



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

**MS-831: Jack, Joseph and Morton Mandel Foundation Records, 1980–2008.**

Series C: Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education (CIJE). 1988–2003.

Subseries 6: General Files, 1990–2000.

---

Box  
48

Folder  
16

Goals Project. Harvard meetings. 1995 February. Includes planning material for other CIJE related meetings, 1995.

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

---

## SLB NOTES

Professor Israel Scheffler

Professor Vernon Howard

Philosophy of Education Research Center, Harvard University 617 495-9084

Secretary: Joanne Sorabella 617 495-3569 Fax: 617 495-0540

---

Sheraton Cleveland City Centre 216 771-7600 Fax: 566-0736

FROM: Alan, 73321,1220  
TO: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
DATE: 1/11/95 4:01 PM

Re: MEF advisory in boston

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Virginia Levi, 73321,1223  
TO: robin mencher, 74043,423  
CC: Alan, 73321,1220  
Ginny, 73321,1223  
DATE: 1/11/95 8:27 AM

RE: MEF advisory in boston

Robin,  
Since I am not up on any details of the MEF advisory meeting, how about you and Carol working on this, with you taking the lead. We can confirm this with Alan, but I think this is the sort of thing that you guys should be taking on. We are too far out of the loop. Let's discuss.  
Ginny

FROM: Alan, 73321,1220  
TO: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
DATE: 1/11/95 4:01 PM

Re: Re: steering committee

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: INTERNET:GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu,  
INTERNET:GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu  
TO: Alan, 73321,1220  
(unknown), 73321,1223  
DATE: 1/9/95 7:28 PM

RE: Re: steering committee

Sender: goldrieb@ctrvax.vanderbilt.edu  
Received: from ctrvx1.Vanderbilt.Edu by dub-img-3.compuserve.com (8.6.9/5.941228sam)  
id TAA15762; Mon, 9 Jan 1995 19:26:33 -0500  
From: <GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu>  
Received: from ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu by ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu (PMDF V4.2-15  
#7190) id <01HLNHO331ZU8X58RS@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu>; Mon,  
9 Jan 1995 18:27:21 CST  
Date: Mon, 09 Jan 1995 18:27:21 -0600 (CST)  
Subject: Re: steering committee  
To: 73321.1220@compuserve.com  
Cc: gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu, 73321.1223@compuserve.com  
Message-id: <01HLNHO331ZW8X58RS@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu>  
X-VMS-To: IN%"73321.1220@compuserve.com"  
X-VMS-Cc: IN%"gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu", IN%"73321.1223@compuserve.com"  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Alan, I just got a message from Annette saying that it is very  
difficult to get hotel space in Boston for around the 9th so we should  
hurry and make reservations.

- 1) Does this mean the meeting is definitely in Boston?
- 2) What are the times (so we know whether we need reservations  
for the 8th and/or 9th) and
- 3) where are the meetings and where should we try to make reservations  
and what are the alternatives if there are no rooms, and  
most importantly,  
CAN ROBIN or someone take care of this for all of us who are to attend?

I look forward to the conference call to discuss the other issues! Ellen

FROM: Alan, 73321,1220  
TO: Sandra L. Blumenfeld, 76322,2406  
DATE: 1/11/95 4:01 PM

Re: Re: staff meetings

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: INTERNET:ANNETTE@vms.huji.ac.il, INTERNET:ANNETTE@vms.huji.ac.il  
TO: Alan, 73321,1220  
DATE: 1/9/95 4:58 PM

RE: Re: staff meetings

Sender: annette@vms.huji.ac.il  
Received: from VMS.HUJI.AC.IL by dub-img-2.compuserve.com (8.6.9/5.941228sam)  
id QAA06178; Mon, 9 Jan 1995 16:48:36 -0500  
Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V7a); Mon, 09 Jan 95 23:49:08 +0200  
Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V7a); Mon, 09 Jan 95 23:45:07 +0200  
Date: Mon, 9 Jan 95 23:45 +0200  
Message-id: <09010095234501@HUJIVMS>  
From: <ANNETTE@vms.huji.ac.il>  
To: "Alan D. Hoffmann" <73321.1220@compuserve.com>  
Cc: annette@compuserve.com  
Subject: Re: staff meetings

Hi Alan,

hope all is well - things here are moving faster than ever,  
and I think a US trip will be a welcome slowdown - the flight  
will certainly be...e long  
Hope things went well with the planning discussion last  
Wednesday - I am quite interested in hearing from you.

Regarding February meetings here are some important  
logistical matters:

a. hotels are heavily booked that week in Boston. I  
strongly urge that you and your team reserve any hotel  
you can. Have reserved for some of my people at 'the Inn  
at Harvard' - across from the Yard, friendly, not super.  
Sheraton Commander may be better. Charles full. booked.

b. Am looking at February 8 (Goals) and 9 (MEF), with  
the 10th in New York for the Ruskay etc. meeting if  
that is OK and with Gail and whoever else on personnel.

c. Need to tell Harvard re-number of participants  
on the 8 and 9 - how many CIJE participants each day?  
We must reserve the appropriate meeting rooms and  
pressure is high there too.

so please let me know ASAP.

d. Any instructions re the meeting of the 14th? Our role if any? Can Robin let me know the schedule - in particular when the day starts and ends? Other meetings in particular when the day starts and ends? Need this info in order not to double-schedule meetings.

e. Hope all of well with you, with Nadia and with your children,

best,

annette

FROM: INTERNET:gamoran%eagle.DecNet@eunice.ssc.wisc.edu,  
INTERNET:gamoran%eagle.DecNet@eunice.ssc.wisc.edu  
TO: robin mencher, 74043,423  
DATE: 1/13/95 5:18 PM

Re: please pass this message along to Sandy B. -- I can't seem to reach her by e-mail --  
thanks

Sender: gamoran%eagle.decnet@eunice.ssc.wisc.edu  
Received: from eunice.ssc.wisc.edu by dub-img-1.compuserve.com (8.6.9/5.941228sam)  
id RAA16664; Fri, 13 Jan 1995 17:12:06 -0500  
From: <gamoran%eagle.DecNet@eunice.ssc.wisc.edu>  
Received: from EAGLE.DECnet MAIL11D\_V3 by eunice.ssc.wisc.edu;  
id AA09029; 5.65/42; Fri, 13 Jan 1995 16:11:15 -0600  
Date: Fri, 13 Jan 1995 16:11:15 -0600  
Message-Id: <9501132211.AA09029@eunice.ssc.wisc.edu>  
To: robin@ssc.wisc.edu  
Subject: please pass this message along to Sandy B. -- I can't seem to reach her by e-mail --  
thanks

From: EUNICE::"postmaster@compuserve.com" 13-JAN-1995 13:00:15.18  
To: <eagle::gamoran>  
CC:  
Subj: Re: ? EMDRPD - Mail Delivery Failure. Refused -- Postage Due. 76322,2406

Re: ? EMDRPD - Mail Delivery Failure. Refused -- Postage Due. 76322,2406  
RE: February 8th Hotel Reservations

Your message could not be delivered as addressed.

--- Returned message ---

Sender: gamoran%eagle.decnet@eunice.ssc.wisc.edu  
Received: from eunice.ssc.wisc.edu by dub-img-1.compuserve.com (8.6.9/5.941228sam)  
id NAA14871; Fri, 13 Jan 1995 13:47:19 -0500  
From: <gamoran%eagle.DecNet@eunice.ssc.wisc.edu>  
Received: from EAGLE.DECnet MAIL11D\_V3 by eunice.ssc.wisc.edu;  
id AA04936; 5.65/42; Fri, 13 Jan 1995 12:45:36 -0600  
Date: Fri, 13 Jan 1995 12:45:36 -0600  
Message-Id: <9501131845.AA04936@eunice.ssc.wisc.edu>  
To: "76322.2406@compuserve.com"@ssc.wisc.edu  
Cc: ALAN@ssc.wisc.edu, "goldrieb@ctrvax.vanderbilt.edu"@ssc.wisc.edu  
Subject: RE: February 8th Hotel Reservations

Please also make a reservation for Bill Robinson for Feb. 8. I expect he  
will be attending the MEF advisory committee meeting. If that does not  
occur we can always cancel the reservation. Thanks,

Adam

*Done*  
*01.17.95*  
*SB*

FROM: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
TO: adam, INTERNET:gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu  
Gail Dorph, 73321,1217  
ellen goldring, INTERNET:goldrieb@ctrvax.vanderbilt.edu  
Alan Hoffmann, 73321,1220  
Barry Holtz, 73321,1221  
dan pekarsky, INTERNET:danpek@macc.wisc.edu  
Nessa Rapoport, 74671,3370  
CC: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
DATE: 1/13/95 1:17 PM

Re: February 8th Hotel Reservations

Please note that I have made hotel reservations for each of you at the Sheraton Commander in Cambridge. As soon as I get the confirmation slips I will forward them. If anyone needs a room for the nite of the 7th as well, please let me know.

Regards,



Sandy

FROM: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
TO: Annettelsrael, INTERNET:annette@vms.huji.ac.il  
CC: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
Alan Hoffmann, 73321,1220  
DATE: 1/13/95 1:17 PM

Re: Staff Meetings February 8 & 9

Dear Annette:

I am in receipt of your message to Allen regarding the above. I have made reservations for Alan, Gail, Barry Dan Peksarsky, Nessa, Adam Gamoran and Ellen Goldring at the Sheraton Commander in Cambridge for the nite of February 8th.

The CIJE participants on the 8th are Alan, Barry, Gail and Dan (4). On the 9th - Alan, Gail, Nessa, Adam, and Ellen (5).

Regarding the 14th of February, we have the Conference Room at the JCCA reserved all day for the Steering Committee and the Mazer Study reserved from 3:00 p.m. for the Jersualem Fellows candidate interviews.

If you need any further information, please let me know.



Sincerely,

Sandy

Message-id: <14010095183900@HUJIVMS>  
From: <ANNETTE@vms.huji.ac.il>  
To: "Sandra L. Blumenfield" <76322.2406@compuserve.com>  
Cc: annette@compuserve.com  
Subject: Re: Staff Meetings February 8 & 9

hi Sandy,

thanks for the info and the arrangements. All that's missing for me:  
a tete-a- tete with Alan in Boston and one with Nessa - Boston or New  
York. Probably Boston breakfast is better. Also I should be informed  
regarding the 10th in New York with Gail and any meeting Alan  
may set up. Will fly in early that morning and won't have a hotel for  
meetings. Where will Gail/Alan want to meet?

thanks  
annette



FROM: Ginny levi, 73321,1223  
TO: Sandy Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
DATE: 1/16/95 8:53 AM

Re: difficulty mailing to Sandra's compuserve. please forward

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: INTERNET:ANNETTE@vms.huji.ac.il, INTERNET:ANNETTE@vms.huji.ac.il  
TO: Ginny levi, 73321,1223  
DATE: 1/15/95 10:24 AM

RE: difficulty mailing to Sandra's compuserve. please forward

Sender: annette@vms.huji.ac.il  
Received: from VMS.HUJI.AC.IL by arl-img-3.compuserve.com (8.6.9/5.941228sam)  
id KAA06609; Sun, 15 Jan 1995 10:16:23 -0500  
Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V7a); Sun, 15 Jan 95 17:16:23 +0200  
Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V7a); Sun, 15 Jan 95 17:14:43 +0200  
Date: Sun, 15 Jan 95 17:14 +0200  
Message-id: <15010095171437@HUJIVMS>  
From: <ANNETTE@vms.huji.ac.il>  
To: 73321.1223@compuserve.com  
Subject: difficulty mailing to Sandra's compuserve. please forward

Received: by HUJIVMS via SMTP(198.4.9.3) (HUyMail-V7a);  
Sat, 14 Jan 95 18:51:42 +0200  
Received: by dub-img-3.compuserve.com (8.6.9/5.941228sam)  
id LAA28458; Sat, 14 Jan 1995 11:51:31 -0500  
Date: 14 Jan 95 11:46:51 EST  
From: Electronic Postmaster <POSTMASTER@compuserve.com>  
Comments: Returned from: <76322.2406@CompuServe.COM>  
Message-Type: Delivery Report  
To: <annette@vms.huji.ac.il>  
Subject: Re: ? EMDRPD - Mail Delivery Failure. Refused -- Postage Due. 76322,2406  
Re: Staff Meetings February 8 & 9  
Message-ID: <950114164651\_515664.456256\_BHH24-62@CompuServe.COM>

Re: ? EMDRPD - Mail Delivery Failure. Refused -- Postage Due. 76322,2406  
Re: Staff Meetings February 8 & 9

Your message could not be delivered as addressed.

--- Returned message ---

Sender: annette@vms.huji.ac.il  
Received: from VMS.HUJI.AC.IL by arl-img-3.compuserve.com (8.6.9/5.941228sam)  
id LAA28782; Sat, 14 Jan 1995 11:39:10 -0500  
Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V7a); Sat, 14 Jan 95 18:39:11 +0200  
Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V7a); Sat, 14 Jan 95 18:39:03 +0200  
Date: Sat, 14 Jan 95 18:39 +0200

FROM: Alan Hoffmann, 73321,1220  
TO: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
DATE: 1/16/95 9:17 AM

Re: Re: steering committee

Sandy,

Please respond to Ellen's message and answer her questions.

Send me a copy.

Shabbat Shalom

alan

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: INTERNET:GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu,  
INTERNET:GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu  
TO: Alan, 73321,1220  
(unknown), 73321,1223  
DATE: 1/9/95 7:28 PM

RE: Re: steering committee

Sender: goldrieb@ctrvax.vanderbilt.edu  
Received: from ctrvx1.Vanderbilt.Edu by dub-img-3.compuserve.com (8.6.9/5.941228sam)  
id TAA15762; Mon, 9 Jan 1995 19:26:33 -0500  
From: <GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu>  
Received: from ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu by ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu (PMDF V4.2-15  
#7190) id <01HLNHO331ZU8X58RS@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu>; Mon,  
9 Jan 1995 18:27:21 CST  
Date: Mon, 09 Jan 1995 18:27:21 -0600 (CST)  
Subject: Re: steering committee  
To: 73321.1220@compuserve.com  
Cc: gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu, 73321.1223@compuserve.com  
Message-id: <01HLNHO331ZW8X58RS@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu>  
X-VMS-To: IN%"73321.1220@compuserve.com"  
X-VMS-Cc: IN%"gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu", IN%"73321.1223@compuserve.com"  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Alan, I just got a message from Annette saying that it is very difficult to get hotel space in Boston for around the 9th so we should hurry and make reservations.

- 1) Does this mean the meeting is definitely in Boston?
- 2) What are the times (so we know whether we need reservations for the 8th and/or 9th) and
- 3) where are the meetings and where should we try to make reservations and what are the alternatives if there are no rooms, and

most importantly,

CAN ROBIN or someone take care of this for all of us who are to attend?

