



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
15

Folder
8

Senior Policy Advisors meeting. 11 May 1990. Minutes,
May 1990.

Pages from this file are restricted and are not available online. Please
contact the [American Jewish Archives](http://AmericanJewishArchives.org) for more information.

MINUTES: Senior Policy Advisors Teleconference

DATE OF MEETING: May 11, 1990

DATE MINUTES ISSUED: May 11, 1990

IN CLEVELAND: Mark Gurvis, Stephen H. Hoffman, Virginia F. Levi
(Sec'y), Herman Stein, Henry L. Zucker

IN JERUSALEM: Seymour Fox, Annette Hochstein

IN NEW YORK: Marty Kraar, Joseph Reimer, Arthur Rotman,
Jonathan Woocher

COPIES TO: David Ariel, Morton L. Mandel

I. Status of Final Report and Plans for June 12 Commission Meeting

A. Status of Report

It was reported that chapter 2 is being redrafted on the basis of comments by senior policy advisors and that revisions have begun of chapter 3. (Policy advisors were asked to submit any additional comments on chapter 3 directly to SF and AH.) Work is now in process on drafting chapters 4 and 5 for submission to senior policy advisors by May 25. Chapter 1, a brief philosophical statement and chapter 6, concluding remarks, are still to be drafted and will be available for senior policy advisors on June 4. Chapters 2 through 5 should be ready to mail to commissioners on June 4.

B. Plans for June 12 Commission Meeting

The discussion that followed focused on whether to proceed with arrangements for a Commission meeting on June 12, in light of this timetable. Arguments for postponement are that (1) the report which will be available for issuance to commissioners on June 4 will not be of the writing quality we seek in the final product and, (2) the timing of mailing will make it virtually impossible for key parts of the report to be discussed with key commissioners before the June meeting.

Arguments for proceeding with the meeting on June 12 include (1) concern that momentum will be lost if the meeting is postponed, (2) that finding another date during the summer will be difficult, and (3) the desire to gain approval for proceeding with the development of the implementation mechanism. It was suggested that the eloquence of the draft report is less essential than the importance of moving the process along.

In further discussion it was suggested that if commissioners have at least an outline of the entire report, with extensive drafts of those parts of the report that are available, it should be possible to obtain the Commission's authorization to complete and issue the report. If it appears that significant concerns remain at the conclusion of the meeting, a small committee of commissioners might be established to serve as an editorial board to work with the authors of the final report. The report would be rewritten in more eloquent prose for publication and presentation at a celebratory event to be scheduled for October.

It was noted that a portion of the Commission meeting should be devoted to presenting plans for the implementation mechanism and for future funding. SHH and HLZ were asked whether postponing the meeting until August would make any real difference in the status of these areas. It was suggested that we have encouraging prospects to report in June.

It was concluded that, assuming a good attendance on June 12, the meeting should proceed as scheduled. At that time we should be prepared to indicate to commissioners what the complete report will contain, including all recommendations. It was suggested that funders be invited to meet before or following the meeting to discuss potential support for the implementation mechanism and to solicit their involvement on the Board.

Following the meeting it was concluded that the June 12 Commission meeting would be scheduled for 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 or 3:30 p.m. (at the latest) and that the decision to hold a meeting of funders would be postponed for further discussion with MLM.

C. Commissioner Interviews

It was suggested that interviews be scheduled and held with commissioners, to take place as soon as possible. Interviewers should plan to discuss the format of the meeting and to present the general approach of the final report. They should make clear that the document will not be in final form, but that it is hoped it can be approved for final editing at this meeting. An update on the status of the implementation mechanism and fundraising can be made. It may also be useful to review the recommendations which were discussed at the February meeting. In addition, commissioners should be asked about attendance plans and should be strongly encouraged to attend the meeting on June 12.

The proposed interview assignments were reviewed and slightly revised as indicated in Exhibit A, attached.

Interviewers are asked to report the outcomes of these meetings to VFL as quickly as possible.