



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
14

Senior Policy Advisors and Commission follow up meeting.
30-31 July 1989. Minutes, July 1989.

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

MINUTES: Senior Policy Advisors, Commission on Jewish Education
in North America

DATE: July 30, 1989

DATE MINUTES ISSUED: August 8, 1989

PRESENT: Morton L. Mandel, Chairman, David S. Ariel, Seymour Fox,
Mark Gurvis, Stephen H. Hoffman, Martin S. Kraar,
Joseph Reimer, Arthur Rotman, Herman D. Stein,
Jonathan Woocher, Henry L. Zucker, Virginia F. Levi
(Sec'y)

COPY TO: Arthur J. Naparstek, Carmi Schwartz

I. Review of Minutes

Assignment

The minutes of June 15, 1989, were reviewed. It was agreed that MLM will talk with Rotman and Woocher about who should accompany him to meet with each of the denomination heads and will arrange the meetings for as soon as possible.

II. Final Report

A. General Discussion

Seymour Fox presented the draft outline of the final report and accompanying research design, both of which were circulated in advance. In discussing the purpose of the report, we were reminded of the importance of remaining sensitive to programmatic interests.

It was suggested that some could perceive the emphasis in the document to be on formal education. We mean to define Jewish education to include both the formal and informal realms. A clear definition of Jewish education should appear early in the final report and should be woven throughout the document. Rotman agreed to convene a group including himself, Kraar, and Woocher to develop a recommended definition.

Assignment

In place of the term "road map," we will substitute "agenda for the next decade."

It was agreed that the primary audience for the report is the enlightened lay leadership of North America, and a secondary audience is professionals. The document should be accurate and complete and written in a readable style. It should be a serious document (with historical significance) and attractively designed.

The rationale for the Commission should emphasize our belief that Jewish continuity in North America is at risk, and that improvement of the quality of Jewish education for Jewish continuity is worthy of a serious effort.

*Schwartz
+ Lemm
set
9/25*

*Rotman
working on*

B. Commissioning of Papers

A memorandum was distributed offering an updated list of potential papers to be commissioned (see Exhibit A). This list and the descriptions of the papers in the outline of the final report were discussed in detail.

These papers are to be prepared as a basis for writing the final report and will appear in an appendix to the report:

1. The relationship between Jewish education and Jewish continuity. This paper will be written by a major Jewish philosopher.
2. The organizational structure of Jewish education in North America. It was suggested that Walter Ackerman could write an effective paper on the historical context, but that others should be consulted on current issues. Reimer has a paper on federation/agency relationships in Jewish education by Yanowitz and Woocher which might prove helpful. VFL will distribute it to senior policy advisors.
3. The synagogue as a context for Jewish education. Reimer has begun work on this paper. He distributed a preliminary summary of his work to date.
4. Attitudes, opinions, and perceptions of needs of lay leadership. It was suggested that the proposed approach--to collect data at the November General Assembly--is not the best way to gather the desired information. Alternatives include (a) A letter from Carmi Schwartz and Bill Berman, transmitting a survey to each federation executive for distribution to each board, (b) conducting a pretest of the instrument at the GA and do a general administration later, (c) commissioning a firm to conduct the survey, or (d) none of these. HLZ will review these options and recommend an approach.
5. Approaches to training personnel and current training opportunities. Following discussion, there was general agreement that this paper should be commissioned. SF will review with Sara Lee possible authors. Two names suggested were Aryeh Davidson and Susan Shevitz.
6. Assessment of Jewish education as a profession. This topic was agreed to without any discussion.

In addition, we were reminded that papers are being prepared describing Community Action Sites and the Initiatives for Jewish Education. HLZ is working on a comprehensive paper on community. (See Section IV of these minutes.)

Assignment

Assignment

Assignment

In discussing the preparation of papers, it was noted that there are a number of organizations with a strong interest in these topics and with useful information to contribute. Woocher will provide VFL with a list of organizations which fit this description and suggestions of how to involve each appropriately. It was noted that an organization with a vested interest in a particular topic could be extremely helpful in providing input and feedback, but is not the appropriate body to write the paper.

Assignment

It was agreed that the papers which have not yet been commissioned should be authorized and authors engaged as soon as possible by SF.

Assignment

An author for the final report has not yet been identified. Fox and Hochstein will oversee the research and writing process. Senior policy advisors are asked to recommend an author for the final report.

III. CAJE Plans

It was reported that at the August meeting of CAJE, MLM will make a presentation on the Commission followed by responses by Elkin and Lee. Thereafter, conference participants will fill out a questionnaire to identify issues of concern to Jewish educators and will discuss these in light of the Commission's work. The recorders of these groups will then meet with MLM and Commission staff on the outcome of those discussions.

