED DATE
13.	Conduct debriefing interviews with commissioners.		SF/AH AJN/JR HLZ/AR	12/14/89	2/7/89	
14.	Talk with Rabbi Zeldin re. level of interest in Commission; decide whether to recommend replacing on Commission.		AJN	12/14/89		
15.	Research copyright requirements.		VFL	12/14/89	\mathcal{A}	
16.	Prepare paper on life after Commission.		SF/ AH	12/14/89	6/89	
17.	Draft outcomes paper.		SF/AH	12/14/89	2/7/89	
(1 ¹⁸ .	Establ ish PR plan.		AJN/ Team	12/14/89	2/9/89	
19.	Plan for organizing to achieve outcomes.		Team	12/14/89	2/9/89	

\sim					1	MANAGEMENT MANUR ON GUIDELINCS ON THI NIS FORM FOR A FUNC	CONFLETION	
	ASSIGNMENTS ACTIVE PROJECTS	FUNCTION COMMISSION STEERING COMMITTEE						
	RAW MATERIAL FUNCTIONAL SCHEDULE	SUBJECT/OBJECTIVE ASSIGNMENTS						
	73090 (REV 10/86) PRINTED IN U SA	ORIGINATOR Virg	DA	DATE 5/2/89				
ND.	OESCRIPTION		PRIORITY	ASSIGNEO TO (INITIALS)	DATE ASSIGNED STARTEO	DIJE DATE	COMPLETED OR REMOVED DATE	
1.	Recommend to MLM schedule o meetings for after the June meeting.	f regional Commission		AJN	4/4/89	TBD		
2.	Work with PBC and HLZ to put together a proposal on communication strategy for MLM approval. This includes determining milestone events, developing communication pieces, developing a work plan and prioritizing the work plan.			AJN	4/4/89	\$/1/89	In proces	
3.	Develop list of PR activiti undertaken immediately - wi			AJN	5/2/89	6/1/ 89		
4.	Frank Strauss at CJF regard	Follow up with Henry Hecker at JWB and Frank Strauss at CJF regarding follow up to meetings of April 9 and 10.		AJN	4/4/89	4/21/89	In proce:	
5.	Develop list of papers to be commission and timetable for final report and cir to planning group for feedback.		2	AJN	4/4/89	6/15/89	In proce:	
6.	Confirm June meetings with and Senior Policy Advisors.	irm June meetings with Planning Group Senior Policy Advisors.		VFL	5/2/89	5/15/89		
7.	Distribute MLM memo of 4/13 Commission outcomes to Plan members.	Distribute MLM memo of 4/13 on possible Commission outcomes to Planning Group		VFL	5/2/89	5/5/89	Done	
8.	Add section on PR to Steeri factbook.	Add section on PR to Steering Committee factbook.		VFL	5/2/89	5/31/89		
9.	Write to PR Committee member future meetings on hold.	ers to put		AJN	5/2/89	5/8/89	Done	
10.	Draft list of communities (in PR approach.	Draft list of communities to be targeted in PR approach.		HLZ	5/2/89	6/1/89		
11.	Distribute draft of Ceneral Commission to Steering Comm and get comments.			VFL	5/2/89	5/12/89		

	\checkmark							SEC MANAGENERT MARK FOR GUIDEUSING ON TH OF THIS FORM FOR A PUN	ee constletton
_		ASSIGNMENTS ACTIVE PROJECTS	FUNCTION	СОМ	MISSION	STEERIN	G COMMI	TTEE	
		RAW MATERIAL	SUBJECT/OBJE			GNMENTS			
		3890 (REV 10/86) PRINTED IN U.S.A.	ORIGINATOR Virginia F. Levi				OATE 5/2/89		
	NO.	DESCRIPTION	·		PRIORITY	ASSIGNED TO (INITIALS)	DATE ASSIGNED STARTED	DUE DATE	COMPLETED OR REMOVED DATE
	12.	Consider meeting with local l Commission.	Los Angeles			MLM	5/2/89	7/1/89	
	13.	Seek David Ariel's advice on to join AJN in making a prese CAJE.				AJN	5/2/89	6/1/89	

Page 2

MEMO TO: Commission Steering Committee

FROM: Virginia F. Levi

DATE: May 3, 1989

At the May 2 meeting of the Commission Steering Committee, I was asked to send you the two documents which are attached.

- 1. Memorandum to Seymour Fox from Morton Mandel listing possible Commission outcomes.
- 2. Draft copy for a general brochure on the Commission which is intended as a trifold, pocketsized piece. Please return it to me with your comments no later than Friday, May 12.

Distribution: Stephen H. Hoffman Morton L. Mandel Arthur J. Naparstek Herman D. Stein Henry L. Zucker

.

"Trom: Morton L. Mandel

To: Seymour Fax

Here are some more thoughts on possible outcomes of the Commission' on Jewish Education. Let's discuss on April 18th telecon.

Outcome #1 The IJE (i.i.)

Outcome #2 Community Action Sites: From Demonstration to Implementation Organized or assisted by IJE, these would be partnerships and coalitions of local and continental bodies, generally under the local Federation flag, to test programs, leading to diffusion.

Outcome #3 Personnel: Building a Profession

A permanent ongoing process led by IJE, with multiple demonstration and pilot projects, to develop and test methods that facilitate personnel recruitment, training, and retention (generally performed at Community Action Sites).

Outcome #4 Federation: A key factor for Jewish continuity

An organized, long-term effort to achieve congensus that the local federation is <u>the</u> key convenor and sponsor of local programs to enhance Jewish continuity (e.g., Cleveland Commission). IJE to work closely with CJF to activate federations to take up this cause.

Outcome #5 The North American Support System: A New Design

A permanent process led by IJE and CJF to harmonize all the continental players (JWB, JESNA, Seminaries, etc.). in a way that brings them to a high level of effectiveness, overall or in selected areas.

Outcome #6 Programmatic Options: Implementation

A permanent ongoing process led by IJE to work with "champions" of programmatic options, as they can be identified, to develop fully those options:

- 1. Champion is Chair of a Commission (e.g. Eli Evans)
- 2. Champion finances Commission or obtains financing)
- 3. IJE helps select and approves all Commission members
- 4. IJE helps select and approves Commission staff
- IJE monitors and exercises quality control on each Commission

Outcome #7 Research, Publications, etc.

A permanent ongoing element of IJE. (To be designed).

CJENA GENERAL BROCHURE draft copy 4.26.89

COVER :

2.8

HEAD: JEWISH EXPERIENCE IS A LIVING THING IDENTITY: CJENA Commission on Jewish Education in North America

PANEL 1:

HEAD: A RICH HERITAGE

SUB 1: The challenge of Jewish continuity

TEXT:

What binds people to Jewish life, traditions and values? Today, the North American Jewish community asks this question with increasing urgency. In cities and small towns, in schools and homes, we feel the realities of modern life pulling us away from the roots of Jewish identity and experience.

How much of our heritage will we preserve to pass on to future generations? That is the challenge of Jewish continuity. It engages the hearts and minds of many Jews, as individuals and as participants in communal activity. This is an auspicious time to join our separate visions in a cohesive commitment to the vitality of Jewish life.

SUB 2: A Commission for action

TEXT:

In 1988, the currents of interest in Jewish continuity

gave birth to CJENA, the Commission on Jewish Education in North America. It is an extraordinary group of people, involved locally, nationally and internationally, who share a strong sense of common identity while representing the diverse traditions and perspectives that invigorate Jewish life. Its purpose is to focus the enthusiasm and energy of committed people on the creative potentials of our best resource--Jewish education.

Support for CJENA comes from a partnership among The Mandel Associated Foundations, JWB--the leadership body of JCC's and YM-YWHAS, and The Jewish Education Service of North America (JESNA)--the planning, coordinating and service agency for Jewish education. It is undertaken in cooperation with the Council of Jewish Federations (CJF), representing community federations throughout North America.

PANEL 2:

TEXT:

ţ.t

HEAD: AN ENERGETIC PRESENT

SUB 1: The potential in education

Jewish education has always taken place in many settings--schools, homes, camps, community and child care centers, synagogues, encounters with Israel. It touches every aspect and stage of Jewish life, carried by people who make it a vocation or an avocation.

> We have, in Jewish education, a tradition of involvement with the why and how of Jewish life. Enhancing its power is the goal of CJENA.

SUB 2: The value of partnership

TEXT :

11.6

_ 7

As diverse as the Jewish community itself, CJENA has brought together professional, religious and lay leaders from every tradition to identify the ways and means of educational enrichment. Supported by the expertise of staff, advisors and organizations, members' personal involvements in education, religion, philanthropy and business keep the work of the Commission in touch with the full spectrum of Jewish perspectives.

SUB 3: The Work of the Commission

TEXT:

CJENA is guided by the conviction that the heart of education is located in people. One goal is to find new ways to broaden the circle of people attracted into the profession of Jewish education by finding the means to inspire, prepare, encourage, and reward them. An allied goal is to coalesce the community organization, leadership and philanthropy that will be necessary for educational development.

The promise of education is in ideas. They are everywhere--in new technologies, innovative practices, model programs. CJENA is committed to exploring the wealth of ideas that can enhance Jewish education.

These are CJENA's priorities. The Commission pursues them within the context of an ongoing study of current Jewish educational issues in a dynamic environment. Challenges of organization and programs, as well as of human resources and support, must be met if education is to respond to the realities of contemporary Jewish life. A clear view of the horizon, a clear vision of the mechanisms for informed change--these are the aims toward which the Commission works.

PANEL 3:

TEXT:

11

HEAD: A PROMISING FUTURE

SUB: The results of communal effort

When CJENA makes recommendations in a 1990 report to the Jewish community, they will be recommendations for action. As the Commission is an initiative born from communal involvement, its findings will be initiatives for the activation of communal resources.

The report will guide the educators, institutions, agencies, foundations and philanthropists whose dedication to Jewish continuity will continue long after CJENA's task is complete. Their success will depend on a strong sense of the strategies necessary to the full development of Jewish educational resources.

One of these strategies is the coordination of local and national efforts. The community is the locus of education. It must remain the focus on initiatives. A national base of knowledge and support can only increase the effectiveness of community action. Accordingly, the Commission will recommend practical mechanisms to merge these two strengths into a working partnership. A design for a national catalyst can channel ideas, people and resources into local networks created to develop and implement innovative programs. National coordination can link local endeavors and build their successes into models for systemic change.

4

> By stimulating a new approach to constructive change through local-national joint ventures, CJENA intends to enhance the Jewish community's continuing efforts to

- . make coordinated, purposeful investments in Jewish education
- . identify areas in which focused support for human resources and programs will have significant impact
- . match organizational and communal concerns to educational priorities

PANEL 4				
HEAD:	MEMBERS			
	Commission on Jewish Education in North America			
TEXT:	Mona Riklis Ackerman	Mark Lainer		
	Ronald Appleby	Norman Lamm		
	David Arnow	Sara S. Lee		
	Mandell L. Berman	Seymour Martin Lipset		
	Jack Bieler	Haskel Lookstein		
	Charles R. Bronfman	Robert Loup		
	John C. Colman	Morton L. Mandel		
	Maurice S. Corson	Chairman		
	Lester Crown	Matthew J. Maryles		
	David Dubin	Florence Melton		
	Stuart E. Eizenstat	Donald R. Mintz		
	Joshua Elkin	Lester Pollack		
	Eli Evans	Charles Ratner		
	Irwin S. Field	Esther Leah Ritz		
	Max M. Fisher	Harriet L. Rosenthal		
	Alfred Gottschalk	Alvin I. Schiff		
	Arthur Green	Lionel H. Schipper		
	Irving Greenberg	Ismar Schorsch		
	Joseph S. Gruss	Harold M. Schulweis		
	Robert I. Hiller	Daniel S. Shapiro		
	David Hirschhorn	Peggy W. Tishman		
	Carol K. Ingall	Isadore Twersky		
	Ludwig Jesselson	Bennett Yanowitz		
	Henry Koschitzky	Isaiah Zeldin		

*

Joseph Reimer

Arthur Rotman

Jonathan Woocher

Henry L. Zucker

SUB:

 \mathcal{P}

.

Policy Advisors and Staff

TEXT:

David Ariel

Seymour Fox

Annette Hochstein Carmi Schwartz

£

Stephen H. Hoffman Herman Stein

Martin Krar

Virginia Levi

Arthur Naparstek

MEMO TO: Planning Group Commission on Jewish Education in North America

FROM: Virginia F. Levi

DATE: May 4, 1989

τ

Attached, for your information, is a summary of a meeting between Art Rotman and Dan Shapiro on April 27 and a summary of a meeting between Henry L. Zucker and John Colman on May 3.

Distribution: Seymour Fox Annette Hochstein Morton L. Mandel Arthur J. Naparstek Joseph Reimer Herman D. Stein Henry L. Zucker Arthur J. Naparstek D:<u>Virginia F. Levi</u>

FROM: Henry Zucker OF PARTMENT/PLAN

DATE: <u>5/4/89</u> REPLYING TO YOUR MEMO OF:

DEPARTMENT/PLANT LOCATION

SUBJECT:

I met with John Colman on May 3 to review the progress of the Commission and some of our thoughts about the June 14 agenda.

He is well impressed with the developments in the Commission. He believes the IJE concept is sound and should be discussed by the Commission on June 14. He believes that the functions of the IJE have to be very carefully thought out. It should be assigned issues carrying over from the Commission's work when the report is issued.

The IJE should be the conscience of American Jewry in the Jewish education field. For example, it should make a periodic report on the state of Jewish education in North America. It should have a high powered research function to evaluate programs. It should be able to offer authoritative information to American Jewish leadership on Jewish education proposals and undertakings.

The Commission should take care that the IJE not turn into a second JESNA. Perhaps it should have a time-limited function during which JESNA is built up to its appropriate leadership position in the field of Jewish education.

Colman suggests that important papers issued by the Commission should be circulated in advance of meetings when they will be discussed. We should invite feedback from Commission members and this can be taken into account when the subject is presented at the Commission meeting. This process is important, particularly since there appears to be too long a period of time between contacts between the Commission's leadership and the members of the Commission.

Colman believes it is a good idea to determine now what will be the meeting dates of all the remaining meetings of the Commission. He suggests the possibility that the last meeting, which would be for the purpose of drafting a report, should be a two-day meeting. The draft report could be converted into the Commission's final report with the benefit of input of the Commission members.

Colman plans to attend the June 14th meeting and has put on his calendar the October 4th meeting. APR 28 '89 13:51 FROM JWB

PAGE.002

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

2

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 NE 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 highprofile 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.

MEMO TO: Seymour Fox, Annette Hochstein, Morton L. Mandel, Arthur J. Naparstek, Joseph Reimer, Arthur Rotman, Herman D. Stein, Jonathan Woocher, Henry L. Zucker

FROM: Virginia F. Levi

DATE: May 12, 1989

Attached, for your information, are reports on interviews of the following commissioners conducted by Joseph Reimer.

- Jack Bieler
 Irwin Field
 Arthur Green
 Carol Ingall
 Mark Lainer
 Harold Schulweis
- 7. Isaiah Zeldin

NAMES OF STREET,

Interview with Rabbi Jack Bieler (4/24/89) hours in his home

1. Rabbi Bieler began by reacting to the 4/5 meeting of the educators saying he was taken aback by the direction taken. He did not anticipate that direction as a result of the December meeting, thought the focus would be on the content of the enabling options and found the current focus on implementation to be very abstract; the processing of process. That worries him.

2. I asked what he'd recommend for the June 14th meeting, Jack wants us to get back to the enabling options in a more concrete way and spell out what we'd like to create. What is the vision? What are the best cases and the acenarios for their oreation and replication? What is the process for selecting community sites? What about task forces? He's concerned that time will run out and these issues won't be tackled sufficiently by the Commission.

3. A question Jack would like raised is whether public education should be seen as a model for Jewish education. He'd prefer using private education as model in particular to stress the issue of excellence in education. He believes that what most threatens the upgrading of the field are low expectations. If no one expects you to be excellent, why become excellent? Let up ctudy what allows for the expectation of excellence in certain private schools and learn from their successes. Let's study our own successes and learn from hem. Jack believes we need to assemble a traveling team (of teachers and other professionals) who can visit, observe and write up "best practices".

4. Rabbi Bieler's other concern about the proposal for implementation is the degree to which it involves partnership with existing institutions - such as BJE's - whom he sees as being committed to non-change. He believes in the power of demonstration projects implemented by the best people working together, and does not believe that the power of such a demonstration can be disseminated by the normal channels. It is rather a matter of setting an example and a standard and inspiring others to join in the pursuit of excellence.

