



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	Folder
15	14

Teleconferences, 1989-1990.

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

---

cc: Mark Gurvis

TO: Henry L. Zucker  
NAME  
DEPARTMENT/PLANT LOCATION

FROM: Virginia F. Levi  
NAME  
DEPARTMENT/PLANT LOCATION

DATE: 9/18/89  
REPLYING TO  
YOUR MEMO OF: \_\_\_\_\_

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONVERSATION WITH SF AND AH

Following are highlights of our conversation with Seymour and Annette of Monday, September 18.

1. SF referred to the memorandum he had just faxed to MLM and HLZ in preparation for a meeting with Charles Bronfman.
  - a. I am to pull out reports of earlier interviews with Bronfman and forward them to both of you to accompany the new memorandum.
  - b. SF suggests a refinement of the "set-aside concept" to note that the starting point for funding depends on what a particular foundation is already doing in the area of Jewish education. It is hoped that this new commitment would go beyond the current commitment. He noted that Bronfman appears to be seeking direction for his support of the Israel experience and might welcome guidance.
2. We are to send Seymour a copy of the Twersky letter when it has been sent.
3. By Wednesday, September 20, Seymour and Annette will fax us a progress report in preparation for the October Commission meeting. This will include an action plan and from one to three appendices, possibly including (a) a description of the IJE, (b) a summary of the status of research, and (c) a description of community action sites.

They ask that we respond as quickly as possible to the draft and will set a time for a telephone conference for late this week or early next week. At that time, they would like to discuss the format for the October 23 Commission meeting and note that Aron and Davidson are available to make presentations, if we decide that this would be appropriate.

4. Annette reported that she has been in conversation with Joe Reimer and that he will complete work on the option papers as soon as possible. She noted that the combining and rewriting of papers should take place after October 23. It was suggested that the new papers be ready to send in advance or distribute to commissioners on October 23.

Seymour and Annette agree with us that Joe Reimer should conduct telephone interviews of his California commissioners and focus his energies on completion of the option papers and work on his research paper.

5. We were asked our position on the Los Angeles Commission. You reported that MLM may call Barbie Weinberg. SF reported that LA is anxious to be a community action site and reminded us of his earlier suggestion to invite

INTER-OFFICE  
CORRESPONDENCE



Barbie Weinberg to a Commission meeting. He also noted that George Kaplan (LA Federation president) would like to meet with MLM. SF will be meeting with Steve Huberman and will fax us a report on that conversation.

6. You reported that Steve Hoffman met with federation directors in New York last week and that they are anxious to be involved. You felt that this was a good beginning to our relationship with federations.
7. SF and AH reported that there will be no formal reports on research ready by October 23. They will have received informal reports on what Aron and Davidson are doing and their tentative direction and will share those with us. They suggest that it might be useful to report at the Commission meeting that research has been launched and for the two primary researchers to summarize the efforts they are undertaking and a time-table for completion of this research. We should let commissioners have input in shaping the research.
8. You suggested that a review of SF and AH's recommendations for a market study be postponed for our next meeting with senior policy advisors. SF will notify us whether to plan to use the language in his fax on research or some new formulation which he will provide.
9. With respect to the Isa Aron proposed budget, Seymour suggests that Annette talk with Sara Lee regarding the use of HUC computers and telephones in order to reduce the proposed budget.
10. SF will be on vacation beginning September 27 until he arrives in the United States sometime between October 16 and October 18.



TO: Henry L. Zucker  
NAME  
DEPARTMENT/PLANT LOCATION

FROM: Virginia F. Levi  
NAME  
DEPARTMENT/PLANT LOCATION

DATE: 9/21/89  
REPLYING TO  
YOUR MEMO OF: \_\_\_\_\_

SUBJECT: SEPTEMBER 22 TELEPHONE CONFERENCE WITH SF AND AH

Based on our discussion with Mark yesterday and further discussion between Mark and me today, following is a suggested agenda for our telephone discussion with Seymour and Annette.