It will be made clear that CAJE is one of a number of organizations whose input will be sought in meetings such as the CAJE conference.

It was suggested that this Commission/CAJE activity should be publicized by CAJE.

IV. Community/Financing Option and Relationships with Federations and CJF

Assignment

Assignment

Assignment

Assignment

Assignment

HLZ presented an outline of a comprehensive paper on community. He proposed the following panel to review a community/financing paper: Ariel, Fox, Hiller, Hoffman, Kraar, Mandel, Naparstek, Rotman, Stein, Wasserstrom, Woocher, and Yanowitz. Zucker will draft the paper with staff assistance of Gurvis and Levi. It was suggested that HLZ call Steve Solender for the suggestion of a New York lay person knowledgeable in the area of finance to add to the panel. HLZ will prepare a brief paper for review at the next meeting of the senior policy advisors.

HLZ will work with Kraar, Hoffman, and Gurvis to develop a plan for a presentation at the General Assembly in November. This might be a topic for a forum. In addition, it was suggested that an audio/visual presentation be considered. We will discuss this further with CJF.

MLM will call Bill Berman to propose that the next meeting of federation presidents and executives be devoted to the Commission.

V. Family Foundations

It was suggested that a preliminary meeting be held to include MLM, Crown, Bronfman, and possibly Hirschhorn, to discuss their willingness to provide funding for implementation. This would be followed by a larger meeting of potential funders. The initial meeting should be held soon.

Assignment HLZ will talk with Hoffman and Kraar about holding meetings with supporting foundation donors about their interest in funding Commission implementation.

VI. Plans for the Next Round of Commissioner Interviews

An outline to be used in the next round of interviews with commissioners and the list of commissioner assignments were reviewed and revised.

Assignment VFL will send the corrected versions to interviewers so that interviews may be conducted and reports submitted by September 15.

VII. Good and Welfare

A. SF reported on a meeting with federation planners in Israel and noted that representatives of five communities asked to be involved in the Commission process. It was suggested that communities active in Jewish education, whether or not they have local commissions, should be involved with the Commission. Woocher can help to identify these communities. Gurvis suggests that at the next quarterly there be a follow-up meeting with planners and will make the necessary arrangements.

Assignment

B. At the October 23 Commission meeting we might divide into three groups, one to discuss the IJE/Community Action Sites, one to discuss personnel, and one to discuss community. As an alternative, each group might discuss all topics. We might also hear a series of capsule statements by the authors of background papers.

C. We might wish to take a different approach with the programmatic options. Initially, the ideas were broken down into as many options as possible. Now we may wish to collapse them into a smaller number of options and develop a strategy to approach each.

D. We might wish to consider holding a series of meetings of interested organizations to discuss how they can contribute to and benefit from the work of the Commission. This might occur between the fourth and fifth meetings of the Commission and is among the items listed for discussion on August 24.

E. It is important to have a plan to move from the Commission to implementation.

VIII. Future Meetings

A. Senior Policy Advisors

The next meeting of the senior policy advisors is scheduled for Thursday, August 24, 10:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. at Cleveland Hopkins Airport Hotel. The following agenda items were identified for that meeting:

1. Involvement of community planners
2. Public relations
3. Progress report on Community Action Sites and IJE
4. Agenda for 10/23 Commission meeting
5. Discussion on how to deal with programmatic options and the agenda for the future
6. Woocher grid on involvement of organizations
7. Time table through the last meeting of the Commission
8. Role of CJF, JESNA, and JWB between now and the final meeting (input, data, public relations, etc.)
9. Consider holding a series of meetings of interested organizations on how they see their involvement in the report and implementation
10. Presentation by HLZ of brief paper on community
11. Possible presentation by JR on his research on the synagogue as a context for Jewish education
12. Status update on each of the papers to be commissioned

B. Fourth Commission Meeting

The fourth Commission meeting is scheduled for Monday, October 23, 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. in New York. Senior policy advisors will meet to prepare for that meeting at 7:30 p.m. on Sunday, October 22, and to debrief on Tuesday, October 24, 8:30 a.m. to noon.