5. Rabbi Bieler plans to attend on 6/14.

J: Reimer

Interview with Irwin Field (5/1/89) 1 hour in his office

1. As I was explaining the direction of our work since December, Hr. Field stopped me to express a different point of view. He felt the focus on implementation is premature and the critical issue now is the product. If you have the right product, the implementation will follow.

2. Hr. Field disagrees with those who say there is no shortage of good ideas, only of good people. He thinks the right "good idea" is crucial to change. I cites the example of the havura - a good idea at the right time. As the right product at the right time, it spread rapidly without an implementation plan. The Jewish world looks for such ideas and tends to pick them up. (He did add that with Project Renewal, on which he worked at the UJA, it did take same pushing hefore anyone would try it out - But once word got our that it use right, it spread quickly - through with modification from community to community).

3. Mr. Field also cautioned against starting another organization, even if we call it on implementation mechanism. He feels our mental energy ought to go into product not "building". Let that follow as the need arises from the spread of the product.

4. Mr. Field thought that at this point the commission should still be concerned about whether it is asking the right questions. Maybe there are questions we've yet to ask that would point our work in different directions. As on example, he thought we have yet to explore the question of expectation: can we expect more of the family than is asked in general education? Can we is better than the general milieu or do we have to operate within certain other expectations? In his mind, if we could ask more and make the family take more responsible for their children's education, we'd begin to solve the problem of leadership. Responsible parents would provide better leadership and also expect more of the personnel.

5. Hr. Field does see a role for a non-local presence in partnership with a local community. The implementation team could help to assemble an appropriat group of people to debate the issues, and generate the right questions and cor up with the right ideas. Also, ideas from local places could be evaluated and enriched and ther disseminated. He believes good ideas would be quickly picked up, but stresses the need for searching for the right questions which will lead to attaining the right products.

6. Mr. Field's not planning on attending the 6/14 meeting.

J. Reimer

Interview with Arthur Green (4/24/89) 2 hours in his home in Philadelphia

1. Rabbi Green had just received the letter to commissioners and seemed quite attuned to where we left off in December and where we were going in terms of demonstration centers - which he and I had discussed last in January. He favors what we then called "the multiple demonstration" approach.

2. We began the current discussion with the question of how does the Commission implement a demonstration approach. Given that a site has been selected, Arthur suggested the following scenerio: a. hire a central local person to run the demonstration center; b. develop an institutional link between the center and local Jewish colleges and agencies; c. establish fellowships to bring in practitioners from other locales to work as interns in the center; d. develop an outreach and publicity strategy to give national visibility to the demonstration projects.

3. We reflected on the model of the havura which we were both involved in at its inception. Green believes the original havurah demonstrated both how powerful it can be to bring together a concentration of talented people working on one project and how the image of something new and exciting can generate interest and replication. He believes in developing powerful models through the concentration of human resources and talents.

I begin to discribe in general terms the mechanism for implementing the community demonstration projects and he reacts positively. His remarks focus on these points: a. in balancing between the tasks of selecting communities and securing funding sources, it is important that the board and the director separate the tasks and not have selection made or directly influenced by the funders' preferences. While the funders need to know that their areas of interest will be concentrely demonstrated in projects, it should not be they who select where those demonstration sites will b. In the selection process, what is being compared are be. alternative dreams or visions. Who has the richest visions within a given area and the demonstrated ability to move towards its realization? What the mechanism can contribute is a forum to articulate and evaluate the dream as well as help in securing the people who can come into a site and help make the dream an educational reality.

:

.J. Reimer

Interview with Carol Ingall (4/24/89) hour in her office in Providence

1. Carol Ingall attended the 4/5 educators meeting and did not need further review. She was ready to begin with her reactions to that presentation of the I.J.E. Carol believes it is a mistake to focus so singularly in the Commission on the process of implementation. What is also needed - and soon - is a vision of programs that can inspire people: where is the process leading - what might concrete, programmatic outcomes look like in the area of personnel.

2. In relation to the proposed focus on localism, Carol cautions not to overemphasize the individuality of needs in each community. A good model developed in one locale can serve as a guide to other communities who will know how to adapt the model to their local needs if there is a bank to draw on for financing adaptation; she believes the demonstration model is a good one.

3. What is needed to make the demonstration model work is a serious search for best practices. She does not believe that the IJE necessarily needs to invent new solutions, but in many cases, existing best practices - which are currently locally-run and nationally unknown can serve as models of what should be done in that area. But they must be found, encouraged, developed and put on view for others to emulate. "Best practices" is an urgent and top priority agenda item for the commission.

Carol's main disagreement with the IJE presentation was with the assumption of synergy: that many demonstrations should be centered together in one or several communities. She believes that concentration of effort in one community would be artificial: it would have no history - no organic roots in that community. Suddenly one or several communities would get a terrific influx of resources which might be overwhelming and which might make that community seem very distant from other communities. She doubts that people would pick up and come to work in one centralized site.

5. Carol strongly believes in a more de-centralized approach. Take the issue of personnel and break it down into its component parts. Then search hard for where in the country communities are already at work on creating positive solutions for that component problem. (She believes more is being done in the field than is generally recognized.) and hence already underway). Then use the IJE to help develop and expand what is already begun in the local community. (She agrees that here the IJE plays a crucial role in setting standards and getting much improved output; but only if it works on goals and programs that are already underway in a community). Then be sure to publicize the local best practice and finance its adaptation to other communities.

6. As a local BJE director Carol believes that her community or comparable communities can develop expertise in one or several pects of the personnel issue, but not in the whole area. She adds, hough, that it would add great luster to her whole program if her agency received national recognition for its area of expertise (eg.teacher induction) and that these partial solutions can have great relevence for change in other communities.

7. Carol plans to attend on 6/14.

FEB-08- 00 04:04 ID:

J. Reimer

Interview with Mark Lainer (5/1/09) hour in a restaurant

1. Mr. Lainer is well attuned to the direction of the Commission and is supportive of the current thinking. He had the following comments.

- a. It is crucial that the 6/14 meeting deal not only with the process of implementation, but also with the content of the proposals around personnel.
- b. Before new projects in demonstrations be undertaken, we must know what is going on "on the ground" in the field. He suggests we send a team around to interview key people from the field in each of the central locations.
- c. What an implementation mechanism can do for a community like LA is to 1. get into our heads and see the issues as we do; 2. help us articulate the goals we set for ourselves; 3. help us to evaluate if we are reaching our goals, and plan for how we can improve upon that; 4. help us to consider alternatives to our current goals and plans; 5. help us to Understand our own successes - how they work as well as they do; 6. help us to disseminate our successes - within our community and nationally.

2. Mr. Lainer is planning to attend on 6/14. He'd like to have his bio rewritten as it does not accurately reflect his involvements in Jewish education J. Reimer

Interview with Rabbi Harold Schulweis (5/1/89) e hour in his office

1. Rabbi Schulweis listened to the general direction of our work and agreed with that direction. Host of our conversation focused on his explaining the need for personnel training in family education - which is the latest rocus of his attention in his congregation.

2. To summarize: Rabbi Schulweis has practiced a model of training selected lay members of the congregation to assume key educational roles alongside the professionals. He developed that in a para-rabbinics program and is now expanding it to a training family educators who will work in homes, family to family. The training is extensive, out there are no materials to use or any teachers to do the training. The rabbis will begin the process, but who will carry if on? There needs to be a new type of training education if this is to have any long term success.

3. As Rabbi Schulweis' focus is on synogogue life, I asked if he saw a need to develop a relationship among congregations, JCC's & Federation. He did see the need and admitted that rabbis can be too turf conscious. He would see the foundation as playing a crucial "shadchon" role in sponsoring formats in which first lay people and then professionals from these organizations could get to know one another's concerns and learn to bridge differences to find more common ground.

4. Rabbi Schulweis does not plan to attend on 6/14.

J. Reimer

Interview with Rabbi Isalah Zeldin (5/1/89) e hour in his office.

1. In explaining the general direction of our work, Rabbi Zeldin reacted to several points, based on his experience at the Stephen Wise Temple, an education-oriented synagogue and its sponsored day school.

2. He believes that dissemination is a crucial issue not done well at present. He gave two examples — When they began their parenting center, one woman was hired half time by the reform movement to disseminate the model which che did to over 90 other congregations. When she asked for more time to support those sites, she was refused. No further dissemination has taken place since. Also he mess family comps as a very promising new idea. It has succeeded in several places in California, but has no way to opread beyond that narrow circle. A real effort at dissemination would be crucial.

3. His temple has set up a substantial fund to which teachers in the day school may apply for training grants. Rabbi Zeldin believes this has stimulated teacher initiative to plan their own professional development and has allowed for innovative practices such as sending general studies teachers to Israel to learn Judaica to incorporate into their classrooms. (Interestingly, the temple does not extend this to teachers in the supplementary school and the rabbi does not believe they should.)

4. Rabbi Zeldin believes there are certain positions that are lacking which could be crucial for both dissemination and training of personnel. He cites the example of a coordinator for the dozen reform day schools. Those schools we no way now of consistently sharing or networking, and yet one additional person could make a real difference.

5. He sees federations and foundations playing a significant role if they could subvent the costs of Jewish education for families. Especially for day schools, but also for supplementary schools, he thinks cost is an increasing factor in keeping students away. Perhaps a campaign to support Jewish learning. As for denominations, he believes they have little role to play beyond producing materials. Education is not their priority and hence not really their active domain.

Rabbi Zeldin is not planning to attend 6/14 meeting. He'd appreciate announcing the dates for next year now to allow him to plan in advance to come.

MEMO TO: Seymour Fox, Annette Hochstein, Morton L. Mandel, Arthur J. Naparstek, Joseph Reimer, Arthur Rotman, Herman D. Stein, Jonathan Woocher

FROM: Virginia F. Levi

DATE: May 17, 1989

Attached, for your information, are reports of interviews with Eli Evans and Maurice Corson conducted by Henry L. Zucker.

Arthur J. Naparstek TO: <u>Virginia F. Levi</u>	_ FROM: <u>Henry L. Zucker</u>	_ DATE: <u>5/15/89</u> _ REPLYING TO
DEPARTMENT/PLANT LOCATION	TTE PARE MA NE /PLANE EN LO LIN	YOUR MEMO OF:
SUBJECT: COMMISSION INTERVIEW	WITH PARRY MAURICE CORSON	

ON MAY 11, 1989, ONE HOUR AT THE LAGUARDIA AIRPORT AND IN THE LIMOUSINE ON THE WAY TO HIS NEW YORK OFFICE LARRY MOSES PARTICIPATED IN SOME OF THE INTERVIEW

Corson is skeptical about the mechanism to follow up the findings of the Commission. He believes that Seymour Fox knew before the Commission was organized what sort of follow-up mechanism should be developed. Corson believes that while there is need of a follow-up mechanism, it is not a good idea to establish a new IJE agency. Rather, the function should be assigned to JESNA.

The Wexner Foundation would not support an independent IJE. It probably would support a JESNA department for the same purpose.

Corson is very touchy on the idea of financial support of the Commission's recommendations because he made it clear in advance that in joining the Commission, he was not implying that Wexner would take on a financial obligation to support the Commission's findings. I made it clear that all financial support for ideas which emerge from the Commission would be strictly on a volunteer basis. Participating foundations would take on financial support in areas in which they have a specific interest.

Corson commented that there are serious splits in the organizational functioning of all three denominations, and that this will probably have a negative effect on the ability of the denominations to be helpful in carrying out ideas developed by the Commission. For example, anything recommended by the Hebrew Union College is likely to be ignored or opposed by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

In general, Corson was supportive of the work of the Commission. He believes it will produce a report which will have substantial influence on Jewish education. He made it clear that the Wexner Foundation has a deep interest in Jewish education and is already supporting major efforts in this field and will continue to do so.

	I: <u>Henry L. Zucker</u>	DATE: 5/15/89
DEPANTMENTAL ANT STRATION		REPLYING TO YOUR MEMO OF:
SUBJECT: INTERVIEW WITH ELI EVANS	14 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

I met with Eli Evans on May 11, 1989 at his office for about one hour. Part of our agenda was devoted to another subject and our discussion about the Commission lasted perhaps 30-40 minutes.

It is clear that Eli believes we should not put the emphasis at the June 14 meeting on an implementation mechanism; rather we should come up with some ideas and should begin to point to what we will eventually be reporting and how we will implement our emphases on personnel and on community and financing. We should make it clear that we hope to come up with new ideas and with money. For example, Eli believes that there is a need for funds for a national pension system for education personnel. He believes there should be a fund for Jewish education built on the model of the National Endowment for the Arts.

Eli believes that the Commission has made good progress, but that there is now some impatience to get at more specific ideas.

Eli referred to his prior discussion with Seymour Fox. Seymour suggested the possibility of a national fund for the IJE, possibly in the neighborhood of \$50 million. Evans believes there is not a chance to raise a fund of this size. Evans believes that a fund of any considerable size would have to begin with a major contribution from Mandel, Bronfman, and Crown.

We reviewed the personnel option, the community option, and the implementation mechanism and the need for a follow up of each by the Commission. It is clear that Eli believes that the implementation mechanism should grow out of prior discussions about the enabling options and the related programmatic options. He believes it is necessary for the commissioners to become excited about the need for improvement in education and about the possibility of bringing about improvements. MEMO TO: Seymour Fox, Annette Hochstein, Morton L. Handel, Joseph Reimer, Arthur Rotman, Herman D. Stein, Jonathan Woocher, Henry L. Zucker

FROM: Virginia F. Levi

DATE: May 26, 1989

٠.

Attached, for your information, is a report of an interview with Bennett Yanowitz conducted by Arthur Naparstek.

1

INTERVIEW WITH BENNETT YANOWITZ

ARTHUR J. NAPARSTEK MAY 23, 1989

I. Progress Report on Commission Activities Since the December 13 Meeting

I reviewed with Bennett Yanowitz the progress the Commission has made. Specifically, we focused on the consensus that came out of the December 13th meeting. I asked Ben if he agreed that commissioners were comfortable with the idea that the Commission's mission was to bring about across-the-board change on a systemic level and to focus on implementation. I also reviewed with Ben the framework which was agreed to by the Commission at the December 13th meeting. The framework includes the identification of personnel and community as enabling options and the identification, without prioritizing, of 23 other programmatic options.

Ben pointed out that the challenge before the Commission is to bring about implementation.

II. Implementation

I reviewed with Ben that in thinking about implementation, we need to look at education on a local level. He agreed with that perspective. l then put forward the idea of the development of demonstrations. At that point Ben indicated that before we begin thinking of demonstrations or any other mechanism related to implementation, we need to assess the problem and get a group of commissioners to talk it through. Let people begin thinking of what personnel means in relationship to implementation on a local level.

Ben spoke of JESNA's emerging role in this area. JESNA is committing more and more time to the issues of personnel. Last month, JESNA's Executive Committee approved the concept of JESNA becoming the organization that could house an endowment for Jewish education. The JESNA goal is to raise \$10 million for the endowment.

He then asked me if I thought this would compete with the Commission. I turned the question back to him, his response being that he and Woocher discussed the problem of competition and felt that the needs in the field were great, and if the Commission only focused on community and personnel and not all the programmatic options, there would not be any competition. I pointed out that there was a relationship between personnel, community and the programmatic options.

INDEX OF KEY PAPERS

.

Section	Page
Outreach Strategies for Formal and Informal Educators Arthur Rotman Jonathon Woocher	1
Communications Strategy Proposal Paula Berman Cohen	4
Report on the Joint Federation/ Congregational Plenum Commission on Jewish Education Charles Ratner	12
Case Studies of Outstanding Programs in Jewish Education Annette Hochstein	15
"Priorities for the Commission" Henry L. Zucker	17
Liaison between the Commission and Educational Constituencies Jonathon Woocher	20

March 28, 1989

TO: Arthur J. Naparstek

FROM: Joseph Reimer

RE: Commission Outreach to Jewish Educational Organizations

I have been asked to review the previous communications on the subject of Commission outreach to Jewish educational organizations and to prepare for the March 30 meeting of the planning group a list of organizations with whom we need to be in contact and recommendations on the nature of the contact.

The list and recommendations are based on the following assumptions. (1) Priorities for organizational contact need to be established. Educational organizations whose members most directly impact the anticipated work of the Commission need to receive higher priority. (2) Higher priority involves face to face communication between representatives of the Commission and the organizations. Lower priority may involve only written communication. (3) Outreach through larger organizational networks that avoids establishing separate contact with smaller organizations makes for smoother communication and should be preferred.