A. We recommend talking first about the agenda for the October 23 meeting, as a basis for discussion for the background materials. We propose the following:

1. Update on action steps currently underway (MLM)
  - a. Research
  - b. Outreach and PR
  - c. Programmatic Options
2. Developments in our pursuit of the enabling options
  - a. Introduction by SF and AH (based on background materials)
  - b. Update on personnel--SF and AH  
How we propose to impact recruitment, training, profession building, and retention
  - c. Presentation by Isa Aron cataloging the issues she is studying and perhaps predictions of outcomes
  - d. Update on community/finance--HLZ
3. Present the concept of the implementation mechanism--MLM

I know that Seymour and Annette have a proposal for the format of the meeting, which they intend to discuss with us tomorrow. The focus of the meeting would be to move us toward an action plan. They will propose to produce a list of points for discussion, will suggest that MLM present these points and that the Commission discuss them as a unit in the morning, as small groups through lunch and the early afternoon, and return to the full group for discussion of how to move to implementation. Seymour described this very briefly to me on the telephone this morning, and I know plans to elaborate tomorrow.

- B. Following this discussion, we should present our reactions to the paper. Mark has prepared a memorandum suggesting, and I agree, that if the paper is intended as a starting point and Seymour and Annette will be prepared to move well beyond it at the meeting, we are relatively comfortable. If the paper is the basis for the meeting, we feel that it is little more than a rehash of old ideas.





cc: Mark Gurvis

TO: Henry L. Zucker  
NAME  
DEPARTMENT/PLANT LOCATION

FROM: Virginia F. Levi  
NAME *VF*  
DEPARTMENT/PLANT LOCATION

DATE: 9/25/89  
REPLYING TO  
YOUR MEMO OF: \_\_\_\_\_

SUBJECT: HIGHLIGHTS OF 9/25 PHONE CONVERSATION WITH SF AND AH

The following is a summary of our discussion with Seymour Fox and Annette Hochstein on Monday, September 25, 1989:

1. You indicated that we have received the draft cover letter to accompany the background materials and that we will do a redraft when we have a clearer sense of the agenda.
2. Seymour and Annette propose to produce a one-page discussion guide for the 10/23 Commission meeting. This will be based on the first page of the proposed background material--a list of the elements of a plan for action. The goal of the meeting is to get approval for an implementation mechanism. They propose that the meeting be structured as follows:
  - a. 10-10:30 a.m. - MLM to introduce the discussion guide, including steps that have led us to the proposed action plan and contents of the plan, an introduction to the final report, and remarks on where we are with community, personnel, and the programmatic options. He would note that the fourth Commission meeting is intended to focus on the action plan with future meetings devoted to discussion of the final report and recommendations.
  - b. 10:30-12:30 - Full group discussion based on the discussion guide. MLM might call on HLZ for clarification on community/finance, on JR on programmatic options, and on SF, AH, or IA to discuss progress on personnel.
  - c. 12:30-2:30 - Break into three groups for lunch and continuation of discussion using the same discussion guide. We will need to identify chairmen and strong staff people for these groups.
  - d. 2:30-3:30 - Each group would report outcomes and recommendations and the full group would discuss further.
  - e. 3:30-4:00 - MLM to summarize and call on Arthur Green for the D'var Torah.
3. In response to your question regarding a report on the state of the field and strategy for accomplishing a vision for the future, SF indicated that Isa Aron has the assignment to develop a report on state of the field. Nothing further was said about vision.

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

4. We agreed that I will make arrangements for a 4-5 hour staff meeting to include at least HLZ, SF, AH, MG, and VFL. If possible, we will include JR and MLM. This is to take place on either the 19th or 20th of October, in Cleveland. The airport is the preferred location. I will make arrangements and notify everyone.
5. Future steps:
  - a. SF and AH will send us the discussion guide and a new draft of the background materials by Wednesday.
  - b. We will redraft the cover letter.
  - c. We are asked to keep SF and AH informed on the status of the meeting with Bronfman.
  - d. I will draft a memo to MLM indicating SF's request that he call Crown to provide an update on Commission thinking and to encourage a meeting between Crown and SF.
  - e. Next week we can expect to receive a draft IJE position description and a draft appendix on research to accompany the background materials.