MINUTES: Senior Policy Advisors, Commission on Jewish Education
in North America

DATE: July 30, 1989

DATE MINUTES ISSUED: August 8, 1989

PRESENT: Morton L. Mandel, Chairman, David S. Ariel, Seymour Fox,
Mark Gurvis, Stephen H. Hoffman, Martin S. Kraar,
Joseph Reimer, Arthur Rotman, Herman D. Stein,
Jonathan Woocher, Henry L. Zucker, Virginia F. Levi
(Sec'y)

COPY TO: Arthur J. Naparstek, Carmi Schwartz

I. Review of Minutes

Assignment

The minutes of June 15, 1989, were reviewed. It was agreed that MLM will talk with Rotman and Woocher about who should accompany him to meet with each of the denomination heads and will arrange the meetings for as soon as possible.

II. Final Report

A. General Discussion

Seymour Fox presented the draft outline of the final report and accompanying research design, both of which were circulated in advance. In discussing the purpose of the report, we were reminded of the importance of remaining sensitive to programmatic interests.

It was suggested that some could perceive the emphasis in the document to be on formal education. We mean to define Jewish education to include both the formal and informal realms. A clear definition of Jewish education should appear early in the final report and should be woven throughout the document. Rotman agreed to convene a group including himself, Kraar, and Woocher to develop a recommended definition.

Assignment

In place of the term "road map," we will substitute "agenda for the next decade."

It was agreed that the primary audience for the report is the enlightened lay leadership of North America, and a secondary audience is professionals. The document should be accurate and complete and written in a readable style. It should be a serious document (with historical significance) and attractively designed.

The rationale for the Commission should emphasize our belief that Jewish continuity in North America is at risk, and that improvement of the quality of Jewish education for Jewish continuity is worthy of a serious effort.

B. Commissioning of Papers

A memorandum was distributed offering an updated list of potential papers to be commissioned (see Exhibit A). This list and the descriptions of the papers in the outline of the final report were discussed in detail.

These papers are to be prepared as a basis for writing the final report and will appear in an appendix to the report:

1. The relationship between Jewish education and Jewish continuity. This paper will be written by a major Jewish philosopher.
2. The organizational structure of Jewish education in North America. It was suggested that Walter Ackerman could write an effective paper on the historical context, but that others should be consulted on current issues. Reimer has a paper on federation/agency relationships in Jewish education by Yanowitz and Woocher which might prove helpful. VFL will distribute it to senior policy advisors.
3. The synagogue as a context for Jewish education. Reimer has begun work on this paper. He distributed a preliminary summary of his work to date.
4. Attitudes, opinions, and perceptions of needs of lay leadership. It was suggested that the proposed approach--to collect data at the November General Assembly--is not the best way to gather the desired information. Alternatives include (a) A letter from Carmi Schwartz and Bill Berman, transmitting a survey to each federation executive for distribution to each board, (b) conducting a pretest of the instrument at the GA and do a general administration later, (c) commissioning a firm to conduct the survey, or (d) none of these. HLZ will review these options and recommend an approach.
5. Approaches to training personnel and current training opportunities. Following discussion, there was general agreement that this paper should be commissioned. SF will review with Sara Lee possible authors. Two names suggested were Aryeh Davidson and Susan Shevitz.
6. Assessment of Jewish education as a profession. This topic was agreed to without any discussion.

In addition, we were reminded that papers are being prepared describing Community Action Sites and the Initiatives for Jewish Education. HLZ is working on a comprehensive paper on community. (See Section IV of these minutes.)

Assignment

Assignment

Assignment

In discussing the preparation of papers, it was noted that there are a number of organizations with a strong interest in these topics and with useful information to contribute. Woocher will provide VFL with a list of organizations which fit this description and suggestions of how to involve each appropriately. It was noted that an organization with a vested interest in a particular topic could be extremely helpful in providing input and feedback, but is not the appropriate body to write the paper.

Assignment

It was agreed that the papers which have not yet been commissioned should be authorized and authors engaged as soon as possible by SF.

Assignment

An author for the final report has not yet been identified. Fox and Hochstein will oversee the research and writing process. Senior policy advisors are asked to recommend an author for the final report.

III. CAJE Plans

It was reported that at the August meeting of CAJE, MLM will make a presentation on the Commission followed by responses by Elkin and Lee. Thereafter, conference participants will fill out a questionnaire to identify issues of concern to Jewish educators and will discuss these in light of the Commission's work. The recorders of these groups will then meet with MLM and Commission staff on the outcome of those discussions.

It will be made clear that CAJE is one of a number of organizations whose input will be sought in meetings such as the CAJE conference.

It was suggested that this Commission/CAJE activity should be publicized by CAJE.