I look forward to the conference call to discuss the other issues! Ellen

FROM: Alan Hoffmann, 73321,1220  
TO: Sandra L. Blumenfeld, 76322,2406  
DATE: 1/18/95 6:30 PM

Re: RE: February 8th Hotel Reservations

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: INTERNET:gamoran%eagle.DecNet@eunice.ssc.wisc.edu,  
INTERNET:gamoran%eagle.DecNet@eunice.ssc.wisc.edu  
TO: Alan Hoffmann, 73321,1220  
(unknown), 76322,2406  
DATE: 1/13/95 1:53 PM

RE: RE: February 8th Hotel Reservations

Sender: gamoran%eagle.decnet@eunice.ssc.wisc.edu  
Received: from eunice.ssc.wisc.edu by dub-img-1.compuserve.com (8.6.9/5.941228sam)  
id NAA14871; Fri, 13 Jan 1995 13:47:19 -0500  
From: <gamoran%eagle.DecNet@eunice.ssc.wisc.edu>  
Received: from EAGLE.DECnet MAIL11D\_V3 by eunice.ssc.wisc.edu;  
id AA04936; 5.65/42; Fri, 13 Jan 1995 12:45:36 -0600  
Date: Fri, 13 Jan 1995 12:45:36 -0600  
Message-Id: <9501131845.AA04936@eunice.ssc.wisc.edu>  
To: "76322.2406@compuserve.com"@ssc.wisc.edu  
Cc: ALAN@ssc.wisc.edu, "goldrieb@ctrvax.vanderbilt.edu"@ssc.wisc.edu  
Subject: RE: February 8th Hotel Reservations

Please also make a reservation for Bill Robinson for Feb. 8. I expect he will be attending the MEF advisory committee meeting. If that does not occur we can always cancel the reservation. Thanks,

Adam

FROM: Alan Hoffmann, 73321,1220  
TO: Sandra L. Blumenfeld, 76322,2406  
DATE: 1/18/95 6:30 PM

Re: draft agenda for MEF advisory committee

FROM: INTERNET:gamoran%eagle.DecNet@eunice.ssc.wisc.edu,  
INTERNET:gamoran%eagle.DecNet@eunice.ssc.wisc.edu  
TO: Alan Hoffmann, 73321,1220  
DATE: 1/12/95 5:31 PM

Re: draft agenda for MEF advisory committee

Sender: gamoran%eagle.decnet@eunice.ssc.wisc.edu  
Received: from eunice.ssc.wisc.edu by dub-img-1.compuserve.com (8.6.9/5.941228sam)  
id RAA26973; Thu, 12 Jan 1995 17:28:32 -0500  
From: <gamoran%eagle.DecNet@eunice.ssc.wisc.edu>  
Received: from EAGLE.DECnet MAIL11D\_V3 by eunice.ssc.wisc.edu;  
id AA20993; 5.65/42; Thu, 12 Jan 1995 16:27:55 -0600  
Date: Thu, 12 Jan 1995 16:27:55 -0600  
Message-Id: <9501122227.AA20993@eunice.ssc.wisc.edu>  
To: alan@ssc.wisc.edu  
Cc: "goldrieb@ctrvax.vanderbilt.edu"@ssc.wisc.edu  
Subject: draft agenda for MEF advisory committee

MEF Advisory Committee Meeting: February 9, 1995 Boston

### Tentative Agenda

#### I. Developing a Module for the Study of Jewish Personnel

##### A. Preparing the Module for Use in Communities

We will come to the meeting on 2/9 with a draft of the module, including Part I: Survey and Part II: Interviews. The draft will include directions on how to administer the data collection.

B. Data Collection: How do we assure quality? What is CIJE's role? Should an outside group be involved?

C. Data Analysis: Who will analyze data? Private consulting group? A university, researched-based institute (CUNY?). Bill? How to ensure quality, comparative bases, and opportunities for secondary analyses from other researchers?

D. What is the dissemination plan for the module itself?

E. How can the data be disseminated and accessed for "public" use?

F. How can findings be disseminated and reported? In

individual communities? Beyond individual communities?  
Reports of secondary analyses?

II. Review of experience of the Policy Brief: What went well, what did not go well, where are we in the dissemination plan, etc?

III. Review of MEF 1995 Work plan and anticipated products in light of the first policy brief, new staff configurations (no field researchers except Bill), changes in CIJE's work plan, etc...The point is to leave the day with a revised work plan.

Do we want additional policy briefs?

Prioritizing topics?

Revisit research paper ideas, such as personnel study in best practice schools, etc.

FROM: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
TO: Barry Holtz, 73321,1221  
CC: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
Alan Hoffmann, 73321,1220  
DATE: 1/18/95 6:38 PM

Re: Dinner on February 9, 1995

Barry:

Please note that the dinner meeting with Joe Reimer, Susan Shevitz and Alan is now scheduled for 5:00 p.m. on February 9th in Boston. The plan is to take the 7:00 p.m. Delta Shuttle to LGA.

All the best,

Sandy

FROM: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
TO: Bill Robinson, 74104,3335  
CC: adam, INTERNET:gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu  
Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
DATE: 1/20/95 2:32 PM

Re: Hotel Reservation for 02.08.95

Bill:

Please note that I have made a reservation for you at the Sheraton Commander in Cambridge for the above date.

Regards,

Sandy



---

## Facsimile Cover Sheet

To: *Sandy*  
Company: *Cije*  
Phone: *212-532-2360*  
Fax: *212-532-2646*

From: *Lee / Reservations*  
Company: SHERATON COMMANDER HOTEL  
Phone: (617) 547-4800  
Fax: (617) 234-1302

Date: *1/20/95*  
PAGES: *3*

CONFIRM: ☒ CANCELLED  
Name of Party: *Alan D Hoffman*  
Arrival: *2/8/95*  
Departure: *2/9/95*  
Rate: *\$135.00*  
Number of People: *1*  
Room Type: \_\_\_\_\_  
Guarantee: *hold till 4 pm*  
Confirmation Number: *1905*

Guaranteed reservations must be cancelled before 6PM on the day of arrival to avoid billing.

CONFIRM: ☒ CANCELLED  
Name of Party: Jail Dorph  
Arrival: 2/8/95  
Departure: 2/9/95  
Rate: \$ 135.00  
Number of People: 1  
Room Type: -  
Guarantee: 4 pm hold  
Confirmation Number: 1906

CONFIRM: ☒ CANCELLED  
Name of Party: Barry W Holtz  
Arrival: 2/8/95  
Departure: 2/9/95  
Rate: \$ 135.00  
Number of People: 1  
Room Type: -  
Guarantee: 4 pm hold  
Confirmation Number: 1907

\* Guaranteed reservations must be cancelled before 6PM on the day of arrival to avoid billing.

\* PLEASE HOLD CANCELLATION NUMBER ON FILE.

CONFIRM: ☒ CANCELLED  
Name of Party: Dan Bekarsky  
Arrival: 2/8/95  
Departure: 2/9/95  
Rate: \$ 135.00  
Number of People: 1  
Room Type: -  
Guarantee: 4 pm hold  
Confirmation Number: 1908

CONFIRM: ☒ CANCELLED  
Name of Party: Nessa Rapoport  
Arrival: 2/8/95  
Departure: 2/9/95  
Rate: \$ 135.00  
Number of People: 1  
Room Type: -  
Guarantee: 4 pm hold  
Confirmation Number: 1909

CONFIRM: ☒ CANCELLED  
Name of Party: Adam Jamerson  
Arrival: 2/8/95  
Departure: 2/9/95  
Rate: \$135.00  
Number of People: 1  
Room Type: -  
Guarantee: 4pm hold.  
Confirmation Number: 1910

CONFIRM: ☒ CANCELLED  
Name of Party: Ellen Goldring  
Arrival: 2/8/95  
Departure: 2/9/95  
Rate: \$135.00  
Number of People: 1  
Room Type: -  
Guarantee: 4pm hold  
Confirmation Number: 1911

Guaranteed reservations must be cancelled before 6PM on the day of arrival to avoid billing.

PLEASE HOLD CANCELLATION NUMBER ON FILE.

CONFIRM: ☒ CANCELLED  
Name of Party: Bill Robinson  
Arrival: 2/8/95  
Departure: 2/9/95  
Rate: \$135.00  
Number of People: 1  
Room Type: -  
Guarantee: 4pm hold  
Confirmation Number: 1912

~~CONFIRM: ☒ CANCELLED~~  
~~Name of Party:~~  
~~Arrival:~~  
~~Departure:~~  
~~Rate:~~  
~~Number of People:~~  
~~Room Type:~~  
~~Guarantee:~~  
~~Confirmation Number:~~

FROM: "Dan Pekarsky", INTERNET:pekarsky@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu  
TO: robin mencher, 74043,423  
DATE: 1/22/95 11:14 AM

Re: CIJE NY Meeting 1/5 -Reply

Sender: pekarsky@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu  
Received: from wigate.nic.wisc.edu by dub-img-1.compuserve.com (8.6.9/5.941228sam)  
id LAA13432; Sun, 22 Jan 1995 11:11:53 -0500  
Received: from mail.soemadison.wisc.edu by wigate.nic.wisc.edu;  
Sun, 22 Jan 95 10:11 CDT  
Message-Id: <2F228385.CF87.0001.000@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu>  
Date: Sun, 22 Jan 1995 10:09:00 -600  
From: "Dan Pekarsky" <pekarsky@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu>  
Reply-To: pekarsky@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu  
Subject: CIJE NY Meeting 1/5 -Reply  
To: 74043.423@compuserve.com  
X-Gateway: iGate, (WP Office) vers 4.04b - 1032  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; Charset=US-ASCII  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

Dear Robin,

For some reason, my attempt to send Sandy a message is not succeeding. Could you let her know that I need a reservation in Cambridge on February 7 as well as Feb. 8?

Thanks a lot.

Dan Pekarsky

done  
01.23.96  
828

I sent danny a message letting  
him know I passed this on to  
you & that we are working  
on your E-Mail.

Sharon  
commanded to  
FAX to CIJE

FROM: Alan Hoffmann, 73321,1220  
TO: Barry Holtz, 73321,1221  
CC: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
DATE: 1/22/95 9:45 PM

Re: Dinner on February 9, 1995

Barry,

Welcome back!

Sandy misunderstood. I don't believe that we will get the 7.30 shuttle (but just might as Joe has a 7 p.m. meeting in Brookline), but will then get the 8.30 shuttle. We will eat in Cambridge.

a.

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
TO: Barry Holtz, 73321,1221  
CC: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
Alan Hoffmann, 73321,1220  
DATE: 1/18/95 6:38 PM

RE: Dinner on February 9, 1995

Barry:

Please note that the dinner meeting with Joe Reimer, Susan Shevitz and Alan is now scheduled for 5:00 p.m. on February 9th in Boston. The plan is to take the 7:00 p.m. Delta Shuttle to LGA.

All the best,

Sandy



---

## Facsimile Cover Sheet

To: *Sandy*  
Company: *CITE*  
Phone: *212 532 2646*  
Fax: *212 532 2646*

From: *Lee/Reservations*  
Company: SHERATON COMMANDER HOTEL  
Phone: (617) 547-4800  
Fax: (617) 234-1302

Date: *1/23/95*  
PAGES: *1*

CONFIRM: ☒ CANCELLED  
Name of Party: *DAN PEKARSKY*  
Arrival: *2/7/95*  
Departure: *2/9/95*  
Rate: *\$135.00*  
Number of People: *1*  
Room Type: *K*  
Guarantee: *4pm hold*  
Confirmation Number: *1908*

Guaranteed reservations must be cancelled before 6PM on the day of arrival to avoid billing.

FROM: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
TO: dan pekarsky, INTERNET:danpek@macc.wisc.edu  
CC: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
DATE: 1/23/95 5:31 PM

Re: Reservation at Sheraton Commander, Cambridge

Dan:

Sorry you had trouble reaching me. I think the problem is solved now.

Regarding your reservation - you are now booked at the Sheraton Commander in Cambridge for arrival on the 7th; departure on the 9th.

Have a good evening.

Sandy.

**COUNCIL FOR INITIATIVES  
IN JEWISH EDUCATION**

**212 532 2360  
Fax: 212 532 2646**

**FAX COVER SHEET**

January 24, 1995

TO:           Annette Hochstein  
              619 951

FROM:       Sandra L. Blumenfield

NO. OF PAGES (including cover):    2

-----  
Please see enclosed form.

slb

FROM: gail dorph, 73321,1217  
TO: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
DATE: 1/24/95 2:43 AM

Re: Staff Meeting and Cindy Chazan

sandy, I got an email from annette that she can get us a \$119 a night rate in Boston. she needs to know for whom and when. I told her for 2/8 for NY team, but I wasn't sure who else and when they needed the rate. If you could send her an email clarifying the schedule and who is staying which night etc., that would be great. thanks

FROM: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
TO: Annettelsrael, INTERNET:annette@vms.huji.ac.il  
CC: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
Gail Dorph, 73321,1217  
DATE: 1/25/95 9:37 AM

Re: February 8 & 9 Meetings at Harvard University

FROM: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
TO: Annettelsrael, internet:annette@vms.huji.ac.il  
CC: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
Gail Dorph, 73321.1217  
DATE: 1/24/95 8:25 PM

Re: February 8 & 9 Meetings at Harvard University

Dear Annette:

Before I begin let me apologize for perhaps not being completely coherent. This is all new to me, so here goes.

On the 8th for the Goals Project - attendees (beside yourself and Seymour Fox?) are ADH, BWH, GZD, NR and DP.

On the 9th for the MEF Advisory Committee Meeting - attendees are ADH, GZD, AG, EG, NR and Bill Robinson (BR).

I have made the following reservations at the Sheraton Commander in Cambridge:

02.07 - Dan Pekarsky (2 nites).

02.08 (all for 1 nite) - GZD, ADH, AG, EG, BWH, NR & BR.

Also, I need to have you fill out a Meeting/Workshop Budget Elements form for the meeting on the 8th. I will fax it to you.

Thanks for all your help.

Sandy

FROM: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
TO: Annette Hochstein, 100274,1745  
CC: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
Alan Hoffmann, 73321.1220  
DATE: 1/26/95 1:45 PM

Re: Copy of: Reservations in Cambridge, MA

Dear Annette:

Alan would like to know at which hotel you will be staying in Cambridge. I have made reservations for our staff at the Sheraton Commander. However, we are now exploring extending through Friday - if there is room at your hotel and the rate is good perhaps it would be more convenient if everyone stayed at the same place.

Thanks,

Sandy

**Mandel Institute**

**מכון מנדל**

**Tel:** 972-2-617418

**Fax:** 972-2-619951

**FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**

**To:** Sandra Blumenfield **Date:** January 26, 1995

**From:** Annette Hochstein **No. of Pages:**

**Fax Number:**

Dear Sandra,

In regard to the fax you sent Annette, re: Meeting/Workshop Budget Elements:

All meetings were arranged within the framework of the Mandel/Harvard project.

Regards,

Michelle

(Annett's secretary)

Entity CITF  
 Project GOALS PROJECT MEETINGS  
 Responsible Person/Meeting Coordinator SANDRA L. BLUMENFELD  
 Purpose STAFF MEETINGS/CONSULTATIONS  
 Date(s) of Meeting 02.08.95 Time of Meeting From: 9AM To: 5PM  
 Meeting City/Airport CAMBRIDGE, MA Arrival Date and Latest Suitable  
 Arrival Time \_\_\_\_\_ Departure Date and Earliest Suitable  
 Departure Time \_\_\_\_\_ Meeting Agenda Attached? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No X  
 Location: Where? HARVARD UNIV. Phone \_\_\_\_\_  
 Address CAMBRIDGE, MA Fax \_\_\_\_\_  
 Is the location already reserved? Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

* ATTENDEES (if more space needed please attach separate sheet)	AIRPORT DEPARTURE CITY	TRAVEL		ROOMS	MEALS	TOTAL
		AIR <sup>1</sup>	DRIVE TRX <sup>1</sup>			
ALAN HOFFMANN	NEW YORK	150	50			200
BARRY HOLTZ	NEW YORK	150	50			200
BAIL DORPH	NEW YORK	150	50			200
NESSA RAPOPORT	NEW YORK	150	50			200
DAN PEKARSKY	MADISON, WI	493*	50	240		783
*493 = COST OF B TO B TICKETS (2)						
ATTENDEE COST		\$ 1,093	\$ 250	\$ 240	\$	\$ 1,583 <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Meeting manager should complete all elements of this form except air fares. This form should then be sent to the Corporate Travel Department who will insert estimated air fares and return the form within 3 working days from the date received. If there are other attendees who will cover their own travel, attach a separate sheet.  
<sup>2</sup> CARRY TOTAL FORWARD TO REVERSE SIDE

# MEETING/WORKSHOP BUDGET ELEMENTS

EXHIBIT A  
No. 1.3  
Effective: 7/2/93  
Page 4 of 4

ATTENDEE COST: (Brought forward from front side)

\$ 4,583

## DESCRIPTION

MEETING ROOM(S):

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\$ \_\_\_\_\_

GROUP MEALS:

(CHECK APPROPRIATE BLOCK(S) AND INDICATE THE PER PERSON COST AS WELL AS THE TOTAL)

☐ BREAKFAST \$ \_\_\_\_\_ (PER PERSON) ☐ LUNCH \$ \_\_\_\_\_ (PER PERSON) ☐ DINNER \$ \_\_\_\_\_ (PER PERSON)

\$ \_\_\_\_\_

EQUIPMENT:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\$ \_\_\_\_\_

GROUP REFRESHMENTS:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\$ \_\_\_\_\_

OTHER (SPECIFY):

\_\_\_\_\_

\$ \_\_\_\_\_

TOTAL MEETING/WORKSHOP BUDGET

\$ 4,583

Submitted By <i>S. Blumenthal</i>	Date <i>02.07</i>	Financial Approval:	Date
Air Fares Estimated <i>1 VT - Bernadina</i>	<i>01.30</i>	Operations Approval:	
Knowledge Center Approval: <i>Alan D. Hoffmann</i>	<i>02.07</i>	Final Approval:	

\*Required for budgets allowing less than 30 days notice.