I. Central Agencies for Jewish Education

1. Bureau Directors Fellowship (BDF)

1.

Chairperson: Gene Greenzweig

Recommendation: Given centrality of bureau directors to access to schools in local communities, we want to let them know about the work of the Commission and to gain their cooperation. (1) Establish contact with Gene Greenzweig. (2) Follow his lead for best way for Commission representative to meet with bureau directors. (3) Make available option of Commission representative addressing BDF at their Spring meeting in June. (4) Follow-up initial contact with possibility of future meeting (especially with big city directors) and written communication to all directors.

II. Jewish Educator Organizations

PR

1. Conference of Jewish Educator Organizations (COJEO)

JETHORT

Chairperson: Dr. Hyman Campeas

Recommendation: Given that COJEO is the umbrella organization of the five constituent organizations of Jewish educators, it is a central address and an effective way to communicate with and gain the cooperation of Jewish educators. (1) Establish contact with Hy Campeas. (2) Ask him to set up a meeting that COJEO would sponsor at which representatives from the constituent organizations could meet with Commission representatives. (3) Follow-up initial meeting with written communication to Board members of each organization.

Coalition for the Advancement of Jewish Education (CAJE)

Executive Director: Dr. Eliot Spack

Oppostunities : intere for them topresent papers or income way his inclusion.

Maybe HJI, AR, JW, JR imile a gip. of CF. JE book merchens to diver.

III. Denominational Educational Bodies

1. Department of Education and Commission on Jewish Education, United Synagogue of America (Conservative)

Director: Rabbi Robert Abramson

2.

 The United Synagogue of America, Department of Youth Activities (USY/Kadima)

Director: Paul Friedman

Recommendation: As central educational bodies of the Conservative Movement, these organizations need to receive high priority contact from Commission representatives. (1) We turn first to Ismar Schorsh, as a commissioner and leader of the Conservative Movement, to ask how to best establish contact with these, and possibly other, educational arms of the Conservative Movement. (2) At his suggestion and under his direction we set up a meeting with the directors of these organizations. (3) We follow-up initial meeting with possibility of future meetings with directors of organizations and with written communication with members of their commission on education.

3. Department of Education and Commission on Jewish Education, Union of American Hebrew Congregations (Reform).

Director: Rabbi Howard Bogot

4. Union of Hebrew Congregations Youth Services Department

Director: Rabbi Allan Smith

Recommendation: That we follow for the Reform Movement the same procedure as above, starting first by turning to Alfred Gottschalk, etc.

5. National Commission on Torah Education, Yeshiva University (Orthodox).

Director: Dr. Mordecai Schaidman

 Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations, National Conference of Synagogue Youth (NCSY)

Director: Rafi Butler

Recommendation: That we follow for the Orthodox Movement the same procedure as above, starting first with Norman Lamm, etc.

Commission on Jewish Education of Reconstructionist 7. Congregations and have not and the Reconstructionist Rabbinical Association.

Director: Rabbi Jeffrey Schein

Recommendation: That we follow for the Reconstructionist Movement the same procedure as above, starting first with Arthur Green, etc.

8. Torah Umesorah, National Society for Hebrew Day Schools (Orthodox).

Director: Rabbi Joshua Fishman

Recommendation: Given the prominence of Torah Umesorah nationally in the day school movement an yet their being religiously to the right of Centrist Orthodoxy, this organization poses a special case for the Commission. Two options are possible. (1) To attempt to establish direct contact with the director to communicate the role of the Commission. (2) To limit contact to written communication.

IV. Academic Institutions

1. Association of Institutions of Higher Learning for DA+S. Les Jewish Education.

Chairperson: Dr. Alvin Mars

Recommendation: Given possible centrality of these institutions for training personnel in Jewish education, we need to be in contact. (1) Contact Alvin Mars to set up best format for meeting between Commission representative and members of the organization. (2) Follow-up initial meeting with written communication with each director of the member institutions.

Association for Jewish Studies 2.

President: Professor Robert Chazan

Recommendation: As this group's mission - teaching Judaica and training scholars in Judaica - is less central to Commission's work, contact is a lesser priority. (1) Contact Robert Chazan to ach Twening p opinion of this see which forms of written communication would be most appropriate for which of the membership.

- Non-denominational informal education v.
 - 1. B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation
 - 2. Hadassah Youth Commission
 - B'nai B'rith Youth Organization (BBYO) 3.
 - 4. American Zionist Youth Foundation (AZYF)
 - 5. Association of Jewish Sponsored Camps

3.

Recommendation: As these organizations are not as yet seen as central to Commission's work, contact be held on a lower lever! of priority. (1) In consultation with JWB, contact directors of organizations to see what forms of written communication would be appropriate for which of their professional and lay leadership. (2) Follow-up meetings between Commission and organizational representatives could be set up if mutual need were to arise.

OUTREACH STRATEGIES FOR FORMAL AND INFORMAL EDUCATORS

COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA

A comprehensive outreach plan for the Commission on Jewish Education in North America includes communication with organizations in both the "formal" and the "informal" spheres. The informal sphere includes Jewish community centers, federations, B'nai Brith Hillel organizations, summer camps and denominational youth organizations (NFTY, USY, NCSY, etc). The formal educational sphere is comprised of educational organizations: academic institutions, central agencies for Jewish education, denominational educational bodies (often corresponding to denominational youth organizations), and Jewish educator organizations (such as CAJE).

Such comprehensive outreach involves direct contact (meetings and specialized communications) with these key educational constituencies. These contacts have two major goals:

- 1. To interpret the work of the Commission to important individuals and groups who will play a role in the implementation of changes growing out of the Commission's work.
- To gather input from these constituencies which can inform the Commission's thinking and enhance the quality and applicability of its recommendations.

It is proposed that contact with the sphere of "informal" educators be accomplished with a written communication or newsletter which would provide updates on the work of the Commission to the targeted groups. Such a publication would appear regularly during the work of the Commission, and would generally follow the format of the Kiplinger letter (which is attached). The newsletter would be primarily a summary of the workings of the Commission immediately prior to the publication date and a forecast of things to come. There should be a limited number of photographs, sketches or graphs, about one per page, no more than about three inches by two inches. The number of pictorials should be limited to maintain the publication's appearance as a newsletter.

The newsletter should appear once within three weeks after each Commission meeting, primarily as a recap of the preceding meeting; and then once again about halfway between the meetings, primarily as a forecast of the questions and issues to be considered at the next Commission meeting.

JWB has successfully developed a publication along these lines, called the JWBriefing for Center Presidents (also attached). However, its audience goes beyond Center Presidents. Experience has shown that, because the format is limited to two pages, the newsletter is pulled out of the pile of mail that normally accumulates at each decision-maker's desk for a "quick read." Most mail, as we know, is consigned to the "when I have time" pile, which means, in effect, that it is never seen. The Commission newsletter should be limited to two pages or, on occasion when there is a great deal of information to be conveyed, perhaps four pages.

The mailing list for this newsletter, encompassing the various target groups, would probably be comprised of about 5,000 individuals. The preparation of an appropriate list is crucial and would require significant staff time in advance of the first issue.

The "formal" Jewish education organizations must be engaged by more direct means in the Commission process. Two kinds of communication appear to be broadly useful in this regard:

1. Invitational group meetings with the lay and professional heads of such organizations for purposes of briefing and gathering of feedback on Commission developments. Three such meetings would encompass the vast majority of organizations (listed in the Appendix) which comprise this category.

An initial round of meetings could be convened this Winter-Spring, with the possibility of additional meetings in the future. One or more Commission members and a high level staff member should meet with the group to present a first-hand account of the Commission's deliberations thus far, and to pose specific questions on some of the issues which have been identified as important for the next phase of the Commission's deliberations. (For example: What do the educator organizations see as priorities in the personnel area? How do the denominational commissions and education departments perceive the role of the ideological movements in providing leadership for Jewish education? What potential do the youth movements see for expanding participation in their programs and how might this be achieved?)

These meetings would fit well into the model of information gathering discussed at the last meeting of Commission Senior Policy Advisors. They would be supplemented by the mailing of reading materials to a wider circle of organizational leaders (as discussed above), and by a standing invitation for the organizations to submit written input to the Commission at any time.

 Specific approaches to a limited number of key organizations, both for the purpose of soliciting input and to insure their feeling of involvement in the Commission process.

Organizations which might merit this special attention are: CAJE (the Coalition for the Advancement of Jewish Education), the Association of Institutions of Higher Learning for Jewish Education, and the Bureau Directors Fellowship.

For each of these organizations, both special meetings and a special request for oral or written input should be arranged. Between now and the end of June, all three of these organizations will hold regular meetings at which one or more Commission members and staff could appear. In

addition, each of these organizations could be invited to submit "testimony" to the Commission, either on the full range of issues which will be dealt with on one or more specific topics (e.g., training models for the AIHLJE, or the situation of teachers for CAJE). Depending on how the Commission's work is organized, such "testimony" could come in the form of written documents, presentations at a Committee or sub-group meeting, or both. These organizations might also be asked to review and comment on other materials (such as drafts of reports or proposals) prepared by and for the Commission.

Since the CAJE conference in August 1989 will bring together the largest number of Jewish educators and education advocates of any North American gathering this year, it may be valuable for the Commission to have a presence at that conference. This could come in the form of an open briefing session on the Commission itself, a series of sessions on specific topics of interest to the Commission at that point in its work, plus written materials available for distribution.

There are, in addition, three other events during the next six months where a Commission presence (via newsletter distribution, staff or member representation, and some combination of public and/or private meetings) would be useful:

- The Midwest Regional Leadership Conference on Jewish Education, sponsored by JESNA and Federations and Central Agencies in the region. <u>March 5-6 in Chicago</u>.
- 2. The JWB Special Convention, April 7-9 in New York.
- 3. The Conference of Jewish Communal Service Annual Meeting, June 4-7 in Boca Raton.

As the Commission's directions and activities take further shape, other groups and organizations may become more relevant to its work (e.g., the association of early childhood educators, the network for research in Jewish education). Contacts with these constituencies can be developed as needed.

To carry out the program of outreach envisioned here, it is clear that some staff resources will need to be allocated for this purpose. JWB and JESNA can be helpful in identifying contacts, and should participate in the meetings with the several constituencies. However, Commission staff will need to assume responsibility for the administrative and logistical tasks involved in sending out briefings and any other special written communications, and in setting up the various meetings envisioned here.

Note: This paper represents a synthesis of two papers submitted to the Commission by Arthur Rotman of JWB and Jonathan Woocher of JESNA.

COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA

Communications Strategy

PROPOSAL

Prepared by: Paula Berman Cohen Submitted : January, 1989

I. PURPOSÉ

The purpose of developing a communications strategy for the Commission on Jewish Education in North America (CJENA) is to assure a consistent, coordinated and effective means of informing and cultivating the Commission's target audiences.

II. BENEFITS

There are many benefits of a planned, strategic approach to communications and public relations. Anticipating the information needs of target audiences and designing the framework for collecting and disseminating such information not only maximizes financial and staff resources, but also promotes continuity in the look, messages, and tone of all CJENA communications. In a planned approach in which the Foundation serves as the clearing-house for all CJENA-related information, copy approval and editorial control remain centralized.

III. ENVIRONMENT

A. <u>Phases</u>

It is projected that CJENA will exist for a specified period of time--perhaps 12-18 months--during which program options will be identified and developed.

B. <u>Major Audiences</u>

A cursory review of background materials suggest potential major audiences for CJENA information. Starting from the closest constituents (FAMILY) and broadening to the largest possible populations (UNIVERSE), as in a pyramid model, four major categories may be defined:

> <u>FAMILY</u> Commissioners, Program Chairs, Policy Advisors, Partners, and Staff

> > -1-

- NATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS, Organizations, Federations representing formal and informal educational settings
- <u>AFFILIATED AGENCIES</u> regional and local affiliates
- UNIVERSE Community-At-Large (Jewish & Non-Jewish).

IV. COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM

A. <u>Development</u> (Steps to Design)

Analysis of these major audiences is the next step in assessing specific needs for communications vehicles and public relations activities, their design, target audience(s), frequency, contents, and article structure. The research conducted to determine these factors involves many steps, including:

- Review information already developed for and collected by CJENA
- Identify established forms of communications (i.e. newsletters, bulletins, special events)
- Analyze existing media (i.e. Jewish newspapers, television or radio programs--particularly in demonstration communities)
- Identify potential media opportunities
- Informally interview key representatives

 (i.e. selected Commissioners, Program Chairs,
 and Policy Advisors).

B. <u>Objective</u>

A well rounded communications program employs a variety of strategies to support a fundamental objective. It is multi-dimensional in that several methods and diverse activities could be instituted concurrently. Successful communications is cumulative; this multi-dimensional approach builds momentum provided each component underscores the fundamental objective. In the case of CJENA, a working objective for all public relations and communications activites might be: To raise awareness, generate interest and enthusiasm, cultivate commitment and ownership among specific target audiences, through a program of activities specifically tailored to promote the goals of CJENA and assure successful outcomes of CJENA program recommendations.

C. <u>Methods</u>

There are several methods of communications which might be appropriate for the CJENA communications program, although their priority ranking would vary as the Commission moves through different phases. These include:

- PUBLICATIONS: printed materials produced on a regular or ad hoc basis, projecting a consistent, professional image.
- MEDIA: identifying CJENA events or developments which would interest the media.
- DIRECT MAIL: broad-based mail campaign to enlist support--philanthropic, in-kind, volunteer--of community-at-large.
- ADVERTISING: paid promotional campaign used to communicate specific information, enhance image or build goodwill among broadest, and usually most difficult to reach, populations.
- SPECIAL EVENTS: CJENA-sponsored activities or invitational presentations by CJENA representative for the purpose of cultivating interest and goodwill.

D. <u>Activities</u>

Within these methods, specific activities can be designed and initiated in accordance with the information acquired through initial market research. The menu of activities could include, but is not limited to the following:

Memoranda Series

One-page, 2-side bulletin format containing timedated information for audiences most closely involved in Commission activities and decisions.

Newsletters

Four-page, magazine format communicating events or developments to selected audiences.

Report

Annual Report format containing conclusions or outcomes.

Press Releases, Descriptive Articles, Public Service Announcements

Developed around specific topics, and distributed on an ongoing basis or in conjunction with CJENA events and developments.

Information Kits

Collection of materials which would assist media, national associations or affiliated agencies in developing articles or other promotion. Contents could include: CJENA Facts Sheet, Leadership Roster, Biographical Sketch on selected leadership, program and project description, quotations, photographs.

Clippings File

Photocopied collection of press coverage on CJENA and related activities.

Conventions, Conferences, or Annual Meetings of Selected Organizations

Solicit invitations for Commissioners to present keynote address or otherwise participate on agenda at major meetings.

Space Advertising

Visual and text themes to promote CJENA objectives among community-at-large.

Posters

Display/poster format of space advertisements distributed to selected locations--work place, place of worship, academic institutions, or recreation sites.

V. IMPLEMENTATION

The implementation of a communications and public relations program of this scope requires meticulous coordination and cooperation among primary audiences. It involves many stages, including:

- Research audiences
- Conceptualize program design
- Develop program structure--activities, budget, timetable, responsibility/authority
- Select and manage suppliers.

VI. RECOMMENDATION

The dynamic character of the Commission on Jewish Education in North America makes pinpointing the precise communications needs and public relations objectives at the outset very difficult. However, anticipation and projection of specific events or outcomes, as well as the audiences involved, will result in a design which provides both structure and flexibility.

A productive approach for CJENA would be to conceive the communications program as a two-phase strategy. The Commission's focus in Phase I is on planning and developing a structure of programs and projects. The communications need to be directed to those audiences closest to these activities and decisions. In Phase II the attention and leadership responsibilities turn to design and implementation of specific programs and projects. Here, success depends on the support and participation of a broad constituency; and, the communications need to reach well into the communityat-large.

Certain activities, such as the Annual Report, act as a 'hinge' which bridge the transformation from Phase I to Phase II. It provides the joint opportunity to summarize the work done by the Commission, and to activate program and project implementation by inviting the broader community into participation.

-5-

HE

TOWARDS THE SECOND COMMISSION MEETING

OCTOBER 4, 1988

CASE STUDIES OF OUTSTANDING PROGRAMS IN JEWISH EDUCATION

DRAFT PROPOSAL

It is proposed that the Commission undertake to prepare and publish a volume of "Case Studies in Jewish Education". The project would entail seeking out examples of outstanding education programs and offer them as cases from which to learn, from which to draw encouragement, and, when relevant, as examples to replicate.