IV. Community/Financing Option and Relationships with Federations and CJF

Assignment

Assignment

Assignment

HLZ presented an outline of a comprehensive paper on community. He proposed the following panel to review a community/financing paper: Ariel, Fox, Hiller, Hoffman, Kraar, Mandel, Naparstek, Rotman, Stein, Wasserstrom, Woocher, and Yanowitz. Zucker will draft the paper with staff assistance of Gurvis and Levi. It was suggested that HLZ call Steve Solender for the suggestion of a New York lay person knowledgeable in the area of finance to add to the panel. HLZ will prepare a brief paper for review at the next meeting of the senior policy advisors.

Assignment

HLZ will work with Kraar, Hoffman, and Gurvis to develop a plan for a presentation at the General Assembly in November. This might be a topic for a forum. In addition, it was suggested that an audio/visual presentation be considered. We will discuss this further with CJF.

Assignment

MLM will call Bill Berman to propose that the next meeting of federation presidents and executives be devoted to the Commission.

V. Family Foundations

It was suggested that a preliminary meeting be held to include MLM, Crown, Bronfman, and possibly Hirschhorn, to discuss their willingness to provide funding for implementation. This would be followed by a larger meeting of potential funders. The initial meeting should be held soon.

Assignment

HLZ will talk with Hoffman and Kraar about holding meetings with supporting foundation donors about their interest in funding Commission implementation.

VI. Plans for the Next Round of Commissioner Interviews

An outline to be used in the next round of interviews with commissioners and the list of commissioner assignments were reviewed and revised.

Assignment

VFL will send the corrected versions to interviewers so that interviews may be conducted and reports submitted by September 15.

VII. Good and Welfare

A. SF reported on a meeting with federation planners in Israel and noted that representatives of five communities asked to be involved in the Commission process. It was suggested that communities active in Jewish education, whether or not they have local commissions, should be involved with the Commission. Woocher can help to identify these communities. Gurvis suggests that at the next quarterly there be a follow-up meeting with planners and will make the necessary arrangements.

Assignment

B. At the October 23 Commission meeting we might divide into three groups, one to discuss the IJE/Community Action Sites, one to discuss personnel, and one to discuss community. As an alternative, each group might discuss all topics. We might also hear a series of capsule statements by the authors of background papers.

C. We might wish to take a different approach with the programmatic options. Initially, the ideas were broken down into as many options as possible. Now we may wish to collapse them into a smaller number of options and develop a strategy to approach each.

D. We might wish to consider holding a series of meetings of interested organizations to discuss how they can contribute to and benefit from the work of the Commission. This might occur between the fourth and fifth meetings of the Commission and is among the items listed for discussion on August 24.

E. It is important to have a plan to move from the Commission to implementation.

VIII. Future Meetings

A. Senior Policy Advisors

The next meeting of the senior policy advisors is scheduled for Thursday, August 24, 10:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. at Cleveland Hopkins Airport Hotel. The following agenda items were identified for that meeting:

1. Involvement of community planners
2. Public relations
3. Progress report on Community Action Sites and IJE
4. Agenda for 10/23 Commission meeting
5. Discussion on how to deal with programmatic options and the agenda for the future
6. Woocher grid on involvement of organizations
7. Time table through the last meeting of the Commission
8. Role of CJF, JESNA, and JWB between now and the final meeting (input, data, public relations, etc.)
9. Consider holding a series of meetings of interested organizations on how they see their involvement in the report and implementation
10. Presentation by HLZ of brief paper on community
11. Possible presentation by JR on his research on the synagogue as a context for Jewish education
12. Status update on each of the papers to be commissioned

B. Fourth Commission Meeting

The fourth Commission meeting is scheduled for Monday, October 23, 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. in New York. Senior policy advisors will meet to prepare for that meeting at 7:30 p.m. on Sunday, October 22, and to debrief on Tuesday, October 24, 8:30 a.m. to noon.

TO: Senior Policy Advisors

FROM: Seymour Fox

DATE: 7/30/89

Below is a new list of the research papers which combines several of them, as well as an update of what we are suggesting.

Papers to be Commissioned:

1. The relationship between Jewish education and Jewish continuity.
(Author: possibly a major Jewish philosopher--if he is willing to undertake the assignment.)
2. The organizational structure of Jewish education in North America, by Walter Ackerman.
3. The synagogue as a context for Jewish education, by Joseph Reimer.
4. Attitudes, opinions, and perceptions of needs of leadership, by Steven M. Cohen and Erik Cohen. (Based on the data to be collected at the G.A. and other sources.)
5. Approaches to training personnel and current training opportunities, by Aryeh Davidson.
6. Assessment of Jewish education as a profession, by Isa Aron.