HARVARD

GOALS

Learning Principles

(1) Serious efforts at educational improvement need to involve serious attention to goals.

(2) ~~For an institution to be~~  
Goals should grow out of serious wrestling with issues of content

(3) Goals need to be understood and compelling

(4) Goals need to be imbedded. Requires serious self-study and evaluation.

(5) Assumed that there are multiple outlets. Not formulaic.  
Need a repertoire of available strategies.

(6) Critical stakeholders need to buy into process.

## GOALS / HARVARD (2)

### DP's concerns

- (2) Strong disposition to drift to consensus as quickly as possible. Usually through slogans.
- (3) Institutions are usually impotent within this process.
- (4)

### Vernon Howard.

Distinction between

VISION { Strategic Vision (See round corners  
business/military)  
Moral vision Kind of people - track of  
character.

### Aims

Plans: Principles of Procedure built into them.

[In the curriculum, because people need it]

FROM: INTERNET:ANNETTE@vms.huji.ac.il, INTERNET:ANNETTE@vms.huji.ac.il  
TO: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
DATE: 1/27/95 12:45 AM

Re: Re: February 8 & 9 Meetings at Harvard University

Sender: annette@vms.huji.ac.il  
Received: from VMS.HUJI.AC.IL by dub-img-3.compuserve.com (8.6.9/5.941228sam)  
id AAA29382; Fri, 27 Jan 1995 00:43:04 -0500  
Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V7b); Fri, 27 Jan 95 07:42:43 +0200  
Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V7b); Fri, 27 Jan 95 07:42:35 +0200  
Date: Fri, 27 Jan 95 7:42 +0200  
Message-id: <27010095074234@HUJIVMS>  
From: <ANNETTE@vms.huji.ac.il>  
To: "Sandra L. Blumenfield" <76322.2406@compuserve.com>  
Subject: Re: February 8 & 9 Meetings at Harvard University

Hi Sandra,

To get the cheaper rate I need you to e-mail me (if possible today) a full named list of the reservations for each of the days. Please send a file that I can just forward as is to our Harvard contact. Thanks. annette

FROM: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
TO: AnnettelIsrael, INTERNET:annette@vms.huji.ac.il  
CC: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
DATE: 1/27/95 1:18 PM

Re: February 8 & 9 Hotel Reservations

Annette:

Here is the list you requested. All reservations are currently at the Sheraton Commander in Cambridge.

February 7, 1995: Dan Pekarsky for 2 nites (confirmation # 1908)

February 8, 1995 - all for 1 nite - confirmation numbers in brackets:

Gail Dorph	(1906)
Adam Gamoran	(1910)
Ellen Goldring	(1911)
Alan Hoffmann	(1905)
Barry W. Holtz	(1907)
Nessa Rapoport	(1909)
Bill Robinson	(1912)

Thanks.

Sandy

FROM: INTERNET:ANNETTE@vms.huji.ac.il, INTERNET:ANNETTE@vms.huji.ac.il  
TO: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
DATE: 1/27/95 12:54 AM

Re: Re: February 8 & 9 Meetings at Harvard University

Sender: annette@vms.huji.ac.il  
Received: from VMS.HUJI.AC.IL by dub-img-3.compuserve.com (8.6.9/5.941228sam)  
id AAA29738; Fri, 27 Jan 1995 00:47:06 -0500  
Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V7b); Fri, 27 Jan 95 07:46:46 +0200  
Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V7b); Fri, 27 Jan 95 07:45:49 +0200  
Date: Fri, 27 Jan 95 7:45 +0200  
Message-id: <27010095074548@HUJIVMS>  
From: <ANNETTE@vms.huji.ac.il>  
To: "Sandra L. Blumenfield" <76322.2406@compuserve.com>  
Subject: Re: February 8 & 9 Meetings at Harvard University

Hi Sandra,

just to clarify - I have made all the  
arrangements for the meetings within the  
context of our Mandel-Harvard project.

Tell the guys that the meetings will take  
place at the Guttman library -- there will be  
signs to guide them. The Library (which is the  
education library) is on Appian way?road?street? -  
they have all been there for the principal's  
seminar (i presume that).

thanks.  
annette

p.s. what this means is that I am not filling  
any CIJE forms.  
thanks.  
annette

FROM: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
TO: Annette Hochstein, 100274,1745  
CC: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
Alan Hoffmann, 73321,1220  
DATE: 1/30/95 2:53 PM

Re: Hotel Reservations for February 7 & 8

Annette:

Alan would like to know where you, Seymour Fox and Danny Marom are staying on the nights of the 7th and 8th in Cambridge. As you know, I have made reservations at the Sheraton Commander in Cambridge for everyone else.

Thanks.

Sandy

FROM: INTERNET:GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu,  
INTERNET:GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu  
TO: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
DATE: 2/1/95 12:58 PM

Re: Re: February 8th Hotel Reservations

Sender: goldrieb@ctrvax.vanderbilt.edu  
Received: from ctrvx1.Vanderbilt.Edu by arl-img-1.compuserve.com (8.6.9/5.941228sam)  
id MAA13315; Wed, 1 Feb 1995 12:57:39 -0500  
From: <GOLDRIEB@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu>  
Received: from ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu by ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu (PMDF V4.2-15  
#7190) id <01H MJ8S14B5S8XKUH Z@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu>; Wed,  
1 Feb 1995 11:56:48 CST  
Date: Wed, 01 Feb 1995 11:56:48 -0600 (CST)  
Subject: Re: February 8th Hotel Reservations  
To: 76322.2406@compuserve.com  
Message-id: <01H MJ8S14KTE8XKUH Z@ctrvax.Vanderbilt.Edu>  
X-VMS-To: IN%"76322.2406@compuserve.com"  
MIME-version: 1.0  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Hi Sandra, I am arriving late on Wed 2/8th to Boston. ARe reservations  
guarenteed for late arrival? Also, could you please give me the  
phone number of the Sheraton Commander where we are staying. Thanx, Ellen

FROM: Alan Hoffmann, 73321,1220  
TO: CIJE NYC-OFFICE, 74043,423  
CC: S. Allenick, 75457,3560  
Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
DATE: 2/2/95 8:48 AM

Re: Sheila's address

Look at this message for Sheila's e-mail address  
a.

FROM: robin mencher, 74043,423  
TO: Sandy Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
DATE: 2/2/95 8:54 AM

Re: Mike Inabr's address for Sandra B.

Sandy: Annette does not have your address in her compuserve account. It would be a good idea to e mail her soon to this address (in address book)

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: HOCHSTEIN, 100274,1745  
TO: robin mencher, 74043,423  
DATE: 2/1/95 6:53 PM

RE: Mike Inabr's address for Sandra B.

Hi Sandra,

Thanks for your fax. I suggest you fedex Prof.Inbar this morning (thursday) - he is leaving Israel Monday - there is a good chance he will get the package on Sunday. His address is:

1, Itamar Ben Avi street, 1

Jerusalem

Telephone: 665-196

In any case there is no need to give us the stuff in Cleveland - we won't see Inbar before Alan does in Boston.

Best regards to all at CIJE

annette

FROM: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
TO: Annette Hochstein, 100274,1745  
CC: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
DATE: 2/2/95 10:32 AM

Re: E Mail Address

Annette:

Please note my E mail address for your CompuServe account.

All the best.

Sandy

FROM: HOCHSTEIN, 100274,1745  
TO: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
DATE: 2/2/95 11:47 AM

Re: E Mail Address

Hi Sandy,

thanks for your e-mail address - this way it is automatically in.

please tell alan that Danny, Mike and Jim will be at the Inn at Harvard, I don't know what Seymour reserved, and I am waiting to decide whether I'll be in Boston or at Cambridge depending on some additional meetings we are having. Best to find me is always e-mail.

take care,

annette

FROM: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
TO: adam, INTERNET:gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu  
Gail Dorph, 73321,1217  
ellen goldring, INTERNET:goldrieb@ctrvax.vanderbilt.edu  
Alan Hoffmann, 73321,1220  
Barry Holtz, 73321,1221  
dan pekarsky, INTERNET:danpek@macc.wisc.edu  
Nessa Rapoport, 74671,3370  
Bill Robinson, 74104,3335  
CC: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
Annette Hochstein, 100274,1745  
DATE: 2/6/95 6:41 PM

Re: February 8 & 9 Hotel Reservations

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Here is a list showing reservations for the above dates at the Sheraton Commander in Cambridge. Please note that Harvard University (thanks to Annette) has guaranteed all rooms for late arrival. Each person is responsible for paying their own bill.

February 7, 1995: Dan Pekarsky for 2 nites (confirmation # 1908)

February 8, 1995 - all for 1 nite - confirmation numbers in brackets:

Gail Dorph	(1906)
Adam Gamoran	(1910)
Ellen Goldring	(1911)
Alan Hoffmann	(1905)
Barry W. Holtz	(1907)
Nessa Rapoport	(1909)
Bill Robinson	(1912)

The meetings will take place at the Guttman Library, on Appian Way, a 5 minute walk from the hotel. A Harvard map will be available at the front desk of the hotel.

If you have any other questions, please feel free.

Have a good one.

Sandy

FROM: INTERNET:gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu, INTERNET:gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu  
TO: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
DATE: 2/6/95 6:51 PM

Re: RE: February 8 & 9 Hotel Reservations

Sender: gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu  
Received: from eunice.ssc.wisc.edu by dub-img-3.compuserve.com (8.6.9/5.941228sam)  
id SAA27957; Mon, 6 Feb 1995 18:48:59 -0500  
From: <gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu>  
Received: from GAMO.DECnet MAIL11D\_V3 by eunice.ssc.wisc.edu;  
id AA02041; 5.65/42; Mon, 6 Feb 1995 17:48:30 -0600  
Date: Mon, 6 Feb 1995 17:48:30 -0600  
Message-Id: <9502062348.AA02041@eunice.ssc.wisc.edu>  
To: "76322.2406@compuserve.com"@ssc.wisc.edu  
Subject: RE: February 8 & 9 Hotel Reservations

Is it correct that the meeting begins at 9am on Feb 9?

FROM: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
TO: adam, INTERNET:gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu  
Gail Dorph, 73321,1217  
ellen goldring, INTERNET:goldrieb@ctrvax.vanderbilt.edu  
Alan Hoffmann, 73321,1220  
Barry Holtz, 73321,1221  
dan pekarsky, INTERNET:danpek@mac.wisc.edu  
Nessa Rapoport, 74671,3370  
Bill Robinson, 74104,3335  
CC: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
DATE: 2/6/95 7:04 PM

Re: Sheraton Commander Phone Numbers

Hello again.

Please note the phone numbers for the Sheraton Commander Hotel in Cambridge:

Phone: 617 547-4800

Fax: 617 234-1302

That's all folks.

Sandy

FROM: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
TO: adam, INTERNET:gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu  
ellen goldring, INTERNET:goldrieb@ctrvax.vanderbilt.edu  
CC: Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
Alan Hoffmann, 73321,1220  
DATE: 2/7/95 4:17 PM

Re: Building the Professions Meeting

Adam and Ellen:

The meetings on the 9th begin at 8:30 a.m.

On the evening of the 8th (from 5:00 p.m. on ) there will be a meeting at the Guttman Library re Building the Profession. You are invited to attend whenever you arrive. Dinner will be available.

Regards.

Sandy

# COUNCIL FOR INITIATIVES IN JEWISH EDUCATION

212 532 2360  
Fax: 212 532 646

## FAX COVER SHEET

February 6, 1995

TO: Professor Israel Scheffler  
Professor Vernon Howard  
617 495-0540

FROM: Alan D. Hoffmann

NO. OF PAGES (including cover): 14

---

In preparation for Tuesday's meeting, Seymour has asked me to send you the enclosed internal document from Daniel Pekarsky. It will form part of the basis for our discussions.

*Regards and looking forward to seeing you.*

*Alan*



slb

Dear Ginny,

I was unable to fax this to NY very early Mon. morning. Please fax it to the New York office as soon as possible. Thanks.

DP

January 29, 1995

Dear CIJE Colleagues:

I have intended for some time to send you a summary of our early January meeting - along with a list of names of potential coaches and a draft of a letter to them. I have, however, had a hard time getting to the task of drafting this material. In part, this has had to do with the press of University of Wisconsin beginning-of-the-semester matters; but I think there's more to it than that! I think there's also been an element of procrastination, procrastination rooted in a measure of uncertainty concerning certain elements of the path we charted in January.

I've solved my problem by determining to do two things rather than one: in Part I, to summarize the course of our deliberations and our decisions; and in Part II, to articulate some of my concerns and a possible alternative route to go. As you will see, some of the concerns addressed in Part II are alluded to in Part I.

My sense is that this document may not be as well-organized as I'd like, and it probably suffers from a measure of repetition. My apologies - but I figured it was better to get it out than to take too much time working it over.

I'd welcome your thoughts as soon as possible.

Thanks.

DP

## SUMMARY OF OUR JAN. NEW YORK MEETING - AND SOME AFTER-THOUGHTS

### INTRODUCTION

The following document attempts to do two things: first, to summarize where we went and what we decided at the early January meeting in New York (participants: Alan, Barry, Gail, Nessa, and myself), as well as to fill-in certain details; second, to raise some questions concerning some of the decisions we made. I have felt a measure of uneasiness concerning some of them and rather than keep them to myself I thought it best to share them and to suggest some possibilities that flow out of them.

### PART I

#### THE PLAN WE'VE PROJECTED FOR THE MONTH AHEAD

Building on the document regarding the "building capacity" challenge that had been prepared for the January meeting, our discussion raised questions concerning some of its points and moved towards defining an agenda for the months ahead. This is to be a period in which we build capacity in two ways: by furthering our own learning and through the identification, recruitment, and cultivation of a cadre of able individuals from whom coaches will be chosen to work with institutions. It is anticipated that there will be at least one, and possibly 2 seminars for the individuals identified as possible coaches between now and the end of the summer; and that next year, some of these individuals will be working with institutions. As they engage in this work, they will keep careful track of what they are doing and learning; they will also meet periodically with one another and with other CIJE staff for purposes of furthering their, and our, learning. With this in mind, we spent much of the morning identifying the kinds of people we would want as coaches, developing a list of names, thinking through the kind of letter that need to be sent to them, and raising pertinent questions. Below is a summary of decisions/issues/questions that arose in relation to this agenda.

Two meetings or one? The initial idea developed at our meeting was to aim for a late spring initiatory meeting, followed by a lengthier summer workshop (probably in Cambridge). In the aftermath of our meeting, two considerations have led me to think that it might be wiser to hold only one meeting (in the summer), rather than two. One of these considerations is cost: particularly since some of the participants may be paying their own way - and transportation is a major cost, having one set of meetings rather than two might make it easier for our targeted clientele to participate. A second consideration is this: in my mind, the primary reason for a spring meeting was to assess the match between promising individuals and our project, so that by

the time the summer seminar came along, the participants would only be individuals who we were prepared to move into coaching roles. But as we discussed the future in NY, it seemed clear that in inviting folks to a seminar next summer, we would not be committing ourselves to employing any of them as coaches; rather, coaches would be selected from among them. Thus, it no longer seemed to me imperative that we weed anyone out in the spring. A third consideration is that a decision to hold two rather than one sets of seminars commits a lot of our energies immediately to the development of a clientele for the seminars, to dealing with logistics of various kinds, to curriculum, etc.; I am fearful that this will not leave us with the time to do the kind of learning we projected for this period. In any event, this remains a matter in need of decision!

How many people should be invited to the seminar(s)? The Pekarsky-document had assumed we would invite a small group of up to 10 individuals, on the assumption that they were hand-picked to work with institutions. Alan encouraged us to think of inviting a substantially larger group of individuals (20 to 25), on the assumption that in the end only some of them would seem suitable for our purposes. Our discussion adopted the Hoffmann view (though, as will be noted later, I continue to have some concerns in this area).

Who would make a good coach? Criteria identified included the following: 1. Strong Jewish knowledge; 2. Knowledge of settings; 3) conceptual bent; 4) strong interpersonal skills, including capacity to work effectively with different kinds of constituency (rabbi, lay leaders, teachers, principals, etc.) (See Pekarsky's "Building Capacity" piece for a related discussion).

Categories of coaches. As the discussion unfolded, some important distinctions were made concerning the kinds of coaches we might want to recruit:

a. "Young blood" and "tried and true": the feeling was that we should be looking not just for people who've already proved their skill and savvy but also for people of promise in whom we should be investing.

b. Agents (or representatives) of institutions or communities and individuals who do not come representing any body. The distinction was important because while there might be natural avenues for securing funding in the case of those who are sent by communities and/or institutions, this may not be the case for those who come as individuals. Moreover, whereas those who come representing some body may have some sense of the immediate contexts in which they will go on to do some coaching, this may not be true for those who do not come representing any institution.