MEMORANDUM

TO: SF, MG, AH, MLM, HLZ

1/26/90

FROM: VFL                      SUBJECT: Highlights of 1/26 meeting of HLZ, MG, and VFL  
on Commission planning

1. HLZ would like to know from SF and AH what is expected of Joel Fox and him with regard to redrafting their earlier papers.
2. Commissioners who had not yet indicated their attendance plans for 2/14 were divided for phone calls: HLZ to call Berman, Fisher, Greenberg, Hiller. MG to call Green and Wasserstrom. AH to call Loup and Melton. VFL to call Appleby, Field, Koschitzky, and Rosenthal.
3. Following up on the suggestion that commissioners be divided into groups at the 2/14 meeting to discuss implementation, community action sites, and one of: community/financing, personnel, research, or programmatic arenas, a suggested set of assignments was made. The proposed list is attached.

4. It was suggested that the following schedule be followed on 2/14:

9:30 a.m. - Plenary 1

Opening statement and chairman's report - MLM - 10 min.

\* [MG will prepare a first draft for reaction by SF, AH, & HLZ.]

Presentation by AH summarizing recommendations and discussing where we hope to be in 10 years - 15 min.

Full group discussion of recommendations - 1 hr.

11:00 a.m. - Groups meet to discuss recommendations - 1 hr.

12:00 noon - Lunch (funders to eat and meet in separate room) - 1 hr.

1:00 p.m. - Groups reconvene to continue discussion - 2 hrs.

3:00 p.m. - Plenary 2

Reports of panels

Discussion

Report on Commission research projects (including projected timetable for mailing, what we're asking commissioners to do with them, how we propose to use them) - AH

The Commission report - SF

(Announcement re interim director for implementation - MLM mechanism )

Next meeting - MLM

4:50 p.m. Concluding Comments - Haskel Lookstein



5. We should have a faxed version of the background materials on Mon. morning, 1/29. We will review immediately and be very judicious in recommending changes. Our goal is to have camera-ready copy in our hands by Thurs., 2/1 so that copies can be made and mailed by the end of the day on Fri., 2/2.
6. MG will ask Alvin Schiff to interview Joseph Gruss and Marty Kraar to interview Max Fisher. AH will be unable to interview Ludwig Jesselson, who is now not planning to attend the 2/14 meeting.
7. Proposed timetable for distribution of final draft of final report: mail to commissioners by May 1, request written response by May 15, plan to discuss points of concern at meeting of 6/12.



MINUTES: Commission Staff Teleconference

DATE OF MEETING: April 12, 1990

DATE MINUTES ISSUED: April 19, 1990

IN CLEVELAND: Mark Gurvis, ✓ Stephen H. Hoffman, Virginia F. Levi,  
Morton L. Mandel, Henry L. Zucker

IN ISRAEL: Seymour Fox, Annette Hochstein

-----

I. Plans for the IJE

It was suggested that the board of the implementation mechanism include 18 members, as follows: 10 potential funders, 4 national figures with strengths in process, and 4 educators. This scenario raises questions about the role of the seminary heads, among others. It provides an opportunity to involve new players in this field, if desired.

It was suggested that the IJE board be supplemented by a group of senior policy advisors with expertise in community organization. Membership might include Kraar, Schiff, and Stein, for example.

A body of IJE Fellows might also be created to provide an intellectual foundation and a core of people on which to draw for the implementation of projects. Possible members might include Ariel, Elkin, Ackerman, Fineman-Nemser, Holtz, and Pekarsky.

Still to be answered are questions about the identity of actual funders and IJE staff. We must also decide how fast to proceed and when to begin inviting people to participate. Do we have the authority to proceed?

In the discussion that followed, it was suggested that the Commission be disbanded at some date and be replaced by a new entity to include the active commissioners and others we might wish to add. This group would be kept informed of IJE developments periodically, would meet annually, and would provide a source of feedback. Staff would be in touch with members as is now being done with commissioners.

In discussing a schedule for implementation, it was noted that concrete steps must wait until the IJE board has been formed. It is intended that the board be actively involved in plans for implementation. It was noted, further, that this approach should have no effect on the conclusions and recommendations expressed in the Commission's final report. It will be the board's responsibility to prioritize the recommendations and spell out criteria for proceeding.



## II. Final Report

An outline of the report was distributed. (See Exhibit A) It was reported that chapter two has been submitted to Fox-Hochstein and will soon be returned with corrections. It will be sent to this group for general reaction to Finn's writing style.