The final product will be published for distribution amongst community leaders and educators.

It is anticipated that the effects of this endeavour will include:

- to illustrate programs in areas of relevance to the work of the Commission
- * to help raise the morale of the field by recognizing, describing and crediting valuable achievements
- to encourage quality endeavours
- * to raise expectations as to what can be done in Jewish Education.

THE PROCESS

1. A steering group should be set up to guide the enterprise. Members of this steering group should include (not mutually exclusive):

a. Commissioners

b. People with the methodological know-how to guide such an endeavour

c. People well acquainted with the field.

[It may be difficult - though important - to avoid pressures to offer a selection of cases that is "balanced" to represent interest groups. This should be borne in mind when deciding on the composition of the steering group].

1



The "Case Studies" process will include the following elements:

1. Identify outstanding programs (should we make a public call for "nominations"? Use professional and communal channels to help identify the appropriate programs? Use staff and consultants and their networks?)

2. Define criteria for selection;

3. Define short-cut methods of assessment (How much evaluation should be done to ensure validity of information? should a team be charged with site visits? Should professionals be asked to do site-visits? Etc...).

- 4. Define guidelines for case-descriptions;
- 5. Set up a screening and selection process

6. Do the actual work

. .

7. Write, edit, present, publish, distribute.

9/19/88 Henry L. Zucker Arthur J. Naparstek FROM: DATE: REPLYING TO DEPARTMENT/PLANT LOCATION DEPART MENT/P YOUR MEMO OF: SUBJECT:

A few thoughts about priorities for the Commission:

The number of topics which are potential sources of treatment by the Commission is so vast that a practical approach by the Commission necessitates zeroing in on the key issues. We can tip our hats to the others so that people see that we haven't overlooked them. I would see our Commission report organized in something of the following fashion:

- 1. A first section to describe the current condition of formal and informal Jewish education in historical perspective, and to produce case examples of successes, stating what are the common elements in successes and the chief causes of failures. This section should wind up with our vision of the field of Jewish education in the year 2000.
- 2. The second section would be a comprehensive discussion of the personnel situation, personnel being the key to improvement of the field. This section would discuss the shortage of personnel, the relatively low quality, the need to develop a career line to attract and keep qualified personnel, our aspiration to create a profession of teaching in Jewish schools, the training centers, and a statement of what is needed to attract and hold personnel. In general, we would tell American Jewry what is the condition of Jewish education personnel and what must be done to improve it.
- The third section would discuss community aspects of the problem. How are 3. we organized now to promote Jewish education? What changes are needed? How can we bring the very top lay leadership into the field? How to make certain that the Jewish community accepts the prime importance of Jewish education? What funds are needed and what are the sources of these funds. What responsibility will the Commission take to carry this message to the sources of funding?
- The fourth section would make it clear that the Commission cannot treat all 4. the important subjects relating to Jewish education. Possibly we should list those subjects worth studying in the post-Commission period, maybe with a brief description of the current situation and the nature of a study which would be helpful. This would partially be a reprise of the first

Arthur J. Naparstek

section which makes it clear that the Commission has selected the universal problems for discussion and action (personnel, community responsibility) and that such other important issues as curriculum, how to teach, judging between day schools and afternoon and Sunday schools, judging the relative importance of concentrating on specific age groups, etc. are subjects very definitely worth study and action, but belonging to other forums.

If we can agree soon on the general thrust of our eventual Commission report, it should help us to assign the preparation of the initial reports to the appropriate consultants, and to avoid a lot of unnecessary work in areas we have decided lie outside of our work.

9/20/88 Arthur J. Naparstek Henry L. Zucker TO: FROM: DATE: NAME NAME REPLYING TO DEPARTMENT PLANT LOCATION DEPARTMENT/PL YOUR MEMO OF: SUBJECT:

Should we add one more section to our projected final report of the Commission, namely a discussion of the day school movement and the supplementary school, (or as Reimer calls it, the congregational school)? This would be an analysis of the current situation in each area, giving it historical perspective, and projecting developments in the next 5-10 years. Here is a good place to tell of the success stories, what works, what doesn't work. A statesman-like section on this subject would be very encouraging for both advocates of the day school and the advocates of the supplementary school, provided that the positive possibilities are emphasized.

LIAISON BETWEEN THE COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA AND EDUCATIONAL CONSTITUENCIES

In order to develop a climate in which the recommendations of the Commission on Jewish Education in North America will receive maximal visibility and support within the Jewish education community, it will be helpful to maintain ongoing contact with several constituencies. Although most, if not all, of the relevant groups are represented on the Commission itself, some type of liaison with their own "official" bodies should be established.

The following are some ideas for carrying out these relationships with groups and agencies involved primarily in the formal educational arena:

Groups:

- 1. Academic institutions currently involved in training Jewish educators -- organization: Association of Institutions of Higher Learning for Jewish Education
- 2. Central agencies of Jewish education (Bureaus) -- <u>organization</u>: Bureau Directors Fellowship
- 3. Denominational educational bodies <u>organizations</u>: United Synagogue of America, Commission on Jewish Education (Conservative); Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Commission on Jewish Education (Reform); Yeshiva University, National Commission on Torch Education (Centrist Orthodox), Torah Umesorah National Society of Hebrew Day Echools (Orthodox)
- 4. Jewish educators <u>organizations</u>: Jewish Educators Assembly (Conservative); National Assocciation of Temple Educators (Reform); Educators Council of America (Orthodox); Council for Jewish Education (inter-denominational, communal); Coalition for the Advancement of Jewish Education (inter-denominational)

Possible Approaches:

- 1. A letter to the presidents/chairs and directors of these organizations from Mort Mandel cutlining the mission and composition of the Commission, steps taken thus far, plans for maintaining contact with their organization, and inviting any input they may wish to provide at this point.
- 2. An initial round of meetings or phone conversations between Art Naparstek and representatives (the lay and/or professional head) of the several organizations to brief tham and "welcome" them to the process. This could be done individually or in groups (e.g., directors of all of the denominational commissions together).
- 3. Designation of a member of the policy advisory group and/or staff to serve as liaison to each of the groups. This has already been done in the case of the AIHLJE (David Ariel) and BDF (Jonathan Woocher).

The liaison will be responsible for maintaining informal contacts with the organization's leadership.

.......

- 4. Sending to each organization, after Commission meetings, an update letter summarizing the state of the deliberations. This letter could highlight issues being addressed, invite input on specific points, and generally give these groups a feeling that they are "tuned in" in a special fashion.
- 5. At an appropriate point in the process prior to the publication of the Commission report, a follow-up meeting or conversation between Art Naparatek and the organizational leadership to "preview" the Commission's findings and recommendations. (Presumably, this would be done with a variety of other key constituencies as well).
- 5. Should any type of group be set up later in the process to consider specifically issues of implementation, representation (either formal or <u>ad personam</u>) from these organizations might be considered.



CHURCH ROAD and GREENWOOD AVENUE WYNCOTE, PENNSYLVANIA 19095 (215) 578-0800

> January 26, 1989 20 Shevat, 5749

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

Dear Arthur:

I've been meaning to write to you since the Commission meeting in December to tell you what a wonderful event that was and how pleased I am to be a part of this important effort.

Those of us who labor in the field of Jewish education on a day to day basis sometimes lose the global perspective that only participating in a meeting like this can restore to us.

I want to tell you that I think the decision to concentrate the Commission's efforts in the areas of personnel and support for the field was a wise one. Hearing the various programmatic suggestions touted by one camp or another, I began to feel that no matter which of them was selected, several things equally valuable would suffer from neglect. I could not agree more than improved efforts in the areas of personnel and general support would help all the specific program areas at once.

At the same time, I hope you and the Commission heard my plea for articulating a clear sense of vision and purpose in Jewish education in the course of the effort to recruit personnel. I don't believe we will tap the idealism and dedication that we seek merely by the raising of salaries and the improvement of benefit packages, however much I agree that these urgently need to be upgraded as well. I hope the Commission staff will find a way to tackle this question of underlying vision. I'm especially happy to report to you that the Philadelphia community seems most interested in the Commission's work. I have been asked to give reports on the December meeting to two separate groups. One involves key members of the lay board of the Central Agency for Jewish Education in this city at the request of Barbara Steinberg, the new Central Agency Director. The other is a group of professionals in the field of Jewish education under the leadership of Dr. Jeffrey Schein. I expect to be delivering both of those reports over the course of the next month. I gather there is much anticipation of great things to come out of this commission and it is nice to know that professionals and lay people in the field have their ears perked.

I just spoke with Joe Reimer regarding the question of shortrange tasks for the Commission. I spoke strongly in favor of the notion of multiple demonstration projects. I would hate to see the Commission, even at this stage, be characterized as a group that produces nothing but verbiage. I think we would do best by actually showing a number of communities what it is that we intend and having some real accomplishments to show for ourselves.

Naturally, I would be delighted if the Philadelphia community were included among those areas chosen for demonstration projects and I would do everything I could to use the good offices of this institution to support such efforts in any way. Please feel free and welcome to call upon me in that regard.

Warm regards and best wishes in your ongoing efforts.

Sincerely/yours,

Arthur Green

Dr. Artnur Green President

AG:eg

- 2 -

The Wexner Foundation

a de terre a la composition de la composition de la composition de la composition de la composition de la compo

December 9, 1988

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

Dear Mort:

I was delighted to have the opportunity to meet with Hank Zucker recently in order to review the progress of the Commission on Jewish Education in North America, and the preliminary draft of the conclusions to be presented to the members of the Commission by staff. In the report's discussion of major areas in the field of Jewish education, I would like to underscore the importance of educational services to Jewish college students which, to my mind, represents one of the most critical areas to be considered. In response to this concern, Hank invited me to share some thoughts with the members of the Commission, which I am more than pleased to do.

A unique and important role an independent commission may play is the conceptualization of Jewish educational services in broader and potentially more effective terms. Authorities in the provision of Jewish campus services estimate that there are approximately 450,000 Jewish students currently enrolled in hundreds of colleges and universities throughout North America. Moreover, the Jewish community's love affair with higher education has been evidenced by the fact that, over the past three decades, in any given year, from 80-90 percent of all Jews of college age have been enrolled in a college or university. Mr. Morton Mandel December 9, 1988 Page 2

The college years for Jews and non-Jews alike are strikingly formative in the development of individual lifestyles and goals. Away from the parental home and community-based institutions for the first time, the college student becomes immersed in the universalist milieu of the campus community, and is afforded the exposure and opportunity to experiment with the widest variety of intellectual, political, social and personal challenges and enticements. In fact, during the college years, many young people consciously distance themselves from the values and traditions of the past in an effort to assert their budding individuality. It is commonly understood that, during the college years, individuals tend to lay the groundwork for, if not make, the most important decisions of their lives with respect to lifestyle, dating and marriage, career, and personal values.

The campus community is critical for another reason as well. In addition to the universalist, "melting pot" milieu referred to above, the campus is also the place in North American society where Israel is most consistently undermined and attacked. The propaganda campaign against Israel and her supporters is centralized on the campus and fueled by highly organized and well funded Arab and Third World organizations. The unsuspecting and ill-prepared Jewish student who arrives on the campus is immediately struck by these activities and is often at a personal loss as a result of them.

The typical Jewish student begins college with an inadequate if not insignificant Jewish education. The statistics shared with our Commission indicate that, in a given year, only 42 percent of all school age (ages 3-17) children are enrolled in formal Jewish education settings, the vast majority being in a congregational or supplementary school. Furthermore, with the widely acknowleged erosion of Jewish practices in the home, many if not most young Jews entering the college years do not arrive with a solid home-based sense of Jewish identification. In Sum, the enterprise of Jewish education, both in schools and in the home, tends to affect in some significant way less than a majority of Jews who go on to the university setting.

A grave mistake of the organized Jewish community in defining the parameters and constituencies of Jewish education rests in the almost exclusive concentration on the age grouping spanning pre-Bar/Bat Mitzvah to The Wexner Foundation

Mr. Morton Mandel December 9, 1988 Page 3

post-confirmation. Invariably, Jewish education is believed to have run its course by the time the young Jew graduates from high school. However, given the demographic and geographical concentration of Jews on the campus, the formative developmental stage the campus represents, and the inherent threats and challenges posed by the campus milieu, the continuation of an attitude relegating campus Judaism to a minor role within the framework of Jewish education is both neglectful and dangerous.

While the leadership of the Jewish community has long been aware of the problems and opportunities associated with Jewish education (congregational schools, day schools, preschools, Jewish camps, youth groups, et.al.), the top leadership of North American Jewish life has never seriously addressed the gross neglect in providing adequate and appropriate funding, staffing, and programming for Jewish college students. In the all too few Hillel Foundations where there are adequate levels of funding and staffing, the results have been very positive (e.q. Harvard, University of Michigan, U.C.L.A., and Washington University). In general, however, most campuses have a ratio of one full time Hillel staff person for every 1,000 - 2,500 Jewish students. As such, Jewish education on the campus, even allowing for the presence of Jewish Studies programs, is woefully underfunded.

From time to time, there have been isolated studies and discussions about Jewish campus constituencies, but in every case they have been aborted by the timidity of national leadership and the political realities of B'nai B'rith's internal agenda and limited funding capacity.

Finally, even given the best efforts of B'nai B'rith Hillel as the national centerpiece for campus services, and local Federations, which often contribute generously to localized Hillel programs, dozens of campuses with thousands of Jewish students have literally no Jewish program as a result of Hillel's inadequate financial resources, or the fact that such campuses happen to be isolated from any Federation's service area.

B'nai B'rith Hillel, in partnership with numerous local Federations, has an immensely important task. It has, to date, been generally viewed as a marginal institution dealing with a marginal constituency, on the periphery of concern to top leadership. Ironically, it is precisely this constituency which holds unparalleled potential in our efforts to upgrade Jewish education. The Wexner Foundation

Mr. Morton Mandel December 9, 1988 Page 4

For these reasons, it is my strong belief that the Commission on Jewish Education in North America must place the campus agenda among the highest Jewish education priorities. We now have an opportunity to take these constituencies seriously, for the sake of Jewish education, and the future of our community. I urge the Commission not to turn it's head away from this challenge.

Sincerely,

Maum Hom

Maurice S. Corson, D.D. President

MSC:sgb

cc: Mr. Henry Zucker



The National Jewish Center for Learning And Leadership

OFFICERS Robert Loup Chairman Rabbi Irving Greenberg President Aliron Ziegelman Associate Chairman Barbara Friedman Sanford Hollander Magda Shenberg Leuchter Norman Lipoff William Spier Stein Ma Chauman Donald Landis Moshe Werthan Treasurers Harvey Arfa Klara Silverstein Secretaries Paul Jeser Exec. Vice President

PAST CHAIRMEN Ben Zion Leuchter Neil Norry Lee Javitch Irvin Frank Herschel Blumberg

FOUNDERS Rabbi Irving Greenberg Elie Wiesel Rabbi Steven Shaw January 3, 1988

Mr. Morton Mandel Mandel Associates Foundation 1750 Euclid Avenue Cleveland, OH 44115

Dear Mort:

This is a belated reaction to the meeting of the commission. On balance, we all should be encouraged by the progress made by the group. I am glad that we also clarified the confusion between the two of us. I truly regret the comment that may have sounded discouraging to the other foundations present from joining in. The main thrust of my words was a plea to you to consider 'specializing' the Mandel Foundation money.

. 172

I am deeply impressed at the breadth of the commission and of your desire to get a review of the entire field of Jewish education so as to be able to choose your 'specialty' wisely. At the same time, there is a danger that you may choose an area which is so broad that it could absorb all of your funds and indeed that of others without really showing a result at the end. My point is that Jewish education might be a case of "less is more". Were you to choose the area of personnel but decide to beef up one outstanding institution (say take the Jerusalem Fellows or some such equivalent program and quintuple it) that might make a difference in the On the other hand, if the money went to outcome. increase the present salaries of all the professionals by a marginal factor of five percent then this would not make a dent in the basic problems of the field.

