



THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE  
**AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES**

**MS-831: Jack, Joseph and Morton Mandel Foundation Records, 1980–2008.**  
Series B: Commission on Jewish Education in North America (CJENA). 1980–1993.  
Subseries 3: General Files, 1980–1993.

---

Box  
14

Folder  
10

Senior Policy Advisors meeting. 30 March 1989. Correspondence  
and minutes, March 1989.

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

---

Mailed to Senior  
Policy Advisors,  
faxed to SF+Att -

COMMISSION  
ON JEWISH EDUCATION  
IN NORTH AMERICA

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

Commissioners

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 Martin Lipset  
Haskel Lookstein  
Robert E. Loup  
Matthew J. Maryles  
Florence Melton  
Donald R. Mintz  
Lester Pollack  
Charles Ratner  
Esther Leah Ritz  
Harriet L. Rosenthal  
Alvin I. Schiff  
Lionel H. Schipper  
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 Rotman  
Carmi Schwartz  
Herman D. Stein  
Jonathan Woocher  
Henry L. Zucker

Director

Arthur J. Naparstek

Staff

Virginia F. Levi  
Joseph Reimer

March 8, 1989

Mrs. Annette Hochstein  
Nativ Policy & Planning Consultants  
P. O. Box 4497  
Jerusalem, Israel 91044

Dear Annette:

This is a reminder that the next meeting of the Senior Policy Advisors for the Commission on Jewish Education in North America has been scheduled for Thursday, March 30, 1989 from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. It will take place at the JWB offices, 15 East 26th Street, New York City.

I hope you will plan to attend this meeting. We have much to accomplish before the June 14 meeting of the Commission, and your input is essential. Please let Ginny Levi know of your attendance plans by calling (216) 391-8300.

We look forward to seeing you on March 30.

Sincerely,



Arthur J. Naparstek  
Director



PREMIER

3/8/89

COMMISSION  
ON JEWISH EDUCATION  
IN NORTH AMERICA

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

Herman —

I realize you probably  
can't make this meeting, but  
am sending the attached  
for your information & in  
case your plans change.

See you for a Planning  
Group meeting on 3/29, also  
at JWB, exact times to be  
announced.

*Ginny*

March 8, 1989

PREMIER INDUSTRIAL CORPORATION  
4500 EUCLID AVENUE • CLEVELAND, OHIO 44103

The next meeting of the Senior  
Commission on Jewish Education is  
scheduled for Thursday, March 30,  
8:00 p.m. It will take place at  
16th Street, New York City.

Robert E. Loup  
Matthew J. Maryles  
Florence Melton  
Donald R. Mintz  
Lester Pollack  
Charles Ratner  
Esther Leah Ritz  
Harriet L. Rosenthal  
Alvin I. Schiff  
Leonel H. Schipper  
Ismar Schorsch  
Harold M. Schulweis  
Daniel S. Shapiro  
Margaret W. Tishman  
Isadore Twersky  
Bennett Yanowitz  
Isiah Zeldin

I hope you will plan to attend this meeting. We have much  
to accomplish before the June 14 meeting of the Commission,  
and your input is essential. Please let Ginny Levi know of  
your attendance plans by calling (216) 391-8300.

We look forward to seeing you on March 30.

Sincerely,

*Art*

Arthur J. Naparstek  
Director

In Formation  
Senior Policy Advisors

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

Director

Arthur J. Naparstek

Staff

Virginia E. Levi  
Joseph Reimer



COMMISSION  
ON JEWISH EDUCATION  
IN NORTH AMERICA

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

Commissioners

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 Martin Lipset  
Haskel Lookstein  
Robert E. Loup  
Matthew J. Maryles  
Florence Melton  
Donald R. Mintz  
Lester Pollack  
Charles Ratner  
Esther Leah Ritz  
Harriet L. Rosenthal  
Alvin I. Schiff  
Lionel H. Schipper  
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 Rotman  
Carmi Schwartz  
Herman D. Stein  
Jonathan Woocher  
Henry L. Zucker

Director

Arthur J. Naparstek

Staff

Virginia F. Levi  
Joseph Reimer

March 8, 1989

Professor Seymour Fox  
The Jerusalem Fellows  
22A Hatzfira Street  
Jerusalem, Israel 93152

Dear Seymour:

This is a reminder that the next meeting of the Senior Policy Advisors for the Commission on Jewish Education in North America has been scheduled for Thursday, March 30, 1989 from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. It will take place at the JWB offices, 15 East 26th Street, New York City.

I hope you will plan to attend this meeting. We have much to accomplish before the June 14 meeting of the Commission, and your input is essential. Please let Ginny Levi know of your attendance plans by calling (216) 391-8300.

We look forward to seeing you on March 30.

Sincerely,



Arthur J. Naparstek  
Director

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. Review of the IJE Concept

A. Underlying Assumptions

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 select 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.
2. 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.



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. Next Steps

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. What is our Objective?
  1. 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.



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

Assignment

The first section of the report might be called "Jewish Continuity 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

- 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.



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 Moment, the New York Times, and the Wall Street Journal. MLM will arrange for Premier's PR representative to work with PBC in establishing contacts with the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal. MLM will consider calling Herschel Blumberg and Paul Berger in an effort to interest Moment in the Commission.

B. Interim Letter to Commissioners

Assignment  
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.]

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. Outreach

A. Progress Report

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. Educators Meeting

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

Assignment

It was agreed that we would tentatively plan Commission meetings to occur in October 1989 and February 1990. Two possible dates for the 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.