This suggested that in the case of those who come as individuals, there might be instances in which we would try to help them secure funding -- possibly by establishing a linkage between them and some institution that they would work with (as coaches) after the training period.

c. A third distinction is between those who come with a clear understanding that the coaching-skills they acquire will be put to work in a particular institutional or communal context and those who come without any clear sense of where (or even whether) what they learn will be put to use. (This point overlaps the point made in b.)

Money-issues in relation to the coaches. There are two issues: one of them pertains to the seminar(s), the other to their work - down the road - as coaches.

With respect to the costs incurred in coming to the seminar(s), we came to the view that CIJE was not responsible for such costs. In the case of many of the kinds of folks we imagined would participate, funding should come from the institution or community for which they work (and which will reap benefits from their training). In the case of others (as noted earlier), we might try to pair them with particular institutions whom they would later serve; or, they would have to pay for themselves. Some of us were less confident than others that those who don't have external sources of support would find their way to the projected seminar(s).

We did not systematically look at the question of how their work in the field would be paid for beyond the summer; but implicit in our conversation was the view that in the case of many of them, their work would fall within their job-descriptions and hence would be paid for by their parent-institution or community; in the case of others, their work might be paid for by the institution they are coaching. Conceivably, in the case of some communities, a kind of barter-system could be worked out, so that X could coach in Y's community in exchange for Y coaching an institution in X's community.

What will coaches do? Precisely what coaches (if "coaches" is in the end the right term - which it may not be) will do out in the field is what we are trying to better understand through our own learning this spring. Nonetheless it is possible in a general sort of way to suggest the kind of work they would be engaged in. This would include:

a. Regular consultations to the institution's lead-staff designed to keep them focused on critical questions and tasks, to suggest and/or discuss possible desiderata, plans and strategies, and to help assess

the best way to approach the institution's educational challenges;

b. Facilitating or leading discussions, classes, or workshops designed to carry the work forward;

c. accessing CIJE-resources that would be useful to the institution in its reform-efforts, e.g. MEF or someone representing the Educated Jew project.

d. carefully monitoring and logging what transpires with an eye towards CIJE's learning.

e. participation in regular meetings and workshops with other coaches and with CIJE staff, with the aim of further professional growth and building our collective body of lore..

How much time this work would take is something we haven't discussed; but I imagine spending a day or so with the institution every 6 weeks, with periodic phone-consultations in between; and also periodic meetings with other coaches, CIJE staff, and educators who can guide our collective learning (about week or so per year). This amounts to about 3 weeks of work per year -- not insubstantial. I don't know whether this is way off-base (and if so, in what direction). Gerstein may be helpful to us on this point.

What's the incentive for people to join with us? It was not at all clear from our discussions that those coming to our seminars and going on to work as coaches would necessarily be making more money than they now do -- particularly if their coaching turned out to be part of their job-portfolio. People felt that the main reasons for participation would be professional growth and the sense that what they learned could be put to effective use in their own work-contexts. What this means is that our recruitment efforts for the upcoming seminars need to emphasize these elements:

"as part of its efforts to improve Jewish ed. in North America, CIJE is offering talented senior educators a professional development opportunity that will, we believe, enhance your work. Beyond this, we are hopeful that some of you will play a role coaching institutions that we will be working with intensively..."

Is there a "CIJE-approach" - and if not, how can we proceed? Pekarsky's building-capacity document referred to using the spring and summer seminars as a way of introducing our colleagues-to-be to the "CIJE-approach?" Well, someone asked at our meeting, exactly what is this CIJE approach? Do we have one?

The answer to this question, intimated in the "building capacity" document, is somewhere between "Yes" and "No". "No" - in the sense that we don't have, as does Levin, a step-by-step process to recommend. But "Yes!" in the non-trivial sense that we have the following:

1. a set of guiding principles (of the kind summarized in the building-capacity document, pp. 7-9) that relate to such matters as the kinds of stake holders that are needed, the place of content in the process, the need to wrestle seriously with issues of goals, etc.
2. an understanding (by the end of the spring a deep understanding) of pertinent approaches to educational improvement (including the Educated Jew project, Sizer, Levin, Comer, etc.), and a commitment and ability on the part of coaches - alone or as teams! - to use elements of one or more of them thoughtfully and eclectically in working with institutions.
3. an understanding that this stage of our enterprise requires structures and an ethos that support careful experimentation, monitoring, and efforts to build a richer knowledge-base.
4. an understanding of the kinds of individuals who are likely to subscribe to #'s 1 - 3, both in theory and in practice.

It is arguable that these four elements are jointly enough to enable us to identify potential coaches, to plan the spring and summer workshops, and to launch work with institutions; this in any case is what the "building capacity" document asserted. BUT: it was precisely this assumption that was called into question at our January meeting. Do we really have enough to offer the sophisticated group we intend to convene so that they come away feeling that (to use Barry's phrase) "we've got our act together", that it's important, that their time has been well-spent, and that it will be worthwhile to share in this process?

There are at least three possible answers to this question, all of which need to be seriously considered: 1) we do know enough to proceed; 2) we don't know as much as we'd like, but we know enough to get started, and much of what we need to be learning will only be learned through the doing - a kind of na'aseh v; 'nishmah!; 3) we don't yet know enough "to go public" and need to give ourselves more time to develop capacity before launching the kinds of seminars we've been projecting.

Our meeting in early January took #2 as its working assumption. I want to re-visit this assumption in the second part of this document.

What would a seminar/workshop look like? We did not explore

this in any detail, but we spoke a bit about what a two-day spring seminar might look like. In addition to including a chance to familiarize participants with the thinking that has informed the Goals Project, we might give them an opportunity to meet with the likes of Scheffler and/or Greenberg and/or Sizer -- both as ways of exciting them and as ways of stimulating some good thinking concerning some elements of our project.

As we discussed names of possible invitees, it was clear that, if they come, we will be dealing with a sophisticated group of people, and this must be very seriously taken into account in thinking about how to structure whatever seminars we develop.

Names. (In no particular order - some probably misspelled)

Here is a list of the names who were mentioned. This is not a final list in two senses - 1) we aren't committed to all the names on the list; 2) we may well want to add others.

Rob Toren  
Tzivvia Blumberg  
Betsy Katz  
Susan Shevitz  
Elaine Cohen  
Poupko (Montreal)  
Jodi Hirsch  
Debbie Kerdimann  
Michael Berger (Atlanta)  
Debbie Hirschman  
Bob Abramson  
Jack Bieler  
David Ackerman  
Amy Gerstein  
Carol Ingle  
Vicki Kelman  
Carolyn Keller  
Marion Gribbetz  
Sara Gribbetz  
Stuart Seltzer  
Danny Lehman  
Amyh Wolk Katz  
Mitch Cohen  
Kyla Epstein  
Elana Kanter  
Sara Lynn Newberger  
Cindy Rich  
Eddie Rauch  
Michael Posnick  
Lifsa Schachter  
Jeffrey Schein  
Karen Sobel  
Marci Dickman  
Steve Chervin  
Debbie Goldstein

Zvi Blanchard  
Kula  
Paley  
David Soloff  
Yossi Gordon  
Harvey Shapiro

Recruitment. Recruitment will involve the following steps:  
a) refining the list; b) drafting a letter to them (see below);  
c) phone calls (by people who know them) that follow-up the  
letter; c) contact with communal/institutional leadership to  
explain the project and get them to financially and otherwise  
support the effort of invitees that "belong" to them; d) finding  
ways to subsidize promising individuals who will not be covered  
by an institution or community.

Below is a first draft of a letter to invitees:

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

As you know, the Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education  
is engaged in a multi-faceted effort to improve Jewish education  
in North America.

The Goals Project is one of several projects launched by the  
Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education in its efforts to  
help improve the quality and the outcomes of Jewish education in  
North America. The Goals Project is organized around several  
guiding assumptions, including the following: 1) that in Jewish  
(as in general) education inadequate attention to the  
identification of appropriate goals and to their thoughtful  
implementation significantly undermines our efforts to educate;  
2) that efforts at institutional reform in Jewish education must  
seriously address questions concerning a guiding vision or set of  
goals; 3) that with the help of thoughtful resource-people, it  
is possible for an institution that is serious about change to  
make considerable progress on this front.

Guided by these assumptions, CIJE is inviting a select  
group of educators to participate in a set of seminars designed  
to enhance their ability to help Jewish educating institutions  
deal with issues of goals in the context of their efforts at  
self-improvement. Although CIJE will be satisfied if the  
seminars accomplish this purpose, it is also hopeful that in the  
aftermath of the seminar, some of you will be interested in  
working as coaches or resource-people with one or more  
institutions that are committing themselves to a long-term  
process of struggling with a goals agenda as part of a broad  
effort of educational reform.

Our plan is to hold a day-long seminar at Harvard in late  
April to launch this effort. At this seminar, you will have the  
opportunity to learn more about CIJE's approach and efforts in  
the Goals Project; you will also have the chance to meet with

\_\_\_\_\_, who is a thoughtful leader in the area of educational reform. A follow-up 5-day seminar in the summer is designed to help participants grow in their ability to help institutions go through a process of change that takes goals seriously. Given the thoughtfulness and experience of the people we are inviting to participate, we are confident that this seminar will also provide CIJE staff with an invaluable opportunity to further to test and refine their own views on the issues we will be considering.

We are happy to announce that CIJE will cover all tuition-costs associated with the seminar and that it will provide X # of meals; other costs are the responsibility of participants or their institutions. Please let us know whether you are interested in attending at your earliest convenience. We are hopeful that you will be able to take advantage of this exciting opportunity.

Sincerely,

Alan Hoffmann, Executive Director  
CIJE

#### SOME MISC. POINTS MADE AT THE MEETING (NOT MENTIONED ABOVE)

1. It was suggested that in addition to looking at the Educated Jew Project, Senge/Fullan, Sizer, and Levin, we should also be looking to the work of Comer. Michael Ben-Avi (at JTS) works for Comer and would be a good contact-person.

2. On what distinguishes our approach: at other times we've focused on the importance of engaging stake holders in an institution in a process of study, in wrestling with content-issues; at today's meeting it was suggested that an additional distinguishing feature of our approach is that it actively engages lay-people in thinking about issues relating to goals.

3. We should not invest too much effort in learning what others are doing before entering our own doing-phase. There is only so much we can learn from them; moreover, much of our own learning will take place in the doing. Which is not to deny that we can learn from the practical knowledge that's already out there!

It was suggested in this connection that perhaps one of the roles Daniel Marom could fulfill (since he will be available to us) is to scout out the landscape with attention to approaches, strategies, and practical knowledge that might be of value to us.

4. We re-visited a comment I made early last summer concerning Fred Newmann's view that there are no serious success-stories out there -- that is, stories about institutions that had "turned it

around." When scrutinized, he suggested, it turns out that the the success was more rhetorical than real -- or else short-lived. We felt at our meeting that this view needed to be tested out some more rather than just accepted with resignation. Pekarsky will meet again with Newmann and do other relevant follow-up inquiry.

5. A question was raised concerning our own study. Earlier we had spoken about some seminars designed exclusively for ourselves prior to meeting with potential coaches. This seems to have droppe out. Should we provide for this? (Parenthetically: Fullan is unavailable to come to anything, but is willing to meet with me in March in Toronto; perhaps one or more of the rest of us could come along. Gerstein is unavailable until summer due to dissertation commitments, but she is interested in participating in a summer seminar.)

## PART II

Part II of this report will be brief and somewhat more general. It tries to raise some basic questions concerning what we are projecting for the period ahead. A useful starting-point in assessing the agenda mapped out above is to remind ourselves, or clarify, what our fundamental priorities and goals are at this stage of the enterprise. In fact, this question -- What are the goals of the Goals Project? -- arose at our January meeting. Though not addressed in depth then, it is worthy of attention as we look ahead. Such attention may help us not to scatter our scarce resources in too many or low priority directions or to bite off more than we can chew.

**GOALS FOR THE GOALS PROJECT:** Here are some of the themes that are often at work in our discussions:

a) to develop a knowledge-base and know-how concerning such matters as: the critical role that goals and vision play in education; dimensions of the effort to become more goals-and-vision-driven; ways in which educating institutions can become more goals- and vision-driven.

b) to develop a reservoir of resources (material and human) that will be available to institutions in their effort to become more goals- and vision-driven.

c) to catalyze in various communities around the country (or at least 9 of them) an interest in encouraging their constituent institutions to become more vision-driven.

d) to actively work, via coaches, with a number of institutions in their efforts to become more vision-driven. This could mean identifying 6 institutions (2 day schools, two camps, and two congregational institutions); or it could mean something more ambitious that included a coalition of vision-driven institutions.

If some variant of d) is adopted, we need to be clear what underlying purpose is:

i. our own learning;

ii. showing what can be done when issues of

goals are seriously addressed,

iii. expanding the field of institutions engaged with issues of goals and vision.

e) to work with the communities that shared in the Jerusalem seminar as they try to encourage their institutions to become more vision-driven (=outstanding commitments!), via the promised local seminars and other strategies.

My sense is that we may need to make some strategic decisions concerning which of these to emphasize in the period ahead. Such decisions will, I think, enhance our effectiveness significantly.

#### SOME BASIC QUESTIONS

I noted earlier that I have had some uneasiness about the direction we sketched out in our January meeting. The uneasiness concerns a matter intimated by Barry when he asked whether we have an "it", that is, a CIJE approach, to share with invitees to a conference. Above I made the case that we do -- and that, to the extent that we don't, immersion in the world of practice is the key to developing a useful one. But I have some doubts about this. I am concerned that there may considerable more work we want to do before "going public" in a splashy way by inviting a whole lot of people (not all of whom are necessarily friendly to CIJE) and trying to engage them. To devote a lot of our energies to convincing the kind of clientele we've projected that we know what we're doing and that they should be on-board with us may not be as wise as a strategy that allows us to focus more of our energies on our own learning.

My own instinct is decidedly not to avoid cultivating coaches and immersing in practice. Rather, I think we should consider going about it in a smaller-scale way as a prelude to something bigger down the road. In a nut-shell, I think we should consider the following:

1. that we identify and recruit a small group of potential coaches (5 to 10 max.), consisting of people whom we strongly believe in and who we think will be genuinely sympathetic to what we're up to. These should be the kinds of people we trust and can go back-stage with as we think through what we're doing.

2. that we hold one or two sets of seminars for this more limited clientele in the months ahead.

3. that we identify a limited number of prototype institutions (no more than a total of 4 or so) that these coaches work with (singly or in combination); one or more of us may also be at work in this process.

4. that, perhaps with the help of MEF, we carefully monitor and try to learn from our efforts, evolving an increasingly sharp approach to our various challenges.

5. that simultaneously we involve other communities in the Goals process by regional or local seminars of the kind we did in Jerusalem. This would be consistent with the idea of moving from 3 to 9.

6. that we find some ways of beginning to tackle the "Community goals" problem, in which, as we know, there's a great deal of interest.

7. that, if we seem to be making reasonable progress in our various pilot-projects with prototype institutions, we proceed next spring to involve in our work the kind of larger group of possible resource-people that we identified in January. By then, we will be surer of where we're going and of where we want to take them.

Although this approach may seem somewhat more modest, it strikes me as possibly safer in more than one respect, while at the same time still being ambitious. To me it feels more in line with where we are in terms of available resources for the project and knowledge-base. Needless to say, I could be wrong about how to proceed and would welcome your thoughts.

*Joel W*

MEMO TO: Alan Hoffmann  
FROM: Dan Pekarsky  
RE: Agenda for Boston and other matters  
DATE: January 31, 1995

Off and on for the last week I have been in conversation with D. Marom (who in turn is talking with Seymour) about our agenda for Boston in relation to the Goals Project. The agenda that I think they would be eager for builds on the recent documents concerning upcoming work with coaches and institutions. Based on our conversations and Seymour's reactions, this morning Marom proposed an agenda for the meeting. I thanked him for his thoughts, told him that I found the general direction he was proposing useful, but added emphatically that any final agenda for the Boston meetings had to be worked through with you. He seemed entirely comfortable with this. I am supposed to be talking with him again on Thursday morning (both about this and about his possible role in Atlanta), so if you have any fairly immediate reactions, it might be helpful to pass them on; otherwise, I'll just tell him that we haven't connected yet about this.