Almost any of the areas identified would be worthy of a major effort. It is true that there is a lack of research and that in a number of cases, attempts to improve conditions would eventually run into obstacles of shortage of personnel, etc. Nevertheless, in almost each of the areas listed in the report, real improvement can be achieved. Therefore, I remain convinced that if the Mandel Family Foundation would choose one area (or a fragment of an area) where it could make a major difference in the long run, this would be the most constructive way to upgrade Jewish It would be my pleasure to consult with you education. as to which area you choose. In actual fact, every area is needed and in every area there is room for a So it comes down to a personal or contribution. intuitive judgment on your part as to which area you Mandel, Mr. Morton January 3, 1988

wish to take on. It may well be that this model of changing one area would be adopted by the other Foundations (those represented on the Commission and those not) so that in the long run the overall area of Jewish education will be covered better this way than by general approaches.

If you choose to work in the area of personnel, there are three possible models of functioning. One is to enrich all existing institutions--but this runs the risk of having a diluted or marginal effect which changes little. The second would be to take one strong institution and underwrite a major expansion. The third would be to focus specifically on new options, i.e., institutions that could nurture major new figures and forces in Jewish education. (An example would be CAJE or Beit Clal--the retreat center which we are trying to create which will bring scholars together and nurture them and deepen their contacts.) If you make a decision as to which of those models you want to follow and then follow-through and concentrate your efforts, you will make a major contribution.

Among the other important ideas that were offered at the meeting, two stand out. One is the idea of a critical study of Jewish education (Eli Evans' proposal). The other was the need for research. If you took research as your area and made a major investment in it that too would be a contribution--even though right now there is no center for research that could carry your investment. The Evans-type study of Jewish education would involve far less resources, of course. It would probably be done best not by a team making a multi-disciplinary analysis but by using a Flexner/Rockefeller Foundation model, i.e., commissioning one intelligent, critical person to do a thorough and effective assessment. The limited investment involved would leave the Foundation free to do other things as well.

The ideas of reaching out to community leadership and stimulating funding also need not be excluded by the commitment to a specific area that is recommended in this letter.

I remain deeply appreciative of your initiative. The very fact that a leader as respected as you, backed by the impressive resources of your Foundation, is willing to give Jewish education top priority carries an important message and serves as an important model. My prayer is that by specializing and concentrating you Mandel, Mr. Morton January 3, 1988

٠

will make an even greater contribution at this historic moment.

Warmest best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

ectas Irving Greenberg

IG:blm

.

e

JAN 3 0 1989



Council of Jewish Federations, Inc.

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

Office of the President Mandell L. Berman

January 25, 1989

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

Dear Art:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Cordially. Berman

MLB/bh

cc: Carmin Schwartz Maurice Corson, D.D.

SOLOMON SCHECHTER Day School

Rabbi Joshua Elkin, Headmaster Helen B. Greif, Asst. Principal, Lower Div. Evelyn B. Lang, Asst. Principal, Middle Div. Arnold S. Cover, Director of Admissions Helen J. Kadish, Director of Development Sharon F. Sugarman, Business Manager

January 26,1989

Dr. Arthur J. Naparstek, Dir. Commission on Jewish Education of North America 45 Euclid Avenue Cleveland, Ohio 44103

the she shall

JAN 3 1 1989

Harvey W. Freishtat, President

Bernard H. Pucker, Chairman, Trustees

Rabbi Israel Kazis, Vice Chairman, Trustees

Eliot Shoolman, Vice Chairman, Trustees

Dear Art,

It was good to speak with you the other day. I am following up on our conversation, and in accordance with your request I am putting some of my ideas in writing in the hopes that they can be shared with others involved in this stage of the Commission's planning.

Based on everything that I have studied and in the literature on educational change, I can say with some authority that it is quite important that at this stage of the Commission's work, we begin thinking seriously about ways in which we can share our progress and instill a modest sense of investment among a broader of individuals, beyond the actual members of. group the Given the fact that the Commission hopes to make a Commission. definite impact on the field, it seems quite appropriate to be thinking about ways in which we can nurture and fertilize the field so as to render it more hospitable and ready to receive the major recommendations and the suggested programs that may come out of the Commission's work.

In our phone conversation, you pressed me to become as specific as possible. In following through on that suggestion, I will limit my remarks to the Conservative and Reform Movements. Given the fact that I am most familiar with the Conservative Movement, I will provide the most detail.

Stein Circle Campus - Lower Division, 60 Stein Circle, Newton, MA 02159 (617) 964-7765 Shoolman Campus - Middle Division, 130 Wheeler Road, Newton, MA 02159 (617) 964-9561

The key stake holders in the Conservative Movement are the Jewish Theological Seminary, the United Synagogue of America, the Rabbinical Assembly, the Jewish Educators Assembly, the Solomon Schechter Day School Principals' Council, and the United Synagogue Youth Movement. It seems to me that we should begin the process of engineering a meeting of key representatives from those various constituencies. I don't think that this should be a difficult task. We already have Ismar as the representative of the Seminary, together with myself as a representative from the Schechter Principals, though additional individuals from the Seminary and from the Schechter Day School community could be brought in, if we so choose. It's my sense that Ismar and I could, with the guidance and support of a member of the Commission's staff, convene a meeting to which we might invite the following individuals: The President of the United Synagogue of America; the Chief Executive Officer of the United Synagogue of America; the head of the Department of Education of the United Synagogue; the current President of the Rabbinical Assembly; the current President of the Jewish Educators Assembly; and the Director of the United Synagogue Youth Movement. Most of the particular individuals refered to in this list are people whom I know. While I don't know them well, I have enough connection with them that I feel comfortable with them being involved in such a meeting.

I would see the purposes of such an initial meeting being as follows:

1. To introduce these individuals to the existence of the Commission and to the manner of its work;

2. To lay out for those in attendance the specific areas in which the Commission has chosen to invest its energies;

3. To present the anticipated future time-table of the Commission's activities;

4. To hear reactions from the group and to make some further plans for the periodic sharing of the Commission's progress;

5. To encourage those in attendance (and to provide them with the necessary assistance) to disseminate information on the Commission to members of their constituencies.

The timing for the wider sharing of the information seems very negotiable, but the importance of meeting with the key representatives from each constituency seems very clear to me. With more time, I could give some additional thought to a more specific agenda for that meeting, though I am sure that you and other members of the staff could certainly come up with a good set of items to be tackled at such a meeting.

and the second second second second

In thinking about the Reform Movement, I find myself somewhat stymied because I do not know the players well enough. I suggest that you contact Sarah Lee and Alfred Goschalk to learn about the nature of the key players in that movement and to go about the process of blocking out what an appropriate course of action might be.

Finally, I want to add one additional comment concerning a very important organization involved in Jewish Education - the Coalition for the Advancement of Jewish Education (CAJE). Ι have been involved with CAJE for sometime, and I have a realistic appreciation of what it has and has not accomplished. As you may know, CAJE sponsors an Annual Conference. In August 1989, the 14th Annual CAJE Conference is slated to take place at the As I think through the University of Washington in Seattle. phenomenon of 1,800 individuals involved in Jewish Education gathering together for a week of professional growth, learning, camaraderie, I find myself feeling very strongly that there should be some carefully developed opportunities during the course of the Conference for individuals to learn about the existence of the Commission and the progress that will have been made by that date. I do not envision a large plenary session, nor do I imagine a full-scale leafletting of the Conference. What I have in mind is much more modest. I think that a group of the senior policy advisors, together with members of the Commission, should have a brief meeting to discuss the structuring of a one and a half hour session, possibly given twice during the course of the Coalition, for purposes of briefing interested attendees on what is happening within the Commission's work. I think it would be highly inappropriate for such a large-scale meeting of Jewish Educators to take place without some visibility for the Commission and its work. I would be happy to elaborate further on this at any point, but I did want to mention it at this time because the CAJE planners are now actively involved in the process of putting together the list of sessions to be offered. I believe that the deadline is March 1st, and so there is some reason to move the discussion along sooner than later as to whether it seems appropriate to have some presence of the Commission at the CAJE Conference.

I hope that these remarks are helpful in communicating my position. I would be happy to speak with you further. I would also be very interested in learning from the concept piece that has been written for other constituencies who may need to become aware and moderately invested in the Commission's work.

Warmest regards to you. I do hope we will have a chance to meet on one of your trips East. All the best.

Sincerely, JOSL Joshua Elkin



Brandeis University

Enilip W. Lown Schwolt of Near Eastern and Judaie Studies Benjamin S. Hornstein Program in Jewash Communa Sort acc rel 7-736-2000 Waltham Massachusetts (2254-2414)

February 6, 1939

Dr. Arthur Naparstek, Director Commission on Jewish Education in North America 4500 Euclid Ave. Cleveland, OH 44103-3780

Dear Art,

As we prepare for the meetings of February 7-9 and plan our next steps toward the final report and beyond, I wish to share with you, Mr. Mandel and the senior policy advisors major concerns regarding the issues of personnel and communityleadership. I've expressed some of these concerns before, but they take on renewed urgency based on recent conversations with Barry Shrage, Sara Lee and Harold Schulweis. Realizing that they share these concerns with convictions equal to mine own encourages me to give voice to them once again.

A Commission of continental scope has to develop as broad a perspective as possible on the major issues in Jewish education. I believe we have done so admirably with our analyses of the twenty-six options, and our decision to focus primary, but not exclusive, attention on the issues of personnel and community. However it is of equal importance that we balance this macro perspective with a micro perspective of how the basic services of Jewish education are delivered to the largest numbers of North American Jews in their immediate environments.

The synagogue, for all its obvious weaknesses as an educational institution, remains the single most prominent deliverer of these services on this continent, and especially in the U.S.A. I say this not only because synagogue-based education for school-aged children is by far the most widely used service, but also because many other of the options we survey either are based in the synagogue (such as adult, family and informal education) or recruit heavily from the synagogue membership (such as summer camps or Israel experiences.) Only the JCC's and the denominationally-based day schools come to mind as major alternative or complementary delivers of Jewish educational services.

Yet our analysis thus far has all but overlooked the issues of service-delivery. I say this now precisely because I do not think we can fruitfully proceed with the issues of personnel and community without simultaneously thinking through how whatever changes we hope to bring about in these macro areas will impact

When in our analysis of the options we approached options like adult and family education as domains-in-their-own-right, we ended up downplaying the role of the synagogues in their service delivery

Dr. Arthur Naparstek, Director P. 2. February 6, 1989

. "

on and be impacted by the culture of the synagogue, our major service deliverer.

Let me be more specific in regard to both the issues of personnel and community. There can be no question that without an influx of quality personnel no branch of Jewish education can grow or flourish. But is seems equally obvious that different institutions employ personnel in quite different ways. To be a professional educator in a day school is a dramatically different experience than to be one in a synagogue. Day schools are built around educators; synagogues are built around rabbis. It may be an exaggeration, but not by much, to say that the synagogue as an institution has never learned to comfortably include the professional educator as part of its regular staff. It is at least accurate to say that while synagogues regularly employ full-time rabbis, they much less regularly employ full-time educators and tend to rely on either part-time professional or avocational educators.

If there were available a new cohort of guality Jewish educators, how would they fit into the current synagogue structure? Would they be slotted into the principal's role in the supplementary schools, guaranteeing almost a life of frustration dealing with ill-trained, part-time teachers and divorced from the adult life of the congregation which is the rabbi's domain? Or is there another model by which synagogues can learn to integrate full-time professional educators into the life of the congregation in ways that allow them to function in a multiplicity of roles alongside the rabbi and the lay leadership and develop a set of talents in working with children, adults, teachers and families? Alvin Schiff and Barry Shrage, among others, have written about the need for this second model (in connection with family education), but I am not aware of any systematic effort to put this alternative model into place.² Can this Commission afford to not deal with the issue of how to integrate educators effectively into the life of the community?

In regard to the issue of communal leadership, I believe our suggested focus has been on Federation leadership which is quite appropriate. However, within congregational culture there is also often a gap between those in power and those most concerned and involved with Jewish education. Here I am on less familiar ground, but the work of my colleague Susan Shevitz suggests to me that decision-making by congregational lay leadership is often

Harold Schulweis is working on an alternative model in his congregation as are other rabbis and educators in their congregations. By systematic I mean an-across synagogue, communal effort.

Dr. Arthur Naparstek, Director P. 3, February 6, 1989

not well informed by an appreciation of the educational issues involved and that congregations as an organizational culture will not become more fundamentally hospitable to providing quality educational opportunities until its top leadership becomes more involved and better informed. Sara Lee has made a similar point with equal power. Will we find a way to address this aspect of community leadership?

In practice I not only support Josh Elkin's plea that we begin to include in our work regular contact with the denominations and with CAJE (where most synagogue educators are to be found), but also that we devote regular staff time to a consideration of these delivery-issues when thinking through the issues of personnel and community. If we go ahead with a bestpractices volume, we can also use that as an opportunity to highlight congregations that have made significant strides towards prioritizing Jewish education for all their members and including Jewish educators as a proud and integral part of congregational life.

I hope these issues will find a way into our discussions next week.

Sincerely yours,

Joseph Reimer

 $n\mathbf{b}$

. 1

David S. Ariel October 4, 1988

> North American Commission on Jewish Education Proposal on Approaches to Training Issues

1. Historical Importance of Jewish Educational Personnel "It is customary in each general assembly of Jewish leadership to examine the by-laws governing the affairs of the community in general and in detail. The first and most important among them concerns support for education." (Regulations of the National Jewish Council of Lithuania [1623-1764]).

2. Definition of Problem of Personnel: a picture of the personnel issue in North America based on studies by the Jewish Agency, Bank and Aron, JESNA and others.

3. Review of Literature: A review of the recent studies on personnel in Jewish education and the state of research (Fishman 1987; Cohen and Wall, 1987; Schiff et. al, 1987; Chazan, 1988; Brandeis Conference on Professionalization, etc.)

4. Training Institutions: A review of the types of training institutions, a summary of the enrollments by institutions and follow up on placement of graduates; consideration of the strengths and weaknesses of each institutional genre; preliminary description of each institution.

A. Denominational Seminaries

Yeshiva University Jewish Theological Seminary Hebrew Union College Reconstructionist Rabbinical College

B. Colleges of Jewish Studies

Spertus College of Judaica Boston Hebrew College Cleveland College of Jewish Studies Baltimore Hebrew University Gratz College

The second secon

C. University Programs

Brandeis University McGill University Others 5. Literature on Professional Training: What are the elements of a profession and how how do these elements relate to Jewish education? Should professionalization be a goal? Should there be differentiation between professionalization and avocational training?

A. The authority of the profession derives from dependence upon the knowledge and competence of the profession and the legitimacy or validity of its interpretations of reality ("persuasive claim to [cultural] authority"). [First problem in Jewish education is that Jewish educators lack a persuasive claim to cultural authority. This is due to the ambiguous relation of Jews to Judaism.]

Authority signifies the possession of some status, quality or claim that compels trust or obedience. (Steven Lukes, "Power and Authority") [Status for Jewish educators cannot be improved through salaries and benefits. Improved compensation is the result of increased status. Thus, the key to improving status is to create a persuasive claim to authority for Jewish educators. Jewish education must first address the issues of dependence and legitimacy.]

The acceptance of authority signifies a "surrender of private judgment" and the acceptance of the superior competence of the professional.(Paul Starr, Social Transformation of American Medicine) [The authority of a Jewish educator is based, in part, on superior competence in Jewish knowledge but must also be based on dependence upon that knowledge. In what way are Jews "dependent" upon the knowledge of Jewish educators? How is Jewish knowledge indispensable?)

6. Training Issues in Jewish Education

A. Professional Issues

Recruitment Training (Preservice) (Inservice) Placement/ Hiring Compensation and Benefits Retention Professional Growth and Development

B. Institutional Issues

Mission and Purpose (Specialized or General) Resources (Faculty, Students, Finances) Institutional Outcomes and Effectiveness 7. Educational Positions: What are the positions for which personnel are being trained, where training is provided. What are the new positions which are not being trained and where training could be offered. Strategic considerations: comprehensiveness of focus, differentiation, prioritization.

A. Preschool and Early Childhood Programs

Educational Director Teachers

- B. Elementary Day School Educational Director Teachers
- C. Elementary Supplementary School Educational Director Teachers
- D. Day High School Educational Director Teachers
- E. Supplementary High School Educational Director Teachers
- F. College Programs
- G. Adult Education Programs
- H. Jewish Community Centers Summer Camping Programs Retreat Centers Youth Activity Programs
- I. Congregations Family/ Parent Educators J. Community Specialists Curriculum Specialists
- 8. Institutional Issues

A. What types of training are needed? Is there one generic program or must there be specialized programs such as denominational programs, day school, supplementary, etc.? (See preliminary report of Association of Institutions of Higher Learning in Jewish Education)

B. What types of institutions should provide this training? What is the role of seminaries, colleges of Jewish studies and university programs? What sort of change is needed within these institutions?