Isa Aron will also produce an additional paper on personnel, based on both existing data and data that she will collect, in the following areas:

- The state of the field of Jewish education;
- The shortage of personnel for Jewish education and personnel needs;
- The training history of good educators in the field;
- Recruitment and retention of personnel;
- Salaries and benefits;
- Bibliography in the area of personnel.

MINUTES: Commission Follow-Up Meeting
DATE: July 31, 1989
DATE MINUTES ISSUED: August 8, 1989
PRESENT: Henry L. Zucker, Chair, Seymour Fox, Mark Gurvis,
Virginia F. Levi (Sec'y), Joseph Reimer
COPY TO: Morton L. Mandel

Following is a summary of decisions and assignments:

1. Gurvis Assignments

It was reported that MG will work on the following areas:
(a) Federation liaison, (b) plans for the GA and the September quarterlies, (c) the organizations which Woocher will identify for interaction with the Commission, (d) liaison with the 12 local commissions and other federations with a major Jewish education planning effort, and (e) administrative coordination of researchers and panels.

2. Panels

For the August 24 meeting of senior policy advisors, we should be ready to recommend panels to review each paper. Each author should submit a list of proposed panel members for his/her research area. SF will propose a panel on personnel and HLZ on community. JR will propose a panel for his paper to SF and HLZ prior to August 24.

The panel members' responsibility is to provide feedback to ensure quality and accuracy of information.

Interaction with interested groups other than panels is intended to keep them informed and to offer them an opportunity to provide input. Groups may be consulted on issues, but will not be asked to review and respond to draft reports.

3. Woocher List of Organizations

JW will provide us with a list of organizations with which to consult. VFL will circulate this list to SF and JR for their reactions and possible revisions before finalizing it.

4. Meetings with Researchers

On August 16 SF, MG, and AH will meet with researchers in Seattle to determine exact assignments and deadlines. It was suggested that each paper follow the same steps:

Assignment

- a. Detailed outline for presentation to panel (if desired).
- b. Draft I to be submitted for quick review by SF, AH, JR (48 hours in advance) and then distributed to panel.
- c. Draft II for presentation to senior policy advisors.
- d. Draft III for presentation to Commission

All papers must be submitted to the Cleveland office for distribution in advance of the meeting at which they will be discussed.

5. What can be ready for Commission meeting number four?

Each author should be ready with an outline, a set of guiding principles, and a sense of potential findings. Each could be asked to report on the issues under consideration.

It was suggested that commissioners might prefer not to see final drafts of papers at this next meeting, but to react to general approaches so that they feel we are continuing to involve them in the process.

We could also be ready with a presentation of "ideas in progress" on the Community Action Site, the implementation mechanism, and background papers for community and personnel.

Potential outcomes of the fourth meeting might include:

- a. Agreement to recommend the IJE
- b. Agreement with the approach to Community Action Sites
- c. Agreement to the method of developing the final report and input into critical conceptual pieces.

The fifth meeting could then give commissioners a chance to respond to a practical approach to the IJE and Community Action Sites, could respond to the findings and recommendations for the final report, and could begin to adopt the background papers. At meeting six commissioners could react to a proposed final report. At that time, we might be prepared to introduce the director of the IJE.

6. Interaction with Funders

It was suggested that we need a timeline for the steps to follow with foundations and federations. For purposes of seeking an initial commitment from potential funders, it was suggested that we need a detailed description of the IJE, including estimated costs, and a vision of how the IJE might work with Community Action Sites.

7. Reimer's Role in the Coming Months

It was suggested that the following might comprise JR's responsibilities with the Commission:

- a. Paper on synagogues as context
- b. Work with MG in liaison with various groups
- c. Follow up with researchers
- d. Work with assigned commissioners
- e. Involvement with writer of the final report

8. Plans for CAJE Meeting

Monday, August 14

7:00 - 9:30 p.m. - AH and MG will meet with Isa Aron while SF meets with Aryeh Davidson.

9:30 p.m. - Meeting of SF, MG, and AH to prepare for Tuesday.

Tuesday, August 15

8:00 a.m. - SF, MG, and AH will meet for any last minute details on meeting with researchers.

10:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m. - Lunch meeting (VFL to make arrangements) of Fox, Hochstein, Gurvis, Hanan Alexander, Isa Aron, Aryeh Davidson, Ariel, Elkin, Lee, Schiff.

5:30 - 6:30 p.m. - Probable time for Cleveland Fellows reception.

8 - 10 p.m. - MLM presentation followed by Elkin and Lee response and small group meetings of participants.

Wednesday, August 16

8 a.m. - Meeting of SF, MG, and AH, with Katz, Lee, Reynolds, and Spack to discuss follow-up involvement with CAJE.