In proposing the agenda that follows, he was clear that it was unlikely that we'd get through all the items but indicated that he and Seymour both felt that #1 was the most important. He also asked me to find out from you how long we'd have for the Goals Component -- and whether it might, if necessary, be possible to use time on Thursday to deal with the MEF component. I would be grateful for your thoughts on these matters as well as on the document I sent you a couple of days ago. I hope all's well. I look forward to our being in touch soon -- possibly by phone. I'll be home tomorrow night (Wed.) after 9 pm your time. Thursday I'm gone virtually all day, ending up in Milwaukee for the first of the seminars there. Anyway, the agenda proposed by Marom follows.

POSSIBLE AGENDA (proposed by Marom, building on conversations with DP and SF)

1. Coaches

- a. conception of coaches (Here, Seymour has indicated his interest in understanding this in relation to his "five levels" scheme: at what level(s) would the coach work, with what aim, and drawing on what bodies of knowledge and expertise? Where can these bodies of knowledge and expertise be accessed? By whom? etc.)
- b. Recruitment
- c. Time-line for training
- d. content of the training

e. Role of Harvard in this process.

2. Working with communities qua communities

a. Summarize situation to date: what expectations and commitments are "out there", e.g. in Hirschhorn's view; the enthusiastic response to Rosenak and the interest expressed by others in exploring the communal dimension; Cleveland's efforts to develop community-goals around Hebrew, etc.

b. Possible next steps: for example, engaging folks like Rosenak to participate as visiting scholars in communal efforts to clarify their goals agenda as a community; or engaging MEF in the effort to do an empirical inquiry that tries to identify common goals-elements that cut across various groupings in a community.

3. Building a meaningful role for MEF in the Goals Project

(around activities like the development of a "Baseline for Goals" instrument that might facilitate accountability; developing an instrument for doing institutional profiles, etc.

4. Other-- for example, how we do or don't want to deal with the Denominations.

FROM: INTERNET:gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu, INTERNET:gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu  
TO: (unknown), 73321,1220  
Sandra L. Blumenfield, 76322,2406  
DATE: 2/8/95 11:45 AM

Re: RE: Building the Professions Meeting

Sender: gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu  
Received: from eunice.ssc.wisc.edu by dub-img-3.compuserve.com (8.6.9/5.941228sam)  
id LAA09935; Wed, 8 Feb 1995 11:36:15 -0500  
From: <gamoran@ssc.wisc.edu>  
Received: from GAMO.DECnet MAIL11D\_V3 by eunice.ssc.wisc.edu;  
id AA17363; 5.65/42; Wed, 8 Feb 1995 10:35:52 -0600  
Date: Wed, 8 Feb 1995 10:35:51 -0600  
Message-Id: <9502081635.AA17363@eunice.ssc.wisc.edu>  
To: "76322.2406@compuserve.com"@ssc.wisc.edu  
Cc: ALAN@ssc.wisc.edu  
Subject: RE: Building the Professions Meeting

I am arriving at 11pm so I'll see you Thurs morning at 8:30am.

~~mtg. Harvard~~  
~~2/8/25~~

CJE

2 copies  
double sided  
stapled

SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION CONCERNING GOALS PROJECT  
CAMBRIDGE, MA, FEB. 1995

INTRODUCTION

I'm not sure whether it's physical anthropologists or paleontologists who try to turn a hodge-podge of bones that they come upon into a dinosaur -- with a few bones left over; but it occurred to me tonight that this is the way I feel about the effort to reconstruct our discussions. I return to my notes and discover a slew of miscellaneous comments, half-comments, question-marks, and unintelligible scribblings; and then I do what I can to turn them into an something that makes sense, probably connecting some elements that may not have been connected during the discussion and omitting any number of items altogether -- either because I can't figure out how they fit in or because I simply don't remember them. The extent to which it ends up reflecting the discussion's content and structure, I'm not sure. Anyway, here goes....I begin with a very brief summary of my opening comments, and then move on to an account of major themes and questions that informed our discussion. I apologize in advance for omissions and misinterpretations, but trust that our discussion will surface them.

BACKGROUND TO DISCUSSION

Pekarsky's introductory comments concerning the day's agenda tied the agenda to some of CIJE's projected and announced activities: namely, to work with select institutions on what we have been calling a "goals-agenda". We would like to get clearer concerning the nature of this work, with attention to the role that what we have been calling "coaches" would play in this process. While we are also interested in the possibly very fruitful contribution to this effort that might be made by CIJE's Monitoring, Evaluation, and Feedback Project, our primary concern today focuses on the coaches-issue, as we work towards an understanding of the skills, knowledge, qualities of mind, etc. that we believe they need; clarity concerning these matters will be invaluable in recruitment as well as in determining the content, form, and length of their training. If we can emerge from the day with a better understanding of such matters, we will be better positioned to move ahead. It was also stressed in this introduction that the presence of Professors Scheffler and Howard offered us with an opportunity revisit, and thereby clarify and/or revise, varied basic assumptions that have been at work in the project -- assumptions which may, for better or worse, profoundly affect the course and success of the enterprise.

Against this background, and in order that all participants might start the deliberations with enough pertinent information, Pekarsky went on to summarize some basic assumptions of the Goals Project, notably, the four following:

1. Educational goals can play an indispensable role in guiding our efforts at education. They help us to make basic decisions concerning personnel, training, pedagogy, curriculum, etc.; and they provide us with a basis for evaluating our efforts and rendering us accountable for what we do.

2. Jewish education typically suffers from a variety of weaknesses in this domain: teaching assignments are often made without goals in mind, or with goals so vague that they are compatible with most anything; what goals there are, are often not understood by or compelling to key stake holders (including the educators); the avowed goals are often not meaningfully embedded in the life of the school, nor is it obvious to participants how attainment of these goals is connected to any guiding vision of a meaningful Jewish existence.

3. Predicated on 1. and 2., CIJE has defined the Goals Project as an Effort to encourage and support institutional efforts to become more thoughtful about their goals and to use them more effectively as a guide to practice.

4. CIJE has also been interested in goals at the level of the community (and has discovered that there is great interest in this matter on the part of some major constituencies we deal with).

It was noted that the projected work with select institutions would represent the third of a three-stage process: a) the Goals Seminar in Jerusalem last year, designed to educate lay leaders from a number of communities concerning the importance of goals and present inadequacies in this area; b) local seminars with representatives of educating institutions from these communities, designed both to enhance their understanding of these matters and to see which if any of them might be a suitable candidate for entering into a partnership with CIJE around a Goals Agenda; c) identification of such institutions would usher in the 3rd stage. Though by the end of the Goals Seminar in Jerusalem, more than one institution expressed an interest in moving with us immediately to the third, or partnership, stage, we felt that a slower approach made good sense for a number of reasons, one of them being that it would give us more time to build capacity (in the sense of both knowledge-base and personnel).

As we have begun to think about what work with institutions might look like, we have tried to articulate some guiding principles that might help to clarify what we're after or how we might proceed. These have included the following:

1. The attempt to clarify goals is critically important. The process of clarifying goals should engage participants in encountering and wrestling with Jewish content issues, and it should culminate in goals that the participants can genuinely and enthusiastically understand and endorse. It is also crucial that they be led to think carefully about what is involved in embedding these goals meaningfully in the life of the institution.

2. There are multiple routes to the desiderata identified in a), and though a coach may walk in with a variety of possible strategies for engaging the participants in the effort, which if any would be useful would depend on a thoughtful assessment of local circumstances. A process of serious self-study (understood in more than one way) would be at the heart of the enterprise.

3. Key stake holders - lay, professional, and (where relevant) rabbinic leadership - must be party to the effort if it is to be fruitful.

4. The development of our own knowledge base requires carefully monitoring what we do and what happens.

Pekarsky's comments ended with two concerns: 1) that when issues of goals come up, there is often a strong tendency in a diverse group to settle on a quick but very vague statement that can generate a quick consensus; 2) that institutional stake holders are sometimes impatient with what may feel to them like "an academic" insistence that they engage in serious study along the way.

## DISCUSSION-PART I

Goals, Aims, etc. An initial response to Pekarsky's presentation focused on its inattention to possibly important distinctions between goals (of different kinds), aims, and visions (moral and strategic). There was a sense among us that making these distinctions explicitly could prove useful -- and the distinction between moral and strategic visions turned out to play an important role in our discussion (later in the day) concerning the role of Goals Project coaches.

Community- and Institutional Visions. Pekarsky's introductory comments had distinguished between work with institutions and work aimed at responding to an interest expressed by many people in addressing issues relating to "community-vision". This distinction and the attention paid to "community vision" drew a number of helpful responses.

First, although it was rightly stressed that the content of

a community vision and an institutional vision might be very different, it was also noted that the two are related in ways that make it somewhat artificial to say that we will focus on institutional visions but not on community-visions:

a. the work of institutions in developing guiding visions greatly benefits from their being located in communities that are actively wrestling with issues of vision.

b. Educating institutions (like the one in Atlanta) which view themselves as "community institutions" necessarily wrestle with what amounts to a "community vision". Indeed, their efforts at self-definition help us to understand what a community-vision might look like.

c. Seminars of the kind being offered in Milwaukee (which bring together lay and professional leaders from significant institutions to think about issues relating to educational priorities) may actually operate to encourage movement towards some kind of a larger community vision.

Second, our conversation (joined with earlier discussions) helped clarify ways of thinking about what a community-vision might look like. Here are some possible elements:

a. A community-vision might identify a language, set of practices, or commitments which, differently interpreted, could be shared by different constituencies in a community. Rosenak's essay identifies some of the elements that might enter into this shared universe. In practice, these shared elements could be identified a) through a process of dialogue among the different constituencies and/or b) by looking at what they are all, albeit in different ways, already doing.

b. A central plank in a community-vision platform might well be a proclamation of its commitment to encourage its local educating institutions to work towards a clear and compelling vision of the kinds of Jewish human beings they hope to cultivate through Jewish education.

c. A community-vision focused on Jewish education might move in two directions (or in a third direction that gives place to both of them):

1. Encouraging institutions that foster some general, ecumenical conception of a Jewish human being.

2. A pluralistic ideal: encouraging the development of institutions, each of which is organized around a different conception of a meaningful Jewish existence. Note that taking such a vision seriously may mean calling into question the idea that our emphasis should be on helping institutions featuring a great deal of ideological diversity to find a shared set of priorities; rather, the emphasis might turn out to be on finding ways to steer people who share similar priorities towards like-minded institutions. (A parallel was drawn to certain formulations of the magnet-school ideal).

3. Encouraging a pluralistic range in the spirit of #2, but one that includes institutions that try to nurture an ecumenical/general citizen vision (of the kind identified in #1).

Which of these visions a community adopts may carry significant implications for its decisions and for the efforts it tries to encourage.

The problem of vagueness. Pekarsky's presentation had pointed out that the vagueness of the goals proclaimed by educating institutions precludes their offering much serious guidance. In the discussion it was observed that in another sense this vagueness might be functional in that it allows very diverse constituencies "to hang together". This comment elicited a number of observations concerning the place of vagueness in the enterprise:

a) It is often asserted that the effort to get beyond vagueness through becoming clearer about what we're about would inevitably operate to reduce the population of participating constituencies. But is there really strong evidence to support this claim? Might it in fact be possible to work towards a substantially more substantive consensus concerning what we're after without pushing aside significant constituencies? Has this really been tried --or has the notion that it's impossible operated to prevent efforts in this direction?

b) It was stressed that community-schools that are ecumenical in their orientations are not necessarily vague or wishy-washy concerning what they are after and what the content of education should be. On the contrary, they may be capable of clearly identifying bodies of knowledge and skill which all graduates should have, e.g., in Jewish history. In response, it was suggested that such clarity might be harder to

achieve in certain delicate areas that concern normative matters, and that this might be particularly true of institutions that make non-exclusion a strong value. But to this it was responded that perhaps it is okay for an educating institution to define itself as deliberately vague or agnostic with respect to certain matters (at least so long as it is non-vague across a great deal of what it does).

c) An additional point related to vagueness, one not made in our meeting, might also be worth noting: while vagueness of goals does often leave Jewish education without a clear sense of direction, we need to be careful not too encourage so much specificity as to rule out a measure of creative interpretation on the part of educators in response to the circumstances they face.

## DISCUSSION-PART II

The second part of our discussion focused on issues relating to the goals agenda in institutional settings and questions relating to the character of what we've been calling "coaching". Discussion began with Daniel Marom's presentation which did two major things:

a. it identified five different levels at which issues relating to educational goals might be discussed (Philosophy; philosophy of education; theories of practice; implementation; evaluation).

b. it suggested that any of these levels (but particularly levels 4 and 5) might offer avenues for engaging participants in institutions around issues of goals.

Whatever the starting-point, the challenge is to encourage participants in the institution to think more carefully about what they are doing, what they are trying to do, and what they think they should be doing. The level at which one intervenes, the parties that one engages, and the questions around which one engages them must be determined on a case-by-case basis. Wherever one starts, one person suggested, the critical role of the coach is to create a level of (stimulating) uncertainty, uncomfortableness, or tension among the representatives of an institution -- the kind of uncertainty that might call forth efforts to inquire thoughtfully about what they are or should be about.

This conversation sparked some intriguing conversation concerning what is at the heart of the coach's role. Up to now we've often spoken of the coach as a kind of resource person whose knowledge of strategic options and of varied conceptions of the aims of Jewish education make it possible for him/her to offer critical insights, suggestions, and teachings, etc. In

today's conversation, the suggestion was made that we think of the coach as a kind of Socratic gadfly whose primary job is to raise critical questions concerning what the institution is doing or is proposing to do -- questions which provoke intellectual tension and serious reflection. Indeed, it was suggested, perhaps we should be looking for coaches who can be trained to know nothing except how to ask good questions.

It was suggested in this vein that we should be developing for coaches a script of seminal questions that they can use, when relevant, in stimulating reflection. Such questions might include the following: a) What are your aims? b) Since these aims may be variously interpreted, can you clarify which you have in mind? c) Why are these your aims? d) What is the relationship between what you are trying to achieve and other institutional aims? d) How will what you are aiming for enter in a meaningful way into the life of the graduate of this institution? e) How are the aims you are articulating connected to - or disconnected from - the institution's avowed mission? f) To what extent does what you do cohere with your avowed aims - or give rise to other outcomes? etc.

An over-lapping formulation of critical questions focused on the following: a) What are you doing? b) What do you think you're doing? c) What do you think you should be doing?

On this view, the coach does not enter the institution with "a bag of tricks", or strategies, or suggestions for how to address goals-related issues. On the contrary, just as a good critic may not be a good novelist, the coach may be adept at helping an institution think critically about it's doing or proposing to do without being particularly adept at helping it identify what it might be doing. The coach should be adept at helping to encourage thought concerning "moral vision"; he or she need not have much to offer in the way of strategic vision (although it was acknowledged that the decision to take up or not to take up a given question, and how to take it up, involved strategic considerations of various kinds.

This view of the coach had much appeal, but it was felt by some that the coach's role might profitably be construed as a hybrid that includes but is not limited to the gadfly model. The key question on this view is this: what kinds of responses and suggestions on the part of the coach are most likely to encourage thoughtful attention to basic aims and the way they are and should be reflected in an institution's life? In some cases, restricting the coach to the gadfly role may prove too limiting.

Even if this last view is granted, the advantage of the gadfly formulation is that it highlights that the coach's role is primarily that of a catalyst, and that he/she cannot be viewed as responsible for more than catalyzing a process for which the institution must assume major responsibility. Our efforts must be primarily focused on encouraging serious reflection concerning goals; and "our bet" is that engaging stake holders in an

educating institution around such matters in a serious way will call into being processes that will give rise to significant improvement. It may well be that the institution's own personnel will prove much more effective than our coaches might be in developing exciting answers to the challenges that the coaches pose.

A concern was expressed that the coach might be drawn into institutional efforts that pull away from the primary focus on goals. The danger was acknowledged, and the response was suggested that the coach must think carefully about which issues he/she feels might forward the goals agenda, letting go of those that seem inappropriate and formulating his/her questions in ways that cohere with the goals-agenda.

Another concern expressed was that the coach be careful not to "set too many fires" in ways that might dissipate the energies of the participants by discouraging follow-through in any given area. The "setting-fires" imagery also called forth the comment that the aim should be to nurture a culture in which the setting of these fires would not depend on the presence of the coach.