9. Related Issues

and have a second second second second second second second second second second second second second second s

A. Is the creation of a national network of specialpurpose institutions feasible? To what extent are the approaches to training denominational, national or local? How many such institutions are needed? B. What is the best way to address the needs of smaller communities?

C. How can the cadre of university faculty in Judaic studies be of benefit to this area?

D. How can a persuasive claim to cultural authority for Jewish education be established?E. What is the proper role of Israel in educator training?

10. A Process for exploring the issues

A. Consultation among Senior Policy Advisors

B. Consultation with appropriate Commission Members (Lee, Elkins, Green, Bieler, Schiff, Lamm, Schorsch, Twersky, etc)

C. Consultation with members of the Association of Institutions of Higher Learning in Jewish Education and ... other appropriate bodies involved in training (e.g. Wexner Foundation Institutional Grants Program)

D. Development of Draft Document on training personnel in Jewish education for consideration

main \word \training.doc

CHARLES H. REVSON FOUNDATION

444 MADISON AVENUE NEW YORK, N.Y. 10022-6962 (212) 935-3340

ADRIAN W. DeWIND Chairman

HARRY MERESMAN Secretary and Treasurer

SIMON H. RIFKIND Honorary Chairman

Horton L. Mandel 4500 Euclid Avenue Cleveland, OH 44103

Dear Hort,

I always admire risk-taking in philanthropy and more than that, real leadership; they are both rare commodities these days. You convened a wonderful meeting and I want to congratulate you for taking the chance on launching it for an adroit choice of members. It was refreshing to watch the professionals and the lay leadership listening to each other and I think the cooperative spirit was a real tribute to you. I also want to congratulate the staff for pulling together materials and data so we could all talk to each other with the same set of facts.

I look forward to participating in the next meeting.

Best wishes,

EE:df

ELLN: EVANS President

August 16, 1988

DAVID HIRSCHHORN

BLAUSTEIN BUILDING BALTIMORE, ND: 21201 NAILING ADDRESS POST OFFICE BOX 200 BALTIMORE, MD. 21203

August 3, 1988

Mr. Morton L. Mandel Mandel Associated Foundations 1750 Euclid Avenue Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Dear Morton:

I am pleased to have been a participant in the first meeting of the Commission on Jewish Education in North America last Monday, and I am happy to have had the opportunity to meet you. My apologies for finding it necessary to leave the meeting before its conclusion due to an overlapping commitment. I shall look forward to receiving the Minutes of the meeting.

In addition to the major themes identified by Mr. Yanowitz in his summary, I would suggest that we consider adding to the Commission's Agenda, the subject of evaluation of programs in Jewish education. I recognize that this is a difficult problem. The Commission would be making an important contribution if the methodology for such evaluation could be developed. Many programs are being undertaken with unclear objectives as to what the program is intended to achieve. How are we to measure success or failure? In this connection, the suggestion made during the meeting that case studies of successful programs be circulated would represent one form of evaluation, provided such case studies included information which identifies how the judgement as to the success of the program was determined.

As you are aware, large sums are already being expended for various forms of formal and informal Jewish education. For example, in Baltimore, almost half of the Associated budget for local services is directed toward programs of formal and informal Jewish education. I am sure more funds are needed, and presumably, one of the objectives of the Commission is to stimulate such additional funding. However, I am concerned that there will never be enough funding unless steps are taken to provide for greater accountability in the use of these funds.

I look forward to participating in the further deliberations of the Commission and I convey my best regards.

Sincerely, Denil Ideachter

DH:ez cc: Mr. Arthur J. Naparstek, Director 🗸 RABBI HASKEL LOOKSTEIN 117-125 EAST 85m STREET New York, N.Y. 10028

THE STUDY HANOVER 7-1000

August 8, 1988

Dr. Arthur Naparstek Premier Industrial Foundation 4500 Euclid Avenue Cleveland, Ohio 44103

Dear Dr. Naparstek:

I am writing in response to a telephone conversation which I had with Annette Hochstein before she left for Israel. We talked about some of the items that I had raised at the meeting of the Commissioners and also about some items which I did not raise. She suggested that it would be a good idea to write to you and make some specific suggestions reflecting my thinking. I shall try to do just that.

Before I proceed, let me put in writing what I tried to say orally about my very good feeling concerning the work of this Commission. In the first instance, just the possibility of working together with so many fine minds and so many committed people of varied religious outlooks is extremely inspiring. We all have many common goals, and to think that we can sit down and work on them together, despite our philosophic differences, is something which ought to be quite obvious but which, unfortunately, in our Jewish world, is not. Furthermore, the idea of having a chance to work with other people to change or influence the trends in American Jewish life that upset us, at least those trends which touch upon Jewish education, is also very exciting. In short, I am very grateful for the opportunity to serve.

Ι.

I am glad the document which summarized the interviews began with "The people who educate." There is nothing more important than that concern if we are going to improve - or even maintain - Jewish education in America today and tomorrow.

The question which I publicly aired at the meeting is not a frivolous one. Very few of us would not worry about a decision of our children to enter the field of Jewish education unless we had sufficient independent means to be able to support them outside

Dr. Arthur Naparstek

of their compensation in the field. That's not the way to build Jewish education in this country. We have to compete in some way with law, medicine, business, computer science, and other fields which draw our best minds away from the service of our people.

We start out with certain advantages. An idealist will find Jewish education to be extremely satisfying. The work year is considerably shorter than the normal work year in the market place. Even the hours are a little bit more reasonable, although those of us who move into administration find that it is a seven day a week - day and night - proposition. And yet, the calendar is much more civilized than that of a young lawyer, doctor or businessman.

The key issue, however, is compensation and professional standing. I have some ideas about professional standing but I would like to focus on compensation.

It seems scandalous that a young person who already has a bachelor degree, or perhaps a master's, and who, if he or she is on the Judaic studies side of Jewish education, also has a Judaic studies background, should have to start a career in teaching in a Day School at a salary less than \$25,000 a year. Different areas of the country may have other standards but, surely, in the major metropolitan centers that is not too much to expect for somebody who is going to devote himself or herself to the future of our children. Moreover, that salary has to rise significantly over, let us say, the first ten years in the field. Within ten years the teacher ought to be able to expect a salary in the range of \$50,000 to \$60,000 without becoming an administrator.

How can we do this? Perhaps the way to do it is by matching grants. Pick a figure which a school ought to be able to afford as a starting salary (\$18,000?) and say that we - whoever that "we" is - will provide half or three-quarters of the difference between that figure and \$25,000. Moreover, if the salary increase is \$3,500 a year (in ten years that means the salary will go to \$63,500) "we" will provide half of that salary increase.

I am not sure who "we" is. Perhaps it should be the Federation in a particular city. Perhaps it should be a consortium of foundations. Under any circumstances, however, it seems to me that we have to provide the funding for this kind of salary. Anything that is much less than that is not going to attract the best minds and talents to the field. Moroever, the worst thing is to have excellent teachers feel that in order to get ahead financially they have to become administrators. Frequently, the best teachers make poor administrators. But even if they turn out to be good, we have lost an excellent teacher in the classroom. If I had my way, I would much rather have excellent teachers in every class than an outstanding principal. An outstanding principal with poor teachers will have a poor school. Ourstanding teachers with a mediocre principal will still be a very good school; if not excellent, at least close to excellent.

Another important idea is in the fringe benefits area. Ramaz has a pension system whereby after three years in the school the faculty member pays four percent and Ramaz pays six percent. There is immediate vesting in the pension. The pension goes up a quarter of a percent per year for each partner, which means that in sixteen years the school is paying ten percent and the teacher eight percent. This represents a very fine pension if somebody stays in the field for about 25 to 30 years. If my memory serves me correctly, we receive about two percent from the Fund for Jewish Education here in New York to help us with that pension. We. appreciate that help but, surely, it is quite minimal. For many other schools it means that they don't have have good pensions. For us, it means that we are running a tuition in the high school of close to \$8,500 a year (this is directly attributable to the high salaries we are paying and the fringe benefits - pension and medical - which we have to fund ourselves). Since we are also a school which has a broad range of economic classes among our students, it means that we have to provide some form of scholarship for about 53 percent of our studnets. What we have, therefore, is a kind of graduated income tax whereby those who can afford to pay are paying very high tuition and others are paying less.

We are a better school because of the salaries and fringe benefits but we may be pricing ourselves out of the market. We need help from the outside. Other schools certainly do if we are to raise the quality of teachers who are attracted to Jewish education.

Among the fringe benefits, besides medical (which is going out of sight), dental (which we cannot even afford) and pension, there is the matter I raised at the meeting of providing free Jewish education for any teacher who is devoting himself or herself to Jewish education. In the school in which the teacher is teaching the education ought to be absolutely free. In another school we ought to be paying half the tuition. That's what colleges are doing to attract good people. Surely the Day School movement should not be doing less.

What I have sketchily outlined here is very expensive. I would like to add one further point, namely, that when I speak about teachers, I mean teachers who are in Judaic studies or in general studies (other schools call it secular studies). Both are giving our children a Jewish education and, therefore, both have to be treated exactly the same way. If we do the things that I have suggested - and perhaps some other things which I haven't thought of - we will fill the teacher training schools with good people, we will have excellent people to go to the seminars and in-service programs and we will have people to whom we can give a higher status and empowerment and personal growth (I am quoting from item E in the interview reviews). If we don't do the basic financial work, however, everything else is going to be less productive. We simply will not have the people to train, to improve, to empower and to elevate. Recruitment of the right people to come into the field is the number one priority, it seems to me. Salaries and fringe benefits are the number one way to do the recruiting. Look at the legal profession and the business world for the models.

II.

In Roman Numeral III of the Review, there are some questions about the extent to which Day School education ought to be supported or supplementary schools ought to be encouraged. While I believe that it is important to strengthen supplementary schools because, in many cases, that's where the clients are, I would like to stress the fact that Day School education has been markedly successful. Among the Day Schools the importance of encouraging students to continue through their high school years cannot be over-emphasized. Moreover, while the impact on students is of course related to the kind of homes they come from, the statement that "students coming from homes that do not support the values and goals of these institutions" may perhaps not benefit so much from Day Schools, is not borne out by research. I have a study that was just done of Ramaz graduates over the past 50 years. While it is clear that the stronger the home the better the results of the education, it is also clear that even with so-called weaker homes there is a substantial impact of the education. I would be happy to make this study available to the Commission if you would like it. I might even suggest that you contact the person who ran the study, Dr. Nathalie Friedman, at 451 West End Avenue, New York City, 10024 (212 TR-3-2064) she has a good deal of information and insight which does not appear as yet in the actual published version of the study which is due to come out in about three months. She has a world of conclusions that might be very helpful to the Dr. Friedman is a chief sociological researcher at Commission. Columbia University and the acting chairman of the department of sociology at Barnard College.

In speaking about informal education, I would like to make a concrete suggestion about camping. My own experience has been that I attended the Ramaz School through elementary school and high school and during my high school and college years I was a camper and then a counselor at Camp Massad, a Hebrew speaking camp which went out of business about five years ago after having had a tremendous impact on several thousand campers over the course of some forty years. That camp no longer exists and it has left a tremendous void in the centrist Orthodox community.

Massad was a Hebrew speaking camp, devoted to Jewish religion, culture and in, particular, Zionism. Hundreds of its alumni live in Israel. Many, many more are leading personalities in the field of Jewish education and communal leadership. Several of them were sitting around the table at the Commission meeting last week. It was a place in which Orthodox and non-Orthodox felt quite comfortable. I learned to get along with people who disagree with me because of my experience at that camp. I also developed a taste for Jewish leadership and the rabbinate in the camp, rather than in my school. For better or for worse, I probably am a rabbi today more because of Massad than because of Ramaz.

If there is a Foundation which wants to make a very significant contribution to Jewish education, the training of leaders, the development of a love for <u>klal Yisrael</u> and the land and people of Israel and to do it all in a Hebrew setting and in a camp which runs according to <u>halakha</u> but which is hospitable to people who are not fully observant, this is a camp which ought to be resurrected. It will not be easy, but I can tell you that there are people and institutions ready to help in this effort, notably Ramaz School and the Yeshiva of Flatbush here in New York. There are not enough opportunities for modern Orthodox young people to be able to go to an inspirational summer camp which is run by an organization as a non-profit entity rather than by private people who, fundamentally, have a profit motive in mind. I think that Dr. Alvin Schiff could shed a good deal of light on this.

I hope that these remarks have been helpful. They probably have been a little bit more longwinded than necessary but rabbis in general, and this particular one specifically, have been accused of that deficiency before. I should of course be more than happy to discuss this with anybody at any time which is convenient.

Once again, thank you for giving me the opportunity to work together with so many wonderful people for such an important cause.

Very cordially yours,

Haskel Lookstein

III.

DONALD R. MINTZ 643 MAGAZINE STREET New Obleans, Louisiana 70130-3477

August 4, 1988

PERSONAL

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

Dear Mort:

I thought the first meeting of the Commission on Jewish Education of North America was extraordinarily productive and positive. The composition of the Commission, together with the interest displayed during the meeting, is a fitting tribute to your wonderful leadership.

I am pleased and privileged to be a part of the effort and moreover, enormously grateful that JWB is a partner in this historic project.

With warmest best wishes, I am

Sincerely, nale

Donald R. Mintz

DRM/pie

Board of Jewish Education of Greater New York



426 West 58th Street / New York, NY 10019 / (212) 245-8200

DR. ALVIN 1. SC mills Executive Vice Preside

August 5, 1988

Arthur Naperstek 2452 Lamberton Avenue Cleveland Heights, Ohio 44118

Dear Arthur:

I thought that the Monday meeting of the Commission was a good one. Most of the credit goes to your careful planning and orientation. As we say in our part of the woods, "Yishar Kochacha".

Much of the discussion actually revolved around givens and confirmed the fact that the challenges of Jewish education are rather clear. In this regard, the last two pages of "Jewish Education at the Crossroads", which I prepared for the Joint Program Jewish for Education, may be helpful. I'm enclosing a copy of this item for you.

The reason for this letter is just to elaborate on some of the remarks I made at the meeting. There are, to my mind, three major categories of challenge:

Personnel

- 2. Children and Families
- 3. Technology

1. Personnel

Regarding this challenge, I am enclosing some information about the "Year of the Jewish Educator" prepared by COJEO.

Questions re personnel which must be answered are:

What will attract personnel? What will keep them? This includes consideration of the teachers' workplace. It refers to the various kinds of educational settings in which teachers work. In many instances, this suggests an upgrading of the school environment and informal programs. Upgrading the workplace carries with it the need to increase possibilities for professional advancement and for career opportunities as well as more meaningful professional experience.

Another question to be answered is:

What will make teachers productive?

In this case, appropriate training to deal with needs of children and families is a necessary response. Moreover, teachers need to be able to be models for their students. They must also be capable of fusing formal and informal education strategies in their work.

2. Families and Children

Reaching and teaching family members of school children and youth in informal educational settings is a major challenge. The need to develop family support systems for pupils is absolutely essential if Jewish education is to become more effective. This means a knowledgeable adult base for our Jewish child education. There is significant research to support this contention. The Jewish supplementary school study of BJE of Greater New York reinforces this point.

3. Technology

How to use technology for formal and informal educational settings is absolutely essential as we enter the 21st century. This means harnessing all kinds of available hardware and software for the purposes of Jewish education in the school, the center, the community and the home.

Essentially, as I noted in my remarks during the morning session, our efforts should be geared to three target populations;

- schools and programs that are effective (example: Day Schools and Camps to which about 20% of the Jewish child population is exposed). These need to be strengthened.
- (2) ineffective schools and programs (example: Supplementary Schools through which approximately 55% of Jewish youth will "pass"). These instrumentalities must be radically changed.
- (3) "Unaffiliated" Jewish children and youth (about 25% of the Jewish child population). These need to be reached and taught effectively.

Developing the appropriate strategies for each target population is our major challenge. Here, providing qualified, creative personnel, adequate family support and effective use of technology, are essential.

With warm wishes, I remain,

Keep up the good work,

Kal Trus

Sincerely,

Alvin I. Schiff

AIS:1z cc: Morton Mandel

MEMORANDUM

TO: Art Naparstek

DATE: April 24, 1989

FROM: Paula Berman Cohen

RE: Communications Strategy: News Media

As you requested at our meeting on April 13, 1989, I have contacted organizations which represent the Commission's key publics to identify existing forms of communications, i.e. newsletters. In addition, I interviewed the following people in order to explore supplementary strategies for reaching key publics: David Ariel, Joel Fox, David Kleinman, Frank Strauss, Henry Zucker.