A question was raised about the desirability of quoting commissioners in the report. While these quotes are one means of introducing both the commissioners and some central ideas, it was suggested that unless we quote everyone, it might be better to quote no one than to risk offending some. Where quotes seem necessary, it might be best not to attribute them, but to state "as one commissioner said, ...." It was agreed that this question would remain open while staff review the Carnegie Report and its use of quotes.

It was suggested that the philosophical statement in the introduction to the report might flow directly from the Fox-Scheffler paper. It was reported that SF is working to get a statement from Twersky defining an educated Jew.

The following tentative schedule was put forward: It is anticipated that four of the five chapters of the report should be ready to send to senior policy advisors by early May and that suggestions and reactions can be incorporated in time to send a draft to commissioners by the end of May. This timetable would allow for a Commission meeting on June 12, as presently scheduled.

## III. Status of Research Reports

- A. Ackerman's paper on the structure of Jewish education is in the hands of senior policy advisors, many of whom have submitted their comments. It is anticipated that this paper should be ready for publication before the end of April.
- B. Aron's paper on the Los Angeles teacher census is in the hands of senior policy advisors. It appears that the data will be useful to the implementation mechanism, but that this paper will not need to be published.
- C. Aron's paper on professionalization should be ready to send to commissioners within the next few days.
- D. Davidson is working on a final draft of his paper on preparation of Jewish educators. We should have it in publishable form by April 20.
- E. It has been agreed that Fox's and Zucker's papers are complete, but will not be published at this time.

- F. Reimer's paper on the synagogue as context is due on April 20.
- G. Reisman's paper on informal education is in the hands of senior policy advisors. It appears that some major revisions are in order. MG will send policy advisor comments to Reisman.
- H. The Scheffler/Fox paper on the relationship of Jewish education to Jewish continuity is nearing completion and should arrive shortly.

#### IV. Update on Funding

It was reported that while MLM is on the west coast later in April, he will talk with the Weinbergs, representatives of the Koret Foundation and the Swig family, and possibly Mark Lainer. Meetings are currently being scheduled to take place in May with representatives of Revson, Avi Chai, Riklis, Cummings, and Scheuer. In addition, HLZ is working on arrangements to meet with Hirschhorn.

SF has been in touch with the Meltons and believes that they are a potential source of support. It was suggested that SF join MLM in meeting with them during SF's next trip to the U.S. In the interim, SF will determine whether Mrs. Melton would be comfortable joining the IJE board.

It was suggested that HLZ plan to talk with Maurice Corson about the likelihood of a Wexner set-aside of funds to help implement Commission recommendations. Wexner interests in recruitment and training would lend themselves to this approach.

It was suggested that a meeting be set up with Arnow and his parents to test their interest in funding.

#### V. Next Meeting

The meeting of senior policy advisors originally scheduled for April 22 was cancelled. It was suggested that this meeting be rescheduled for either Thursday, May 3 or Sunday, May 6 in Cleveland, depending on when Finn can be ready with the final report. SF will let HLZ know by April 18 which is the preferable date. VFL will ask policy advisors to hold both dates.

An interview schedule to be used in communication with commissioners should be ready for review at that meeting.



## THE COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION

### REPORT OUTLINE

#### I. Introduction

- A. What is an educated Jew -- basic philosophical statement
- B. A perspective on current environment in Jewish education in U.S. and why reached crisis stage

#### II. Purpose and history of the Commission

- A. How and why it was founded
- B. Unique features of Commission
- C. Who the commissioners and advisors are
- D. What the goals of the Commission are
- E. How it is funded
- F. When and where it met
- G. Commitment to create ongoing program

#### III. History of Jewish education

- A. Some background on Jewish education in the U.S.
- B. Analysis of what's wrong with Jewish education in U.S. today
- C. Research findings indicating state of crisis
- D. Relationship between education and continuity
- E. Examples of some successful programs -- i.e. Mexico, Pasadena, Melton Center
- F. Local commissions -- i.e. Cleveland

#### IV. Recommendations of the Commission

- A. Conclusions & plan (26 items)
- B. Personnel, funding, etc.
- C. Creation of Institute for the Advancement of Jewish Education (final name to be determined)
- D. Description of "lead communities" concept, how they will be chosen and how they will function
- E. Why plan will work

#### V. Glimpses of the Future

- A. How lead communities will affect whole Jewish community
- B. What Jewish education as a whole can be in future