It was noted that how our efforts with this project will be received may depend heavily on finding "the right rhetoric". Such rhetoric might include the following elements: 1) empowering educators by encouraging them to wrestle with issues concerning the aims that should animate their institution's efforts; 2) philosophical reflection concerning basic questions is eminently practical; it carries significant implications for what we should be doing; and 3) "lest you think we're up in the clouds," we are aware of and able to draw on practical strategies being used in a variety of educational reform efforts.

It was suggested that work with institutions (on the gadfly model) might involve creating special seminars/workshops for clusters of principals and clusters of lay-leaders, aimed at helping them move the process along in fruitful ways that outstrip the role and competence of the coaches.

The day ended with questions: a) should we be re-thinking the kinds of folks that should serve as coaches? b) should we be working with several institutions or possibly with only one? c) should we be trying to cultivate a very small cadre of coaches (or is it "facilitators") with whom we can share our back-stage uncertainties, or should we be trying to work with a significantly larger group? There was disagreement concerning such matters, and we agreed to return to them.

March 1, 1995

To: Alan Hoffman

From: Michelle Barmatz (Annette's secretary)

Enclosed please find a copy of the minutes from the Harvard Goals meeting that Annette has asked me to forward to you.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be "MB", is centered on the page. The signature is written in a cursive, stylized font. The background of the signature area is a light gray square with a faint, repeating pattern of the word "RECEIVED" in a grid.

## THE HARVARD MANDEL PROJECT

Minutes of the meeting of February 8th and 9th, 1995  
held at PERC, Harvard University

### Participants:

Dr. Israel Scheffler (IS), Dr. Seymour Fox (SF), Dr. Vernon Howard (VH), Ms. Annette Hochstein (AH), Dr. Alan Hoffmann (AlH), Dr. Daniel Pekarsky (DP), Dr. Barry Holtz (BH), Ms. Nessa Rapoport (NR), Ms. Gail Dorph (GD), Mr. Danny Marom; (joined discussion on the 9th) Dr. Michael Inbar (MI), Dr. Ellen Goldring (EG), Dr. Adam Gamoran (AG), Mr. William (Bill) Robinson (BR). Recorded by Stefania Jha.

---

### AGENDA: Goals Project

(meeting on the 8th; chaired by D. Pekarsky)

### Introductions:

AlH: Welcome.

Our ongoing project is the Educated Jew. - At the CIJE we started to develop our own agenda. The issue surfaced: If we are to develop our own agenda through N. America, if we are to allocate money, then to what end? "Where are we going?" How are we going to know if we are succeeding? How do we know when we get there? We are pushing the agenda toward the goal: The path toward Jewish Education in Diaspora and general Jewish Education.

- There is an exciting partnership between Mandel Institute and the CIJE. A meeting took place in Israel on "What does it mean to think about Jewish Education?" It is unusual in our project to have a Philosophy of Jewish Education: this is the portion of what gets pushed aside. It is an important message of what we are doing, i.e. Philosophy with Israel Scheffler.

- We hope what comes out of today is an ongoing question to keep us on course, to look at, in a broader aspect of Philosophy of Education, and to contribute to the Philosophy of Education translated into practice.

IS: Let me introduce my colleague Vernon Howard. His interests are in the Philosophy of Education and the Philosophy of Art. His new book is Toss the Student, a take-off on William. James' essay. Vernon has general statements on goals and aims.

- Introducing also Stefania Jha, who wrote a working paper on "Theory and Practice," has been working with PERC-Mandel for some



- The Goals Project was to educate institutions. Our lay readers were excited about what guides a community, not what guides educational institutions. We are constrained by (a) personnel, (b) knowledge (there is more to learn). The work we need to do with institutions [is like] what we did in the Jerusalem seminar: we brought together lay people and sent them home with the idea of re-educating the community. The idea was to bring together a clientele, to identify institutions with which we could develop an agenda. The Milwaukee community followed this course; they recruited people (35-40) from the community for seminars. We hope that out of the seminar we will be able to identify goals. We want to be clearer about our goals and identify practice. This year we need time to get clear on goals and what is our knowledge base.

Our central agenda today is:

- (1) What is the knowledge base;
- (2) Who are the people who could do the work, and how to cultivate and recruit them.
- (3) What principles guide our work? (Peirce's imagery of the strength of a rope made of fibers.)

A summary of our guiding principles is:

- (1) Serious efforts at educational improvement needs serious attention to *goals*.
- (2) For an institution to be organized around goals, what would be a consideration for goals?

The issue about *content* and goals need to be *understood* and be *compelling* and be embedded. This requires serious study, attention to self-study and evaluation. We assume there are multiple paths to goals, because institutions are different.

- What is necessary is that the person who helps the institution be open-minded and have a repertoire of knowledge about approaches to change.

- I want to approach the different *levels* at which intervention can be made.

- We also need to have critical people *buy into* the process (e.g.: rabbi, lay leadership and congregation), otherwise we won't get far.

Comments/concerns about institutions:

- There is a strong disposition on the part of stakeholders to drift to quick consensus in the form of vague slogans. Also, while the

CIJE insists on clarification and informed decisions, institutions are impatient with this process - they want to get on with the process. I am concerned. How do we engage institutions in serious reflection?

- Also: Seymour has talked about different levels of entering into the process: from Philosophy -> Philosophy of Education -> curriculum -> issues in education. At what level a person will be working with this?

The initial set of questions is:

"What is the work?"

"Who are the coaches?"

"How do we recruit them?"

The MEF is invaluable in tracking this project. For the lay leadership this is important - they want to see.

VH: Have you given attention to the general philosophical issues of goals and aims, to clarify not so much the content, but the meaning of 'goals'?

DP: We have talked about 'vision' in the sense of what we envision by the kind of person and community which emerges out of this (e.g.: the quality of mind, etc.), but not specifically goals and aims. If you think it will be helpful, take this point.

VH: As a general issue - at the highest level of institutional concern, distinguish between (a) strategic vision (see around 'corners'), and (b) moral vision (concerning character). Then move down to the level of aims, which have principles built into them ('larger program'). Then further down, specific goals which have *extrinsic* ends.

DP: This is invaluable as we move into institutions. So far we have been dealing with a 'moral vision.' What 'meaningful existence' animates their lives - people need to have confidence that there is such a thing as 'meaningful existence' as a Jewish person. See congregations - what attracts people to them? Slogans, - but many have direction. It would be important for them to arrive at clarity.

IS: Is the vagueness functional? I.e., if this is the only way to mobilize the community - to be vague - otherwise there may be people excluding people?

SF: I think it is.

GD: It does serve a function - it creates a big umbrella; inside it is amorphous, but people feel they can talk about e.g. 'this is the kind of education your kids will get.'

SF: This is a good way to ask "What is the 'it'?" The moral or the strategic vision? We would want people to become sensitive to both. I want to ask - if we were to work with an institution or community - schools

would be easier - what would we do? And what difference would it make?

DM: I have been hearing the different pieces around the table - I would like to share an idea:

There are some *levels* of distinctions, as working categories. The levels at which issues can be discussed are:

- (1) Philosophy,
- (2) Philosophy of Education,
- (3) Theories of practice,
- (4) Implementation,
- (5) Evaluation.

AlH: Is vagueness 'functional'? Functional for whom? At what level? It is possible for institutions, synagogues to 'spread the tent'? But it would be *dysfunctional* in education. I have come to believe that the reason that adolescent education fell apart, is the fact that it is a homogenizing message. There is a groundswell of desire to be engaged - the lay leadership understands that this *is* one of the issues.

IS: So in effect there is a trade-off - if you make the schools more precise in their goals, then some will 'fall off' - so you are saying that it would be better to have a 'family' of schools to serve a variety of needs.

AlH: I never had this conversation straight in a community. There has been an unspoken obfuscation which has kept the community together, but it has not been helpful in schools.

IS: For example, in Boston there are schools of different stripes. Is this, writ large, could [it] be the vision? Each school reinforcing some segment of the community at large? A different idea from a 'general citizenship.'

BH: The portrait of Boston is not typical. Generally, there is a fragmentation on the right. Communities want to create a community school. One of the things community leaders stress is that *everybody* be included. This is a value; the Federation consciousness...

NR: Analysis of Alan (AlH) is about the functionality/dysfunctionality. But if education produces a *civic* member ...

GD: We could have a 'family' of schools. Also, we could come up with something else: the denominational idea may have served a purpose in its time, but now it is 'frozen'? In the study, there may be thinking about what kinds of person, synagogue, etc. ...

SF: On fragmentation: if carried to the extreme, it will be difficult to explain what is meant by "being a Jew."

IS: General citizenship?

SF: If the question is - if there is a chance to build only one kind of school X, would you build it ( )? They would say 'yes.' The question is, "what it means to be a Jew." On the spectrum of secular - orthodox. It is a serious question. This may be something we will find out when we examine the 'it' .... What justifies existence of an institution, if we lose one-third of the community? Exclusion, or not? ... Orthodox, Reform, Conservative, Secular, 'Just Jews' .... What kind of knowledge base would you have to have?

DP: Note parenthetically: "Community - Vision." What may be a community's practice when they are serious about 'vision'? A way to encourage participation is by something like a 'magnet-school system.' It would include generic types. Communities harbor a great diversity and we have to face the question: Is it possible to articulate guiding aims which people can subscribe to?

IS: We have been making an assumption that any school which strives for consensus must be weak in content. I would distinguish generality from vagueness. Large doses of content can be part of 'general.' If one of our values is over-arching citizenship, then the challenge is to ask "What does that imply?" and "Does your curriculum goal has that as a value?"

SF: The denominational movement sold a line which is impossible. But 'Jewish citizenship' as higher value than fragmentation .... In the tension between two values, how should that be treated? - Magnet-denominational schools? We still need a definition of 'citizenship.' 'Diversity is crucial and should be supported [?]'

GD: In Milwaukee, the Federation does not allocate funds to a school because they don't teach modern Hebrew. [It is] a different vision.

BH: Is this a different philosophical question? Jewish education as different from public education in America? ... "We teach you literature for example, but we will not touch many issues, e.g. prayer." [?] But then the question is, how can we teach Judaism without prayer?

SF: It is the history of politics of orthodoxy. Conservative, Reform Judaism? - The argument will fall apart: The conservative/Reform movement thinks that, for example, they can deal with the question of prayer. - There is a lack of success in that education. Orthodox education deals with specific questions of observance. It may not be a fair distinction to say 'Is this an issue in N. America [?]'

DM: This is relevant to Goals Project: Ron Renault's project "'Citizen/breakdown of community' [debate] is under-mining the content issue? When we deal with institutions, when we deal with content, when we deal with communities and schools, we have to separate

these? But what we do in either, [will have to] go together somehow. On the community level, people want something that is not ambivalent. The question is, who is going to put this idea forward? - If the communities will ask "What are your goals?" (positive), "What makes us a community?" If we had this conversation, it might move the Goals Project further. - One could look at institutions in the community and see what are done in common, bring the various educators together to benefit everybody. - My question is whether decision is made: 'citizen goal/specific-diverse' ...

IS: I conflated two goals, two levels - community and school.

DP: Like Nozick's framework for Utopia?

IS: Each school would be pressed to say what it is doing in its own stripe. Then go to the community and ask *their* goal (e.g.: foster any kind of school ...), their conception of what it means to be a citizen.

DP: My initial understanding was that it was at the institutional level.

SF: Historically it was: "Are there goals?" But then the question was: "Can we get anything done that the whole community could agree [on]?" There are at least four issues: (1) How would one deal with institutions in the Goals Project; (2) Communities; and so on (3) , (4) ...

DP: I benefited from inputs on the "Community-Vision" issue. I would like to come back to the issue of diversity. I want to go back to what it means to work with institutions.

AlH: You (IS) reminded us - consensus meant 'lowest common denominator' - but what would it mean to have 'highest multiple'? The locus of our meeting is the Federation. People ask: "Can we come to a consensus?"

- Another point: - The discussion about the new community high school (day school). Communities have to think of ways to create schools for adolescents who are at an existential time in their lives. - Another question: There is a normative question about Jewish existence (e.g. decision about prayer in school), the relation between normative Judaism (content) and spirituality. These issues get connected.

BH: If we are going to work with an institution, what do we do?

SF: Schwab and I were called into a controversy between open/not open school. Schwab wrote a paper on religious schools. The issue of prayer is a cop-out, the way the matter is treated. - The issue is, what it means to be a Jew. E.g.: Can't exclude schools on issues of, for example, modern Hebrew. To make a hierarchy of values, e.g., who should be a head? The point is, the heat around issues (sacred cows) eliminated the discussion. Our job is to help communities to start a conversation. Goals, content - we help communities to clarify this.

- IS: My view is that a community be pluralistic. It does not mean 'no content.' We don't know what is going to survive.
- DP: On the one hand, there is something good about the school-congregation tie. On the other hand, there is a tension.
- IS: There is a non-denominational excellent school in Berkeley.
- DM: Exploring non-denominational issue only begins the discussion. Discussing communities is a different discussion.
- GD: In the seminars you have several institutions - then they go back to their own. Institutions, who normally don't sit together, the temperature is already turned up. People overlap from different areas - communities, schools, etc.
- AIH: The real question is, what is the relation between school and society? Schools do not go beyond 8th grade.
- GD: There was an era of time when high schools were where education started.
- SF: You (DP) made the issue: why should schools be related to congregations?
- DP: Continuity between family and synagogue, celebration ...
- IS: We are talking about content as if it would be part of the curriculum. - But we are talking in an oblique way about the elements in the orthodox adult's life. In community schools, the categories of orthodox lives are less prominent. [It is] the adult question: "What are we asking? In order to survive, we have to ...." The Philosophy of Jewish life is the *adult* question.
- DP: I asked in Jerusalem: "What kind of person will emerge? Will it be meaningful for the person who emerges from it?"
- BH: I have been thinking - Is there really a legitimate secular Jewish way *now* in America? - Once there was, but now - is there? (People say such things as "Being Jewish is most important, but I am not religious")
- DM: In a report for the JCC, Jews identify themselves as ethnic.
- BH: If the JCCs would be serious, they would be groping for this.
- SF: Barry, suppose if you did an analysis, what component would it include? Ethical person, ..., how is it different from secular? What would you come out with, if you asked this about 'conservative'? What do they insist on? Same thing with Reform? - I think the distinction today would be a term of 'citizenship' and a spectrum of religious practice. - Barry, do you have a definition of [any of the above]?

.....intermission.....

DP: We need to make a schedule - What kind of people for what kind of work - in reference to the nature of coaching.

DM: I would like to make a suggestion where coaches may intervene in institutions. I am giving a summary of various conversations. Here I have a map of content (elements of) categories:

(1) Philosophy (tilted toward education);

(2) Philosophy of Education - The Educated Jew (not yet in the language of practice, but what you aim for - the 'portrait');

(3) Theory of practice - goals of education, principles guiding practice;

(4) Evaluation (of what we are doing related to goals).

We define what a coach does in terms of these elements. We can discuss intervention related to these categories.

DP: E.g. on 'Curriculum' - The principal may pull out a list, or show me it in action. Which one do you mean? By implementation, do you mean all?

GD: When I am thinking of the 'it' - what is the outcome you hope for? a written something that is analogous to the Educated Jew Project but it is for 'our school'?

DM: In a general sense. You want to take the institution to search out its content, then after the search and explicitness, work with that in trying to develop a day-to-day way of doing it (the 'how'). - Enter the school on the level of Philosophy of Education, and then [do] theory-conceptualization. - Say to the school: "This is what I think you are doing." - When the school does not agree, then the tension between the two will start a discussion. - These are just examples of what a 'coach' may do. The coach will help with the formulation, unpacking the formulation, etc.

DP: Clarify please.

DM: For example, moving from (3) to (4).

SF: Would you (DM) be disturbed if a community wants to talk Philosophy?

DM: No, we can enter anywhere.

GD: What I did not understand is - I thought you could do this as a goals' clarification exercise, but where is the take on the Jewish content? That is what matters to us.

DM: That was (4).

GD: Are we saying that the coach needs to know all of this?

SF: Yes. But start anywhere. If I were a coach, I would ask "Would you like to look at what is the conception of 'Bible'?" Then move to the level of theoretical. The coach has a sense of all levels. The way I see DM saying, is that the way the response is, will not be empty "I think Bible is..." but will look at it critically.