Through these discussions, additional forms of media--i.e. satellite communications, national newspapers and journals, news service--and, the largest communities which may warrant subsequent contact through local organizations, were identified. Of these, only the news service organization--Jewish Telegraphic Agency, and satellite communications--CJF Satellite Network, were surveyed. The other publications and largest communities are listed at the end of this memorandum (II. and III.) for your review and consideration for future utilization.

Each entry has been assigned a rating which provides you with my recommendations for how best to utilize it. Specifically, the codes address the following:

<u>Numbers = Time Frame</u>

- (1) = immediate (between now and the June meeting)
- (2) = near future (immediately following June meeting)
- (3) = future (to be determined)

Letters = Type of Submission

- (a) = news release
- (b) = feature article
- (c) = opinion editorial

The opportunities for op.ed.'s have not yet been researched. Through the individual interviews mentioned above, however, several national papers were identified and have been marked accordingly. I. Publications and Organizations contacted:

A. <u>National News Service</u>

··· ··

2(a)	Jewish Tele gr aphic Agency (212) 643-1890 Editor: Mark Jaffe Mg. Ed: Elli Wohlgelernter	<u>Daily News Bulletin</u> 2,500 circulation Published 5 days/week Reports breaking news of international interest; does not print press releases or announcements.
1(a) 2(a) 2(b)		Community News Reporter 5,000 circulation + 100 jewish newspapers Published weekly Reports community and organization news; will accept concise press release which describes Commission and its' activities (up to 2 pages, double spaced); enclose background information separately.

In addition to covering Commission news in the <u>Community News</u> <u>Reporter</u> JTA will also distribute articles on the Commission which appear in the <u>Cleveland Jewish News</u>, to its' 100 other newspaper subscribers.

B. <u>Satellite Communications</u>

3	Council of Jewish Federations (212) 475-5000	<u>CJF Satellite Network</u> Television link to 50
	Contact: Frank Strauss	federations across the country Open scheduling Well-suited for conferences, news briefing, presentations; Costs range from \$2,500 - \$5,500/hr depending upon production requirements (# of cameras, teleprompter, etc.).

C. <u>National/Umbrella Organizations</u>

	Council of Jewish Federations (212) 475-5000 Contact: Frank Strauss Editor: Amy Rothchild	News Briefs 600 circulation (CJF Board, Federation Executives and Presidents) Published monthly Reports CJF activities; will accept a press release or announcement (and photos) on Commission Deadline: 15th of the month
l(a) 2(a)		What's New in Federations 7,000 circulation Published quarterly (April, June, Sept., Dec.) Reports on what is going on in federations around the country; Will accept a press release or announcement (and photos) on Commission
	Submit one release (up to 3 pages, it is for inclusion in one or both	
2(a)	Jewish Education Service of North America (212) 529-2000	Pedagogic Reporter 4,800 circulation (practitioners, senior educators, principals) Published quarterly Contains column for JESNA news-briefs suited for Commission news, updates, announcements. Deadline: 10 weeks prior to publication Editor: Mordecai Lewittes (unavailable until 4/27/89)
2(b)		<u>Trends</u> 2,500 circulation (5,000 printed) (distributed to community leadership in Bureaus and Federations) Published semi-annually Each issue developed around a single theme; does not print press releases or announcements; well-suited for major article on Commission outcomes or

recommendations. Contact: Leora Isaacs

2(a) A new publication is being developed by JESNA for distribution in the Fall, 1989. Its' focus will be on news briefs; Commission news will be welcome.

· • •

- 1(a) A packet of information is sent out regularly by Jon Woocher to Bureau Directors. See entry under Bureau Directors Fellowship.
- 1(a) A packet of information is sent out regularly by Jon Woocher to Education Contacts, i.e. Federation Executives and/or Jewish Education contacts. Packets include, but are not limited to, briefing paper and position announcements. News, announcements, updates and articles on the Commission are welcome.

l(a) Jewish Welfare Board 2(a) (212) 532-4949 2(b)	<u>Circle</u> 24,000 circulation Published bi-monthly Reports on center and conference activities; will accept article or announcement (and photos) on the Commission. Deadline: 1 month prior to publication Editor: Shirley Frank
2(b)	Zarkor 2-3,000 circulation Publishes information

Publishes information considered helpful to practitioners, i.e. resources, program ideas, models; better suited for major article on Commission outcomes, recommendations, etc.

?(a) "Board Highlights" are distributed to Presidents, Executives and (b) Officers of all centers, following each Board meeting (next one slated for September, 1989). When the Commission, or its' representative, is next on the JWB Board Meeting Agenda, a detailed article on the Commission could be included in the subsequent "Highlights" mailing.

- 1(a) An information packet is distributed weekly to all center
- 2(a) Executives. Information on the Commission is welcome. If the Commission publishes its' own newsletter or progress report, additional copies could be included in the Executive's mailing for the centers to distribute to their local leadership.

4

- 1(a) Bureau Directors Fellowship
- 2(a) (305) 576-4030

. . .

2(b) Contact: Gene Greensweig

Per Mr. Greensweig and Jon Woocher, there is no organizational publication. The only regular mailing to members of BDF is through JESNA. (Information packets are sent out regularly by Jon Woocher.) Information on the Commission--articles, announcements, progress reports, etc.-- is welcome. If the Commission publishes its' own newsletter or progress report, extra copies could be included in the packets with a recommendation that they be distributed to local leadership.

<pre>1(b) Coalition for the Advancement 3 of Jewish Education (212) 696-0740 Editor: Ronni Strongin</pre>	Jewish Education News 4,000 circulation Published 3 times per year Each issue is developed around a specific theme, and also includes information on CAJE events; does not accept press releases unless it relates directly to CAJE members or conference activities. Deadline: May 3 (summer issue distributed at August meeting).
1(a) B'nai B'rith 2(a) (202) 857-6585 2(b) Editor: Linda Ostro-Schlesinger	<u>The Insider</u> 6,000 circulation (B'nai B'rith Leadership) Published 8 times per year Includes small feature articles, news briefs and program calendars; accepts press releases and announcements Deadline: 1 month before publication.
l(a) Editor: Jeff Rubin 2(a) 2(b)	<u>B'nai B'rith International</u> <u>Jewish Monthly</u> 500,000 circulation Published monthly Includes 2-3 feature articles, small features and profiles, column on B'nai B'rith news; accepts press releases and announcements. Deadline: 2 months before publication.

Union of American Hebrew 3 Congregations (212) 249-0100 Editor: Aron Hirt-Manheimer

Reform Judaism circulation unknown Published quarterly Movement-wide publication; accepts press releases.

- (212) 245-8200

1(a) Coalition for the Advancement Conference on Jesuich 2(a) of Josish Education 3 (212) 245-8200 Educator Organizations

COJEO does not have a publication for members of its' constituent organizations. Representatives meet monthly, and it is up to the executive boards of each organization to communicate information to the membership.

1(a) Hadassah

¢. . .

- 2(a) (212) 355-7900 2(b) Contact: Jim Lee (Director of Public Affairs)

<u>Hadassah Magazine</u> 400,000 circulation Published 10 times per year Does not routinely accept press releases for publication.

Tapestry

(circulation unknown) Published 4 times per year through the Jewish Education Department; distributed to professionals involved in education programs/services. Contents include suggestions on educational programs.

Submit Commission information directly to Jim Lee, Director of Public Affairs. He determines what information is suitable and for which publication.

П. Publications to be researched:

National Newspapers 1(a)

2(a)

2(b/c)

<u>The Jerusalem Post</u>	The National Jewish Post & Opinion
(212) 355-4440	(317) 927-7800
55,000 circulation	103,000 circulation
Published weekly	Published weekly
Deadline: 2 weeks before publication	Deadline: Wednesday noon, 1 week before publication

2(b) B. National Journals

£

Journal of Jewish Communal Service (201) 821-1871 (CJCS) 4,800 circulation Published quarterly Welcomes news releases releases Deadline: 10 weeks before publication Editor: Sanford Sherman Assoc.Ed: Phyllis Ollander

Present Tense (212) 751-4000 40,000 circulation Published bimonthly Welcomes news

Deadline: 10 weeks before publication Editor: Murray Polner

Moment (202) 387-8888 30,000 circulation Published monthly Welcomes news releases releases Deadline: 6 months before publication Editor: Hershel Shanks Exec.Ed: Suzanne Singer <u>Tikkun</u> (415) 482-0805 40,000 circulation Published bimonthly Welcomes news

Deadline: 4 weeks before publication Editor: Michael Lerner Assoc. Ed: Peter Gabel

III. Communities to be considered for target communications:

Publications produced by key local organizations, i.e. federations and centers, for their constituents are another resource to be considered. CJF has a list of member agency cities, separated according to size: large, large intermediate, intermediate, etc. JWB also has a directory, organized by both geographic location and city size. With the help of these lists, a distribution strategy targeting Commission information directly to key local organizations, may be devised.

CJF Top "19" Cities

3

Atlanta, GA Baltimore, MD Bergen County, NJ Boston, MA Chicago, IL Cleveland, OH

Denver, CO Detroit, MI Los Angeles, CA MetroWest, NJ Miami, FL Montreal, PQ New York, NY Philadelphia, PA St. Louis, MO Puttolung, PA San Francisco, CA Toronto, ONT Washington, DC

IV. Recommendations for Press Materials:

Editor's Facts Sheet

Commission facts sheet which accompanies all news releases (including multiple/ongoing submissions to the same publication/organization). Available to send out at any time for unscheduled requests. "Bullet" format in which information is provided in either question/answer or heading/description presentation. 2 pages maximum length. Covers such information as: definition, sponsors, goals, timetable, members.

<u>News Release</u> Concise statements, focused on one topic. 300 words.

before June Meeting:

Advisory on where Commission stands, going into June Meeting, with particular emphasis on identification of 2 priorities: focus on people in jewish education (personnel), and community-its leadership, structure and funding sources as a major agent for change.

after June Meeting:

Report on discoveries/outcomes from June meeting. If more than one major announcement to report, prepare separate releases.

<u>Feature Articles</u> 500-1,000 words Same topics with different slant for general/jewish media, as appropriate.

Suggested topics for general and jewish media:

1. 'This is the time for change', it is in the air in communities across North America (point to specific illustrations to acknowledge those local communities/organizations also involved in seeking change in jewish education. Use that as the springboard for introducing the Commission as the entity which has the vision and leadership to bring the entire North American community together, coalescing what is 'in the air'.

- 2. Develop profile of Mort Mandel--philanthropist, Jewish leader, corporate leader, (and, possibly selected other key forces on the Commission), to sell an idea which might lead to a feature story in a major publication.
- 3. Descriptive article on mechanisms which may come about as a result of the Commission, which identifies applications to other school movements, i.e. catholic and public school systems. (This topic may also warrant smaller feature articles which relate to specific mechanisms/publics.)

Suggested topic for jewish media: (in addition to above)

4. Pluralism--Jewish community is made-up of diverse traditions. Through the Commission entity worked consciously to merge together to reach common goal ("wedding together of different groups and ideas").

Opinion Editorial (Op.Ed.)

Philosophical article on specific theme, submitted by Commission representative (prepared by staff, as warranted). Article suggestions listed above may also be developed as 'op. ed.' Both could be submitted to the same publication.

Suggested topics include:

- 1. Commission as the entity which has the vision and leadership to bring entire North American Jewish community together.
- 2. "Personnel" and "Community": the priorities which set the stage for jewish education.
- 3. Mechanisms.

rev.4/26/89

Draft For Discussion - September 14, 1988

THE COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA

SUGGESTED NORMS FOR ALL COMMISSION DOCUMENTS

At the debriefing sessions following the first Commission meeting, the planning group agreed that it might be useful to set down agreed-upon norms to guide the preparation and presentation of all papers to be written for the Commission.

Scope

The following materials are involved:

- a. Documents for the Commissioners e.g. the data pages for the first commission meeting.
- b. Staff research papers e.g. the background paper on which the data pages were based; the personnel document to be prepared for the second meeting: the "map" of Jewish education, etc...
- c. Commissioned research if and when needed and decided upon.
- Policy papers for the Commissioners. e.g. Summary of interviews; options' paper.
- e. All future publications of the Commission, e.g. "Best Practice" document.

<u>Goal</u>

Our purpose is to reach agreement, and some amount of uniformity, as to the <u>Method</u> by which documents are prepared, the <u>Level</u> of social science thinking and research involved, and guidelines for the <u>written presentation</u> of documents.

Rationale

The need for such agreement arises from two peculiarities of our work:

** Materials are being prepared by different people in separate and distant locations. This makes it harder to ensure adequate communication of expectations and of the anticipated depth, reliability, and validity of the background work.

** Ours is a multi-disciplinary endeavor. The unifying factor is the policy orientation of the Commission. This requires methodological agreement on the use of Social Science research for policy making, and on the applicable research norms. 1 The major challenge facing research for public policy is to strike a correct balance between the research needs and the inherent characteristics of the decision-making world. Chief amongst these are time limitations (Commissioners will not wait to take their decisions); limitations of resources (what are adequate and relevant research parameters); and the need to translate policy questions into social science questions - and then to translate social science findings back into policy-relevant language.

Some guidelines

These guidelines do not presume to relate to the individual methods of research, data-gathering, analysis and scientific reporting of the researchers. Rather they come to deal with one common aspect of all the Commission work.

- 1. All materials prepared for the Commission irrespective of their depth or breadth should represent state-of-the-art knowledge.
- 2. The use of state-of-the-art methods appropriate to policy-oriented research should be encouraged. Polling methods of various kinds (e.g. delphi) should be considered - as a means of involving some or all Commissioners and various publics in the analytic process and the learning that will lead to recommendations.
- 3. Every paper prepared should fit within the overall workplan and research design for the Commission.
- The methodology used in the preparation of materials should be disclosed preferably before the paper is written - for critique by the planning group.
- 5. Consultations with the top experts in the various fields of relevance is probably our most effective means to overcome the time constraints inherent in the Commission work, while maintaining the quality level we seek. In order to ensure state-of-the-art knowledge, no materials will be circulated beyond the planning group before the author has the opportunity to consult with experts, either individually or in group meetings. Hopefully, as work progresses, a group of experts may be identified for ongoing consultation.
- 6. In each case, we will decide who is the relevant audience for the document. Documents for the Commissioners must be prepared with the following elements in mind:
- * The pluralistic nature of the Commission requires awareness of the diverse sensitivities amongst Commissioners. Is the document likely to offend such sensitivity? If yes, is it a necessary and worthwhile price to pay?

* The presentation should meet the requirement of very intelligent, very busy lay-people.

-

7. We may decide to allocate oversight responsibility for these various elements to different members of the planning group.

<u>Noțes</u>

1. There is extensive literature on these topics. The following article may be useful:

James Coleman: "Policy Research in the Social Sciences", 1972, General Learning Corporation.

CONCUSSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA

MASTER SCHEDULE CONTROL 76392 (REV. 12/86) PRINTED IN U.S.A. 1988-

- 1990-----ELEMENT Oct. Nov. Dec. Jan. Feb. Mar. May Apr. June July Aug. Sept. Oct. Dec. Nov. Jan. Feb. Mar. 10/10-10/13 2/7-12/12-Planning Group 12/15 2/9 Senior Policy Advisors 10/12 12/12-2. 12/14 10-4pm 12/13 6/15 3. Commission 6/14 Task Forces 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. . 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19 20

÷.

FROM THE SECOND TO THE THIRD COMMISSION MEETING FIVE MONTH PLAN: FEBRUARY-JUNE 1989 SECOND DRAFT -- FEBRUARY 6, 1989

DESIGN THE OUTCOMES

Having decided to focus its efforts on personnel and the community, the next task of the Commission is to design and agree upon desired outcomes of its work. This decision--which may be altered as work proceeds--will dictate the nature and process of the work for the coming year.

The kind and amount of research and development activities; the nature of networking and public relations; the involvement of institutions and foundations; the role of individual commissioners; the staff work--all should be defined and specified in relation to the current definition of outcomes.

1. Draft Alternatives

A brief outline drafting possible outcomes will be prepared for discussion purposes. The first version of this outline should be ready for the meetings of February 7-9. It should be viewed as a working paper only, used for brainstorming and discussion purposes only. A decision should be taken as to the need and appropriateness of preparing a paper for distribution amongst commissioners.

2. <u>Wise-people</u>

Ongoing consultations will be held with various experts--academics and practitioners. The current series of consultations relates to the nature and viability of various types of outcomes that will be presented in the outcomes outline document.