- DM: Putting it on the table is a 'learning' movement. The looking at it again, and learning about alternatives is a critical move.
- SF: If the school told you 'X', wouldn't you start that as a way to move?
- DM: Yes.
- SF: Let us say we start with what the school says. Then begin a conversation, see what that means. Not schools and lay-people together.
- DP: We are talking about *doing* this, not *talking* about doing it.
- SF: If I were the coach, I want teachers to articulate this to me.
- DP: We could do two or three different things: (a) What do they mean by it? Encourage them to give examples; (b) Ask what implications this may have; (c) now content: different ways of approaching the issue.
- SF: I would be willing to spend six months on *articulation*. If it stops there, it will not add to the richness. It is not to make people feel good.
- GD: Where would you want to end up? If it stops at for example 'Bible,' is that good?
- SF: Good for a start. Let's say they go onto Jewish History, Jewish practice, ...
- GD: It becomes a statement: e.g.: the Mitzwah of choice is study. One of the things we can lift up as a paradigm at the end is the Educated Jew.
- SF: You are going too fast. We have to go step-by-step. We will dilute this moment if we jump that high. Ask "What the value of study is." The decision what to 'play' depends on the audience, what the audience benefits from. Our conversation is 'working papers.' With the school we can stop anytime.
- DP: I have a Deweyan sense of a coach. He needs to see, ... his concerns are to become progressively clearer and thoughtful about what it is we want to do.
- SF: First ask the teachers what they do, then I would ask what the subject (e.g. Bible) says to contemporary [man].
- AlH: I thought we were talking about an institution, an ongoing reflection in an institution.
- SF: Raising the level of conversation to another level... - Let us keep 'what to think' and 'what to do' separately.
- VH: But these are not content, but categories. The 'it' is not up there. I am reminded of Chris Argyris' distinction of what people in fact are doing and what they think they are doing, i.e. the 'is : ought.'
- SF: I would not be disturbed (as a coach) at this point if respondents are not accurate.
- DP: But whether you go forward would depend on which way [they] answered this.

- SF: You can start anywhere.
- NR: [But what about] community mobilization?
- SF: I want to keep community on hold for now.
- GD: I am trying to understand DP's Dewey point. I put on the lenses at the choice point...
- VH: I was wondering why use the term 'coach' - but then, you are training someone in the use of an instrument.
- AlH: If we are talking about an iterative process, in terms of these categories ...
- DM: It seems to me a coach tries to create a tension or resonance between levels. In the context of practice, to help the discussion going.
- SF: The coach is to break the log-jam.
- DM: You understand me if you say 'breaking the log-jam.'
- SF: The lens we are looking through is Philosophy.
- DP: But it is similar to what you did with the 'teachers and the Bible' example earlier.
- BH: I am thinking, when we talk about the Bible, here I feel I know what I am doing - the bottom-up approach. I did not have this sense when we talked about the Philosophy/Educated Jew Project.
- I am concerned about three things: (1) It will feel to the school - 'Nice, but what is the hoopla'; (2) It will get us into issues of pedagogy [rather] than the Goals Project. I thought the distinction between teaching and goals will get mixed up. Is this a teacher improvement project or a goals project? (3) I am afraid it is too atomized, even though it is easier to start with a specific 'thing,' but departments are separated and nobody else hears about it or impact the school as a whole. Maybe these happen over a long period of time - like the Coalition of Essential Schools report.
- GD: We need to keep our eyes on 'principles,' clarifying concepts/goals. SF was using a different principle - something about the way learning takes place, - discomfort ...
- DP: I think your point is at the heart of this question: you (the coach) are creating tension so you hope learning takes place, - Danny's point of 'atomization.' A coach needs to walk into an institution and see where to start. He needs to talk to critical stake-holders. There may be various ways of cutting into this - like what happened in Jerusalem (seminar). I said: 'Why don't we bring people together and see what they think of it' - or say 'Maybe it is not yet time....'
- BH: I noticed you get [one gets] sucked into areas of the school, and you notice it is no longer the 'stuff' you started out with. For example, the principal approaches you with a problem for help. It is hard to exclude him with any of his troubles, these troubles will be seen as impinging on the goals.

- SF: Let's talk about this as a 'problem,' not as inevitable. So coaches will not 'get sucked in.' I took it as DM pointing out what *could* take place and you (BH) point out what could be a danger.
- DP: The guiding principle could be: 'Do I see that as a vehicle to accomplish my purposes,' and 'What connection it may have to what I am doing?' If the problem gets me 'sucked in,' I would 'deflect' it.
- DM: For example, if there are contradictory problems, you could 'construct' through 'discomfort.'
- BH: The issue is, how much do the coaches need to know?
- SF: We will get back to this in a minute. About coaches: either I will point to something/somebody else, or deflect the question....
- IS: Question: Before you go to the school, what do you tell the school you are going to do?
- DP: So far we said we will work with the Agenda.
- GD: We said to them - "If an institution has a goal, it is a different institution." They think they are going to have a 'Dewey school.'
- IS: You said to schools - "We are going to show you how to be a 'vision driven' school?"
- DP: Vision, principles, people who are committed to it and put it in practice.
- IS: What the coach can do is limited - start a process of self-development - coach as catalyst. If I were doing it, [I would] have a series of questions that I could interject at various stages, e.g. on the structure and relation of subject X to others. Ask: 'Is this what you in fact are aiming at?' 'What results as your graduate?' ... Not linear questions.
- DP: I don't want [it] to be perceived as an all-or-nothing ...
- GD: In order for people to change, offer them an alternative model, where you can aim, even if it can only be articulated vaguely - a paradigm shift.
- IS: Like Edmund's alternative of what an effective school would be...
- AIH: It is not only 'moving up and down' the ladder, but that different parts of the school are at different places. How world-views are played out in the classroom. There are different levels of intensity/engagement for a movement to happen.
- IS: A coach needs to be able to see across horizontally. Also, there may be a big gap between a 'mission statement' and what gets 'translated' into ...
- SF: The process will contribute to improving the school/goals. You want to get the process going. - We had a four year conversation at the Seminary. - These talks energized the institution. The effect can be upward and downward. You keep your eyes on goals, aims, and how it is reflected in pedagogy. What are the kinds of questions that will

help the coach to trigger this? Then the question is, how this will be translated into pedagogy. Remember that the focus is on the goals/aims.

NR: I did not think the Goals Project was about 'improving the school.' I thought it was the big narrative: "What is the meaningful existence of a Jew." The question of meaning - I wonder where this conversation happens?

DP: I think the question of 'meaning' is part of this, but it is part of what goes on in the institution.

GD: The 'hows' - the 'strategic vision,' is that what we are talking about now? We are talking about images of institutions with criteria, e.g. 'coherence.' Now we are talking about how you go up and down levels. - I am wondering...

VH: The coach is a 'diagnostic dialectician.' What I call 'strategic vision' is what goes from 'stem to stern' in an institution. A 'moral vision' is a companion to the above.

DP: You point raises the question that 'stem-to-stern' presupposes a deep familiarity with the institution and with process.

SF: The strategic and moral visions are different talents, but need to be 'married' in an institution.

IS: Think in Socratic terms - the 'gad-fly'; the questions are based not on the knowledge-base for Socrates. Train your coaches to ask questions. Questions like 'What they want to do?' "How they want to get there?" ...

SF: The strategic leader gets the results. The philosopher sees the complexity and asks questions to 'disturb' the early closure.

.....  
DP: I am interested in the suggestion that the emphasis is on the moral rather than the strategic vision. The coach - when *does* he need to be skilled in the strategic domain, when does he *not* need to be skilled in the strategic domain?

VH: The 'gad-fly' notion - it is also [in the] asking of the strategic questions ...

GD: ... and help provide someone who can *do* what needs to be ....

DP: I want to understand what the coach does not do.

SF: We want to introduce the coach - an element in schools that is missing.

IS: A coach as a critic, for example. A coach can recognize good leadership or practice, but may not be able to do it [himself] - a second-level capacity. - With respect to moral vision: If you follow the Socratic idea "The process of questioning is the care of the soul" (a normative notion), the questioning the coach initiates ...

- SF: (1) the bet is that we should make explicit what we are doing. (2) The power of staffs - there is a lot of strength, they can invent. (3) Principal [as] expert on strategy; or even layman or politician may be good in strategy...
- NR: Why would a coach leave then?
- SF: If the coach did a good job, he does himself out of a job.
- BH: Coaches 'set fire.' The fire may go out; then he goes somewhere else.
- SF: Socrates was very disciplined when he talked about beauty and did not go onto the subject of justice, but stayed with the first issue.
- DM: But the coach may show alternatives or point to someone who does. The coach does not only raise, but sharpen the question.
- IS: Socrates never gives answers. He asks questions and presses the answer by asking further questions. Socrates asks for principles.
- DP: But you can bring in an example and start discussion from there.
- SF: We may want to consider a hybrid. Most teachers would not tolerate 'no input.' Also, it takes a high degree of artistry to keep up being the gad-fly.
- VH: The term 'coach'...
- SF: The term came from our critics.
- BH: The question is, what is involved in training a gad-fly?
- GD: My question is, if there was a hybrid .... We struggled with the process/content issue. We did not place this in the 'process' column. I thought the hybrid will be an interweaving of these. I was going to let the coach have some content. The coach needed to understand the template, where we are going, the kinds of questions which make sense inside each place and how to go from place to place. I had to understand what goes on inside these levels.
- DP: What I find helpful about the 'gad-fly' is that you don't need to do everything, rather than infuse with new content ....
- IS: I would put new content in way of questions. The coach has to have a 'curriculum of questions' of branched sequences, to get people to think what they are doing, what they *think* they are doing, where the graduates are heading. This is going 'up' (on the four 'categories'). In our talk earlier, we went 'down.' I would manage it so that people would not be dependent on the coach forever.
- DP: I think the Coalition of Essential Schools do something like this.
- NR: The Coalition - questioning schools?
- SF: Hutchins' article on the definition of a university president...
- IS: ...rotating presidents...
- SF: A guy may be burning himself out...
- DP: [Two points about coaches]: (1) the coach makes the goals central to the enterprise; (2) the coach will engage institutions to improve

themselves ("If you wrestle with goals, it will make you a better school.")

- We seem to be saying (2), a narrower sense.

SF: My suggestion is: There is a strategic problem here. Communities will see this as games and as not leading anywhere. We are talking about it as powerful; a lot of educators will hear it as 'soft.' It is a question of rhetoric [?].

There are three sets of ideas: (a) Empowerment of educators: involve educators in the questioning process; (b) These sets of questions are a praise to philosophy; they make a difference in theory leading to practice - like the Dewey school. (c) There are doctrines out there which inform the process. We can't lose the battle because of 'soft' language.

DP: To the extent that 'gad-fly' is emphasized, it is related to the readiness issue.

SF: For example, in the Jerusalem seminar, the Baltimore people - it was clear that they did not understand about principals and lay-people. - It may be that the principal's education is what we have to work with, that they have to deal with lay-people. Lay-people will have to be 'sold' this. If they become partners, they will become your strength.

AlH: How would you 'operationalize' this? If we think about this 'facilitator/gad-fly' (not a coach), there is a big piece here: field testing, etc. There could be a curriculum here. I am wondering - are we talking about a different kind of person/training than the people we talked about on the 29th?

NR: Question: I would like to hear a Jewish notion about the 'gad-fly' idea?

SF: I would suggest, find a place that we want to work with, and then make it difficult to get in.

DP: My comment: I would want to look for/ identify 3-4 people, strong, with whom we can have backstage [conversations]...

AlH: There is a major trade-off to be done in those two suggestions. If we have a small number of people, the impact will be limited. We need to ask ourselves, what is the range of potential impact if we go the other way. Seymour suggested the slow experimental way. The question is one of "How do you get the conversation going in N. America, so it will not be an esoteric discussion?"

.....  
AlH: We want to devote tomorrow to evaluation and feedback (MEF), but we have to devote a couple of hours to the profession. We will try to review how are the issues of building a profession (personnel).

AH: The Personnel Action Plan - When preparing for the MEF meeting, there was a sense that we should do [an assessment of] "What the monitoring involves".... The discussion of the Personnel piece will be revisited tomorrow with the MEF.

GD: (Handout) On what we did in December with the Lead Communities (see pg. 4 of handout). In the Policy Brief, the results seem to be similar to other communities, so they seem to be representative of teachers in the US. What we found out is that teachers are poorly prepared - only 20% trained in both subject and pedagogy. What was not known, is that there is stability, even though teachers are part-time. Educators think of themselves as 'career people.' It is worth investing [in them.] It is a different view than what the community thinks of it, that teachers 'fell into it,' and were not trained for it. Teachers are not treated as professionals, with in-service training. - We had a seminar in three Lead Communities. [Came up with a] comprehensive Personnel Action Plan. So what you have here is a 'cut' Barry and I took, focusing on professional development.

SF: Do you have an inventory? Is it written? It should be.

GD: There are some isolated course-like things - a 'program' for example in early childhood ( a 'best practices' approach). Most things are episodic and have no target audiences, they are not connected. Because things are not connected, there is no long view. So we created a semi-comprehensive program. (See chart "Creating a Personnel Action Plan" - it is like a work-sheet.)

AH: The cells in this chart - are they numbers or content?

GD: Number cells. See pg 5 and 4 for content cells, and pg. 3 for target audiences. You would need to make it bigger to quantify it.

AG: Maybe you need to have general categories.

GD: As we go through this, we will see the findings and then see what we'll have to do. See pg. 4 'mapping it out' (done by teachers). You can't do interventions with teachers without their leaders. What is not present, [is that] there is no strata of people in the community who could teach the teachers. Schema: C(motivation) - D(organization) + E(evaluation, capacity)  
We needed an ongoing process, documented. This leads to an assignment to them: "What do you want to do in five years? How do you get there?" Then give them some tools. We gave them some rubrics filled (see pg. 9) to get them started. How do you build the capacity for this? Create a template. Create capacity for Teacher Leadership training. (See handout: A. Teacher Training; (1) Virtual College; ...)

AlH: We had a big international meeting, the CIJE in advisory capacity, where we moved the locus of action onto them. Invited them [to the

question of] what they can draw on from the community. One great success and nightmare would be if the Jewish Assembly, if the top twenty people would say, we have an action plan and now we want to implement it.

The problem is, there is nowhere in N. America where in-service can be handled. So the big agenda for 1995 is to build in-service programs.

SF: Are there any in-service programs?

GD: In Baltimore there is one, which gets close.

SF: Suppose there is all the capacity to do this. Is there an assumption that there is transfer? If you only train in subject or pedagogy, what would you do? Teach the subjects and skills separately? Would they be able to put this together?

AlH: You need to think of what kind of people need to do training for what kind of populations.

SF: But I am asking: "If you have 500 Gails, I want to know what they would do?"

GD: You will track - do different things for different kinds, there is a difference between pre-service and in-service.

SF: Alan said we have three models...

GD: I would do a diagnosis, then based on that, we would suggest. We use this document to get to the diagnosis.

SF: Someone will have to work with people. What is a 'virtual college' of teachers? How do you make the 500 Gails? What is the first step?

GD: Find 20 people, train them to be trainers.

SF: But..

GD: Let me explain. When we saw we did not have enough people to do the training...

SF: What is the tactic to cut into the problem? Let's say I will just take very talented people and train them.

BH: Let's say we know the skills and abilities such people should have, we will go find a few people. There may be five types of people....

SF: How do you produce the five types?

AlH: There are two parallel roads here. Their argument was to provide a Personnel Action Plan, do a survey and offer an agenda. But what you say is that now they have to produce 500 Gails. But what *can* be done, is to work with these communities and draw on talents. I believe that the quantitative issue matters. (If what is at stake is to train X number of people, then they can draw on energies that exist.) Then, there is the qualitative issue.

AlH: The major issue in from of the CIJE is to train the capacity. Our first assignment was to make a Personnel Action Plan. We have to ask

ourselves: "In 1995, how many communities can we be engaged in? Nine."

AH: If you speak of the larger questions, then putting it in terms of in-service training, ... then you will need to address other issues. Can't bet solely on the current pool of people - there is a turn-over.

GD: One of the issues that we have to address is salaries, standards, benefits. The issue of licensing fell out of the plan three times. It is a big money issue for communities.

BH: The document is in four parts. We said: retention, salary, in-service, etc.... The powerful document CIJE created is the Policy Brief. So that result is our reason for the in-service plan.

GD: In the 'virtual college' we will admit only people who have specific preparation. Who would be the faculty? There are people out there who are trainers. Some schools of education are doing such things. People who are self-conscious of their activity as trainers. They would come in and together with us, they would help us target the next generation of trainers (considering such as dispositions, skills, understanding)

BH: If Milwaukee will demand from us serious in-service teaching, and if we don't have a person who can go out to various communities, but if we could entice one to join the faculty and train a number [of people] and they can go out into the community....