3. Brainstorming

A staff brainstorming session will be held in Cleveland on the topic of outcomes.

4. <u>Research Design</u>

A research design will be prepared following decision on the type of outcome aimed at.

5. <u>Research on Personnel</u>

Data gathering and reviewing existing research should be undertaken, both for defining the nature and scope of the problem and for offering a picture of the field (for the purpose of the final report).

Issues may arise that will require commissioning research e.g., evaluation of existing training programs; norms for training personnel.

6. <u>Research on the Community</u>

Data gathering and reviewing existing research should be undertaken, both for defining the nature and scope of the problem and for offering a picture of the field (for the purpose of the final report). Issues may arise that will require more basic research e.g., the cost of education; profile of leadership; how the community perceives Jewish Education and the need for improvement.

7. Carry out Research

The implementation of the research design.

8. Small Group Meetings

Small groups of commissioners will be meeting at the invitation of one prominent commissioner in his/her office to discuss the work, next steps and possible action.

The idea of this kind of involvement has emerged as a means of ensuring more active involvement and stronger ownership of the work by more commissioners.

These meetings will have to be staffed and prepared.

a. Group 1

One group may be convened at the invitation of an outstanding commissioner.

b. Group 2

Same

c. Group 3

Same

a West Coast

9. Educators' Meeting

A meeting of the commissioners who are educators will be convened, as it was in Boston last October, to discuss possible outcomes.

10. Individual Interviews

The process of individual interviews with commissioners should be continued to ensure the learning and development process, commitment to outcomes and to implementation.

The process should be monitored and documented (see individual commissioner sheets and individual assignments).

11. Letter or Summary

Midway between the two Commission meetings a letter, newsletter or report should be sent to all commissioners to report on progress.

12. Institutions on Board

As part of the p.r. and networking efforts, commissioners should be encouraged to bring their institutions/constituencies on board as regards the work of the Commission.

13. Secure Attendance at 3rd Meeting

As at previous meetings, attendance of commissioners at the coming meeting should be secured; secretaries should be called and reminded, etc.

14. Send Pre-meeting Materials

Background materials (if there are any) should be mailed 2-3 weeks in advance of the meeting.

15. <u>Report to Publics</u>

Same as 12 above. Materials should be prepared by p.r. staff.

16. <u>A Mechanism for Implementation</u>

The Commission has determined that its work will be implementation oriented. In order to do this, it may be useful to set up a mechanism that will be responsible for carrying out the tasks linked to implementation: initiating action, securing sponsorship, planning, facilitating implementation, monitoring and evaluating.

17. First Steps - Mechanism

In order to be effective at the end of the Commission's work, the mechanism for implementation should be planned and gradually established in the near future. If adequate, limited, staffing could be secured, the mechanism could begin the task of planning specific interventions and of securing sponsorship, linking up with stakeholders, etc.

18. Launch the Mechanism

Formal decision to set up and launch a mechanism for implementation may be taken at the third meeting of the Commission.

19. Staffing the Mechanism

Staffing for the implementation mechanism will depend on decisions concerning the nature of the mechanism. A mechanism that will be pro-active would probably best be headed by a CEO with strong financial and administrative ability. A mechanism that will deal mainly with follow-up, data collection and dissemination of knowledge may need an educator at its head, etc.

The size and composition of the team will vary with the definition, however in any case a small team of talented educators with a strong knowledge of the community and of the field.

20. Staffing for Research

To be determined in accordance with the needs of the research design.

21. Staffing for PR

To be decided at the meetings of February 7-9.

FROM THE SECOND TO THE THIRD COMMISSIO

	Feb 189	Mar 189	Her 89	May 199	Jun '89
. RESEARCH & DEUELOPHENT					
A: DESIGN OUTCOMES 1. Draft Allernative Strategie 2. Wise People Methodology 3. Brain-storm Planning Group.	HA: Des	ign the Uu F21 F2	1	1 1 5	
 B. OTHER RESEARCH 4. Research Design 5. Personnel: data & analysis 6. Community: data & analysis 7. Case Studies 8. Uisions Paper 9. Carry out research design 	-5. R	l osearch on osearch on osearch on arry out e	Llass Course	muncitg≖–⊸[
1. COMMISSIONERS INVOLUEMENT					
10. Small Group Heetings Heeting 1 Heeting 2 Heeting 3 11. Educators Meeting 12. Individual Interviews 13. Letter or Summary 14. Institutions on Board (P.R 15. Secure Attendance 16. Send Pre-meeting Materials 17. A Report to Their Publics	1	Individual Institutio F15. Sec. Report to	13, L ns on Bo. i		
III. A MECHANISH FOR IMPLEMENTATION					
18. Define 19. First Steps 20. Launching	F18.	à mechanis F	6 808 100 19. 516g. 1	PLEMENT t Steps -	m) 1 +24
IV. STAFFING 21. For Implementation Hechanism 22. For research 23. P.R.	1	1			
J. PUBLIC RELATIONS 24. Approve Plan 25. Approve Networking Plan	:				
JI.THE THIRD COMMISSION MEETING 26. Define Expected Outcomes 27. Set the Agenda 28. Logistics 29. Prepare Materials			· · · ·	∳.=	1
JIL STAFF MEETINGS 30, February to Design Outcomes 31, March for Small Group			;	:	1 T
. 32. June 12-16 Plan & Debrie Meeting of June 14th			-	2	•
, ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES		Le renere	-		1

COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA

Morton L. Mandel, Chairman

Senior Policy Advisors

David S. Ariel	-	President, Cleveland College of Jewish Studies 26500 Shaker Boulevard, Beachwood, Ohio 44122 (216) 464-4050
Seymour Fox	-	Professor of Education, Hebrew University The Jerusalem Fellows, 22A Hatzfira Street, Jerusalem 93152 02-668728
Annette Hochstein	-	Consultant, Nativ Policy & Planning Consultants P. O. Box 4497, Jerusalem, Israel 91044 02-662296
Stephen H. Hoffman	-	Executive Director, Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland 1750 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio 44115 (216) 566-9200
Arthur J. Naparstek	•	Director, Commission on Jewish Education in North America President, Premier Industrial Foundation 4500 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio 44103 (216) 391-8300
Arthur Rotman	-	Executive Vice President, JWB 15 East 26th Street, New York, New York 10010 (212) 532–4949
Carmi Schwartz	-	Executive Vice President, Council of Jewish Federations 730 Broadway, New York, New York 10003 (212) 475-5000
Herman D. Stein	-	University Professor, Case Western Reserve University 439 Pardee Hall, Cleveland, Ohio 44106 (216) 368-4380
Jonathan Woocher	-	Executive Vice President, JESNA 730 Broadway, New York, New York 10003-9540 (212) 529-2000
Henry L. Zucker	-	Consultant, Premier Industrial Foundation Executive Vice President Emeritus, Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland 4500 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio 44103 (216) 391-8300

.

	<u>Consultants</u>		
-	Seymour Fox		
	Annette Hochstein		
	Joseph Reimer	•	Assistant Professor, Benjamin S. Hornstein Program in Jewish Communal Service, Brandeis University Waltham, Massachusetts 02254 (617) 736-2996
	Herman D. Stein		
	Henry L. Zucker		
	Staff		
	Arthur J. Naparstek		
	Artinur 5. Kaparstek		
	Virginia F. Levi	-	Program Officer, Premier Industrial Foundation 4500 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio 44103 (216) 391-8300
	Rachel M. Gubitz	-	Program Intern, Premier Industrial Foundation 4500 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio 44103 (216) 391-8300

.

•

DRAFT 10/6/88

Commission on Jewish Education in North America Planning Group Meeting of October 12, 1988 10:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m. Jewish Community Federation of Clevleand, Room A

Tentative Agenda

Participants: Mandel (chairman), Naparstek, Zucker, Fox, Hochstein, Ariel, Reimer, Rotman, Schwartz, Stein, Woocher, Levi, Gubitz

- I. Review Assignments of August 2, 1988
- II. Review Options Paper drafts and related papers submitted by SF, AH, HDS, JR, DA
- III. Review outlines for vision and best practice papers
- IV. Review proposed timetable for 10/13-12/13/88
- V. Review proposed timetable for 10/88-2/90
- VI. Review proposed research design
- VII. Review proposed agenda for Commission meeting of 12/13/88
- VIII. Review proposed public information strategy
 - IX. Review proposed outreach strategy with important constituent groups

COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA

4500 Euclid Avenue Cleveland, Ohio 44103 216/391-8300

June 2, 1989

Dr. Herman Stein 3211 Van Aken Blvd. Shaker Hts, OH 44120

Dear Herman:

I am pleased to enclose background materials for the meeting of the Commission on June 14. Included are a brief executive summary, a progress report and two appendices. I hope that you will find them helpful.

The issues we will be discussing are complex. Therefore, we are planning the meeting in a way that will make it possible for us to benefit from the thinking and ideas of our entire group. We have structured the day to provide a balance between meetings of the Commission as a whole, and smaller group meetings to permit a more extensive exchange of ideas.

I look forward to seeing you on June 14th. Please remember that we are scheduled to meet at the New York City headquarters of the Hebrew Union College, One West 4th Street (between Broadway and Mercer, one block east of Washington Square) from 9:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Warmest regards.

Mort

Morton L. Mandel Chairman

Enclosures

Morton L. Mandel Chairman Mona Riklis Ackerman Ronald Appleby David Arnow Mandell L. Berman Jack Bieler Charles R. Bronfman John C. Colman Maurice S. Corson Lester Crown David Dubin Stuart E. Eizenstat Joshua Elkin Eli N. Evans Irwin S. Field Max M. Fisher Alfred Gottschalk Arthur Green Irving Greenberg Joseph S. Gruss Robert I. Hiller David Hirschhorn Carol K. Ingall Ludwig Jesselson Henry Koschitzky Mark Lainer Norman Lamm Sara S. Lee Seymour Marrin Lipser Haskel Lookstein Robert E. Loup Matthew J. Maryles Florence Melton Donald R. Mintz Lester Pollack Charles Ratner Esther Leah Ritz Harrier L. Rosenthal Alvin I. Schiff Lionel H. Schipper Ismar Schorsch Harold M. Schulweis

Commissioners

Ismar Schorsch Harold M. Schulweis Daniel S. Shapiro Margaret W. Tishman Isadore Twersky Bennett Yanowitz Isaiah Zeldin

In Formation Senior Policy Advisors

David S. Ariel Seymour Fox Annette Hochstein Stephen H. Hoffman Arthur J. Naparstek Arthur Rorman Carmi Schwartz Herman D. Stein Jonathao Woocher Henry L. Zucker



Arthur J. Naparstek Staff

Virginia F. Levi Joseph Reimer

COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA

4500 Huchd Avenue Cleveland, Ohio 44103 246 - 891-8300

April 19, 1989

Mrs. Sara S. Lee Rhea Hirsch School of Education Hebrew Union College 3077 University Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90007-3796

Dear Sara :

The third meeting of the Commission on Jewish Education in North America will take place on June 14 from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. at Hebrew Union College. 1 West 4th Street, New York, New York.

The purpose of this letter is to report on follow-up work by our staff and senior policy advisors since our December 13th meeting, and to let you know that a staff member will try to meet with you in advance of the June 14th meeting.

Since our last meeting, the Commission staff has been hard at work. At the December 13th meeting, our Commission opted to focus its work initially on two main subjects: (1) the shortage of qualified <u>personnel</u> for Jewish education and, (2) the <u>community</u>, its structure, leadership, and funding. Emphasis on these two enabling options was seen as the key to across-the-board improvements in Jewish education. A number of commissioners urged that we consider, in addition to these two enabling options, various programmatic areas such as early childhood education, day schools, supplemental schools, the Israel experience, etc.

We believe that it is necessary to develop creative, effective, and feasible approaches for dealing with the enabling options of personnel and community and relate them to the various programmatic areas. We need to devise a workable strategy to demonstrate that personnel and community can indeed be acted upon in a comprehensive manner. In personnel, this involves recruitment, training, retention, and profession building. In community, it involves recruiting outstanding lay leadership, improving the climate, and generating substantial additional funding.

Commissioners Morton I, Mandel

s funnum Mono Riklis Ackerman Ronald Appleby David Arnow Mandell L. Berman Luck Bieler Charles R. Brontinau John C. Colman Maurice S. Corson Laster Crown David Dubin Stuart E. hitenstat. Joshua Elkin Eh N. Evans frwin S. Field Max M. Fisher Alfred Gouschalk Arthur Green Irving Greenberg Joseph S. Gruss Robert I. Hiller David Hirschhorn Carol K. Ingall Ludwig Jesselson Henry Koschutzky Mark Lamer Norman Lamm Sata Scheel Seemon Martin Lipset Haskel Lookstein. Robert E. Loup Matthew J. Maryles Florence Melion Donald R. Mintz Lester Pollack Charles Ratuer Esther Lical, Ruz Harret E Rosenthal Akurl Schift Lond H. Schuper Jama Schorsch Enrold M. Schulwers Daniel S. Shapiro Margaret W Tishman Ladore Iwersky Repart Yan our Isaah Zel Lir

Belinstates: Senior Policy Advisors

David S. Anel S. vmon Fox Annette Hochstein Stephen H. Holfman Arthur J. Napurstek Arthur Rotman Carmi Schwartz Herman D. Stein Jonathan Woocher Henry L. Zucker

Director

Arthur I. Naparstek – Staff

```
an the bound of the second second second second second second second second second second second second second s
```

It seems clear that important change cannot be achieved if it is based at the national level alone. Real change must be undertaken on the local level as well. Most education takes place at the local level. There are already significant local level initiatives to achieve major improvements in Jewish education. The pool of people who can be recruited for tangible local demonstrations includes not only the current cadre of educators, but also rabbis, Judaica scholars, federation executives, and Jewish scholars in the secular and academic world. This adds up to seeking change through a combination of local and national initiatives.

To implement a national-local approach to make comprehensive improvements in Jewish education, we need ways to encourage new ideas and ways to cause these ideas to be implemented. Such efforts would be aimed at emphasizing the personnel and community options, and encouraging the development of local sites which will utilize the personnel and community options to demonstrate that these options can lead to systemic change in delivering Jewish education.

The local community would need to be a full partner in the design of any such programs and in their implementation.

We expect to discuss the whole question of implementation with each commissioner prior to our June 14 meeting. You will be hearing from a staff member to set up an appointment.

We hope, through this interview process, to bring you up to date on what we have been doing since the last meeting of the Commission, and to get your reactions to the various questions and alternatives before us. At the conclusion of the interview process, we will use the commissioners' input to prepare various proposals for review at the June 14 meeting. Your input and reactions are crucial to us as we plan the next steps of the Commission's work.

We look forward to your participation in this interview process and in the June 14 meeting. Best personal regards.

Sincerely,

Most

MORTON L. MANDEL CHAIRMAN

bcc: David Ariel Seymour Fox Annette Hochstein Stephen Hoffman Arthur Naparstek Arthur Rotman Carmi Schwartz Merman Stein Jonathan Woocher Henry L. Zucker Joseph Reimer

This letter was sent to all commissioners.

AGENDA

COMMISSION PLANNING GROUP MEETINGS

FEBRUARY 7-9, 1989

Attendance: Morton L. Mandel, Arthur J. Naparstek, Henry L. Zucker, Virginia F. Levi, Seymour Fox, Annette Hochstein, Joseph Reimer, Herman Stein, Rachel Gubitz

TUESDAY

Ι.	Review Factbook	MLM/AJN	3:00-3:45
	A. Minutes B. Assignments C. Feedback from commissioners		
	 Telephone contacts Interviews Correspondence Special meetings (Woocher and Rotm 	an)	
II.	Discussion on Outcomes	SF/AH	3:45-8:30
WEDNES	DAY		
III.	Continuation of outcome discussion with possible attention given to mechanisms for implementation	SF/АН	9:00-2:00
IV.	Discussion on outreach and network strategies A. Review JESNA, JWB papers	AJN/SF/AH	2:00-5:00
۷.	MIG - Planning Meeting	MLM/SF	6:00-8:30
THURSD	AY		
VI.	Discussion on communication and public relations program	AJN	7:30-8:30
	A. Review Paula Berman Cohen proposal		
VII.	Work Plan	SF/AH	8:30-10:30
	 A. Review five-month work plan - FebJune 1989 1. Work with commissioners between Feb.and June 2. Research plan 3. Staffing needs 		
VIII.	Work assignments and deadlines	AJN	10:30-11:00