GD: Before we could start a school for teacher-trainers, we need to find...

BH: find top people, create a program.

SF: How much time do you think it will take?

GD: A chunk.

SF: It will take four of you. You should know that you are talking about a budget ...

BH: I thought this part of the plan was less vulnerable. To train a tier-one person is not a big issue. To train tier-two people is more difficult.

SF: We are not talking about a 'virtual college,' but a real college, which costs less. It would be OK with me if you (CIJE) would focus on a 'virtual college.' My comments are made so we can go in front of the American Jewish Community and say how you want to do it.

BH: Is there a whole different way to go about it?

SF: You are saying, to build the people who respond to the need. Tell the CIJE that this is not a cosmetic approach. What is the minimal [kernel] we need - what is the tactic we can get 'Vicky' in there (as faculty)?

BH: Run a workshop...

SF: Run three summers, one month, until you get the 'college.' On salary?

- AlH: Ultimately, we have to have communities to understand that they have to pay for it.
- SF: Three things you said are on a sound track: find people, training, budget issues.
- AH: Ackerman is supposed to look at regional colleges, then we can send people there[?]
- SF: Make a plan for the N. East. - What is 'virtual'? - If I were you (BH), then I would tell them: this is where the action is, and figure out a game-plan.
- GD: Jewish Education training is not the same as general education.
- AlH: How do we juggle the issue? - We pushed the communities to recognize the need for in-service. We have new communities who sign onto "yes, we will have in-service education."
- SF: Let's assume we created this demand and we will now have to service them. What do we do till then? We will have subject-matter people working with them, pedagogy people too.
- AH: They are educating the community as well. Please view it as only one piece. Let them think of what they do as good or not good. You might offer the quality criteria. We have to use part of the energy of CIJE to produce an action plan, and produce the modules of the 'nine communities.'
- GD: Number two on this plan is that - guidance.

### Summary:

- AlH: Let me track the progress of our thinking: We were talking about a CIJE work-plan. In November, we sharpened the focus, saw how enormous was the challenge in N. America, saw how it relates to two thrusts: (1) to work in additional communities; create an understanding by doing a survey of their own; (2) create a capacity. As I understand it, this work-plan now does not fit into a bigger plan of some 'college' on the broad idea. Then, to try to do the 1995 do-able piece, which could help us to move to the bigger piece of it, the community piece is taking slow enough, will give us enough time to build a model. We did not put it into thought of how will we spin it out.
- SF: (to AH) How would this work itself out?
- AH: To have the 'virtual college' take on this now?
- GD: What we can't get them to do is to reform what they have.
- AH: You train up a few, who will offer a different model.

GD: We were involved in pilot initiatives. They started with something we told them, but we can't make them as powerful as we thought we can.

SF: I would like to suggest: Here are the steps we need to take; here is a list for the best places (programs A,B,C,...)

BH: One of the facts is this - the communities have good will, but do not have people who will understand.

GD: In Milwaukee they decided their teachers have to have an M.A., so they found a college in Cleveland, they funded it. But then they were not quite ready.

SF: Move people...

GD: I don't think you can move people like that.

AlH: We raised the question: how would an M.A. degree fix the problem? Ask what would it take to make Cleveland a regional center for training.

AH: There are two questions, and you are addressing both. (1) The question of standards has never been raised with that group. (2) You have some of the pieces in place.

GD: [on standards: people were afraid to fail]

SF: Here is a point: Why shouldn't you be permitted to fail? - On the topic of selling standards: Why shouldn't you be permitted to build an alternative?

AlH: Let's think it out. The 'virtual college' idea is ten days old. Milwaukee contacted Cleveland in September. We are in a better position to assess the situation now. I think as we think of where we will be five years from now, we are still in the process of building while servicing the community.

SF: I would like to suggest the CIJE should ask itself "What will be the strategic vision, what problems will it meet and ask yourself what architecture this plan needs. We need to see 'what is the plan for the building.' This is a more fundamental question.

AlH: The plan is the one for capacity. It is a mobilization story, it is not only a ...

NR: Would the Harvard Principals' Model help?

BH: If only a little bit is done it will be bad. What we hear from communities is, "We are already doing it!" It may be a failure.

SF: See what Annette's quality thing would do. They would know what is involved. State your case, try it out. - It may fail - but why not?

NR: The Harvard seminar was not only a service, but a model.

GD: Could be critiquing, not offering a model.

SF: I saw this material; I am impressed. I hear from this, supplement this activity you could consider quality prototypes of programs. What are the institutes which respond to these? "What do you need?"

Influence or money?" Get your board to have this discussion, have them agree that this is a short-range plan, and then a long-range program is built.

.....  
 Tomorrow we start at 9 am, to deal with Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback. At 2 pm D. Pekarsky will bring us his thoughts on today's discussion. We will finish at 4:30 pm.

.....  
 Afternoon meeting, 9th February  
 (already in progress; AG of MEF has taken notes)

.....  
**AGENDA: (1) Monitoring, Evaluation and Feedback**  
 (Alan Hoffman, chair)  
**(2) Review of yesterday's discussion.**

Discussion on MEF (in progress):

AlH: There is consensus about policy briefs, but not about policies. We have no consensus about the highest priority topics. That is what I heard.

GD: We did not talk about Educational Leadership.

EG: But this is educational leadership. We are analyzing the documents.

SF: There is a consensus at the CIJE that leadership is top priority.

NR: We are talking about Policy Briefs in the context of community mobilization.

AlH: We are talking about: (1) research reports; (2) policy briefs. The first item is a research paper on Jewish schools in three communities. One new research brief on teachers.

NR: Is that a policy brief?

AlH: We definitely need a research report, and we need to think about what we need for a policy brief for what we need to do next year. For item (3) [referring to the National Education Goals Report Core Indicators, item 'Student Achievement and Citizenship'] we need a research report, [and] a research paper on quality of teachers and on in-service.

AG: I would advocate (4) [of the National Ed. Goals Report Core Indicators, item 'Teacher Education and Professional Development'], because cost is relatively low and return is high.

AlH: We try to decide how much of that is necessary. We agree that the module is an important part.

AH: Don't you want to decide when you have the lay-of-the-land in front of you?

- AG: the (5) [of the National Education Goals Report Core Indicators, item 'International Achievement Comparisons'] module...
- AIH: The CIJE agenda: the issues are the following - (1) The three community reports...
- AG: We are questioning whether there is an audience for it.
- GD: It may inform our decisions on salary and benefits...
- AG: We considered it a big job initially, but if we use the template, we have a smaller job.
- BH: Shouldn't there be a summative document?
- GD: We should have something to hand out at requests...
- EG: Sort of 'best practices'?
- AIH: There are CIJE reports circulating (not authorized drafts) ... but there is a summary needed...
- GD: I mean (1) for internal use; (2) for community X as an example. ....[ on credibility of delivery] Time-line? promise it for 1995? Our credibility is at stake.
- AH: You have many things on which your credibility rests, not only this.
- AIH: Which items do we need?
- AG: There is a large agenda item we have to introduce now.
- AIH: Annette, would you introduce it?
- AH: We read documents given to us, sat back and looked at all. We think the topic is a big one. The CIJE reached a place where MEF assessment is to be done. A number of things converged, that it is time to do the evaluation after the Personnel Brief. The question is, I think, by what measure do you want to evaluate yourselves. We have the Personnel thing (?) and Policy Brief in front of us, so it is time to look at it.
- AG: It is not so different from what we talked about. We need to take the pulse. We had an idea of leading indicators, and [can] use it in the Jewish communities - like the US National Goals Panel [see document]. Many of you know that (4) is new (teaching force). Some of these are concrete. Many of these are stable (hard to change?). So if we want to do it, we need long-term commitment.
- EG: They mapped their indicators back on the goals. In Mike's (MI) presentation he (1) pressed what the indicators should be; (2) and what Adam (AG) said, the emphasis on what is in our work-plan. If we don't have a serious discussion on this, we will only have a serious response [?] Our current work is heavy on research.
- AH: What do we mean by 'indicators'? Maybe Mike can clarify. Can we define standardized measures which will give us a picture, over time, of the state of Jewish Education in America? But I understood that what you said, wanted to go to specifics. Then what I would say - can

you go in and measure that. (Are these two things?) Today, we relate more to the work of the CIJE.

MI: The conception of indicators related to decision making (concept-related): (1) It is relevant to many decisions ('how many students?' 'literacy'); Another, (2) they are head-counts: some are qualitative - less reliable but relevant. The criteria is *relevance*. We have to decide which we need. The secondary: reliability (for research) - if nor reliable, then results fluctuate too much, and decisions made on them are misleading.

SF: The issue is evaluation. Indicators will evolve. When we started, we were asked by the board, - we used qualitative indicators (e.g.: 'how many take post bar-mitzvah?'; 'later, how important is Israel experience?')

It is an interesting question, if this is an indicator. Or teachers in in-service education; number of recruits of different kinds; then the quality of Hebrew; ... What would this group want to say is qualitative - in terms of Hebrew, teacher education, etc.? How would you look at this? There are a number of things to evaluate - what is worth investing in. I would ask communities, what is worth investing in. There is now no accountability, only laundry lists. There is another line of effort to be set off ...

BH: To evaluate the quality/impact.

SF: E.g. Family education. "What is family education?" The community would have to explain. If you have them say what it means, they may want to invest in it. It could be a catalyst for research. The community will give money for research if they see it makes a difference. The questions are: (1) what kind of research is to be launched, which may be indicators; (2) what items would be looked at, CIJE would look at it, be evaluated[?] - you invest in something not only if it is a 'good idea,' but if there is a way of doing it.

GD: It is too complicated, but it makes sense. What does it mean 'evaluate CIJE'? Process feedback?

BH: Evaluating the next stage in implementation plan. - I read the mobilization plan for Atlanta. I forgot how embedded our thing is in the politics of community. - How far is this from education!

SF: I think it is education. Ask Coleman what happened when he did his report on segregation. Dirty politics? It is education.

BH: What would/should we be evaluating? I don't think it is good for us to get involved in all these endless subcommittee meetings.

SF: I don't agree.

NR: How do we measure success when we no longer have researchers *in* the communities? If we come up with comprehensible indicators, it would be very useful.

AH: I pictured this: there is a Personnel Action Plan. Get a team that does this. What would be a successful implementation? 1997 National training institution ('95 decided upon). In Baltimore, teacher assessment started, the quality of the program answers the criteria. It is a translation of concrete product. So in 2-3 years, you can give a report to the CIJE, showing strengths and weaknesses.

AIH: I think, what is put on our agenda is: "Has CIJE emerged to the next stage which puts us on the path for next stage of development?" Are we clear on the path? What are the way-stations? We put it on the agenda, next time we meet, there should be a paper about it to have a discussion. Then a monitoring/advisory group can look at it.

AH: We left Ellen and Adam with no closure/feedback. we need to decide if we give them ...

### Review:

DP: My handout: Summary and thoughts about yesterday's meeting. I would like a discussion on issues we discussed yesterday. [all reading handout] Are there significant errors?

IS: Qualification (on last-but-one page, 3rd paragraph) on the 'coach.' I did not intend to rule out that the coach may be adept at identifying and helping remedy. The point was that the coach may *not* be the person to *lead* the institution, but know what is the conception, help identify problems, bring formulations ( a critic, in a sense).

DP: People were turning in different directions about how many institutions to work with, to cultivate a small group/ large group? We don't need to make a decision now, but talk. Seymour, you brought up a suggestion....

SF: The number will be very small. Consider what other activities do you carry out. Keep in mind what and how to do it. Today, what is for public discussion? Questions are: do you learn better/more from two institutions than one? Let's see - the combinations one/many communities, one/many coaches. Harvard maybe training coaches, make a curriculum, a pedagogy of coaching is to be worked out. Stefania suggested it can be video taped. 5-7 people to be trained. If you succeed with 2 or 3, you are not paralyzed.

AIH: It is possible to have a bigger group which is already engaged. They are nor given recipes; they are in an on-going process of learning – a circle within a circle. As I think of the profile, as we were talking about it, (people less directive??) and take it in different directions .... It would be a high level of demonstration seminar. I would not limit it to a small group.

- GD: We were thinking of a cadre. Then we said, 'let's think smaller': Trainers to work with others. Then we said, 'let's think who would be the first people to start this job.'
- DP: I envision a small working group because by the time you bring in a large group, you may have a better idea. I am skeptical about coming up with so many names - a list of trainees.
- GD: We are talking about commitment, time, - not so much skills, persons and places matched.
- DP: The question is - what kind of person ...
- AlH: A thoughtful Jew, committed to Jewish Education, able to engage a staff of a school, capable of a 'branching' dialectic, with a strong pedagogical skill.
- SF: What makes Is (IS) a Philosopher of Education (not only a Philosopher) is, that he can contribute/respond to a principal. We need more than a 'thoughtful' person. E.g. Twersky, who runs a school.

Link between Goals Project and MEF:

- DM: Skills are needed: content area, interpersonal skills. - The summary of yesterday: learning and always doing; when you get into a discussion of the community-wide goals, you get resonance. We should not lose the momentum. How to keep the momentum? (ask Nessa) There are people in the Educated Jew Project, community people could be invited, to become sensitized to content. Develop visiting scholars from the Educated Jew Project. Possibilities are: (a) MEF research on community goals and show 'what we learned'; (b) DP, if MEF people could be sitting in seminars and write it up as case study; (c) if we are talking about goals, we need to differentiate between and help institutions evaluate what they say their goals are and what they do; (d) create an environment with committees, MEF, scholars...
- BR: On the coaches - you talked about educators; there is another one: anthropologists - looking at the culture of the institutions. What if we did the three projects over, and did nine?
- AG: My reaction was - institutions would come up with goals and we will evaluate them. The close analysis of process is not our strength. We are not good at the kind of work you are suggesting. Last August we decided to do a different kind of evaluation, not an immersion, but an interviewing key actors and writing a memo and maybe repeat in six months. We could shift, but ....

- DP: Linking of MEF and Goals Project – a good idea (MEF doing institutional profiles). Self-study of different kinds is valuable. Issue of community vision - 'should we/or not' be on the agenda. We may need to revisit 'how important it is'; or should we be more modest? - Also, how many institutions do we work with? The number of resources, what the resources are, what is our impact? Impact depends on dissemination. This may be why the MEF contribution is important.
- BH: MEF and Goals Project link is important. We need to evaluate underlying assumptions. If the assumption is 'goals matter,' it is a faith assumption, a powerful assumption. - I have been thinking about the lay people. A level of skepticism is there. How do we measure that goals are [approached]? The MEF got started because we wanted to know answers to these questions: 'If you do X, do things get better?' - This new discussion changes the MEF job.
- GD: Did we talk about the Personnel Initiatives in the communities?
- AG: It is a longer term...
- BR: In terms of testing, pre/post test, matched groups...
- DM: It is the content issue: can some of the content things stay on MEF's agenda?
- EG: We have MEF, could add RP (Research and Policy).
- AIH: As part of the 'MEF design' - look at evaluation of CIJE Projects, Personnel Project, and Goals Initiative. We have to reconceptualize what our work will have to be. - Where are we on (1) Number of incentives [?]; (2) training process; (3) coaches.

### Summary:

- SF: The question of agenda: Where Harvard can help us? What is the scope? What/how MEF undertakes for evaluation? Sharing goals with communities; sharing progress and difficulties. - What is wrong with declaring change of direction, or re-evaluating (on the model of the hard sciences, when they get negative results?)
- NR: The Goals Seminars may be effective models of community mobilization.
- SF: It could be an important step. Supposing somebody shared with communities how complex it is, show them what the light at the end of the tunnel is, and a Twersky-Scheffler philosophical piece, - it will raise the level of discourse.
- AIH: We need to decide how to go ahead for the summer seminar, and plan out how to engage institutions for the fall. We need to figure out how to go about the training. We need to work these out in the summer. We need a document which plans this out.

SF: A video conference?

DP: We are thinking about a small number of institutions and some of us are going in and playing a role (DM and I). What type of commitment does it involve?

SF: Institutions should be *recruited*, not by applications.

DP: The issue of community vision is brought up, then it is put on the back-burner. It is something we will [have to] deal with in some way?

AIH: You have to suggest a *process* of how to go about it.

SF: I suggest: take the community who did this *best* (requires wisdom): Cleveland?? - Lead a community discussion, then you pick a community where you *can* succeed. We refuse the *mechanical* way of doing it.

NR: Maybe the first way to engage the community is to have a community goals seminar.

GD: In our minds was someone who is not a content-free 'gad-fly'. Content should be there. The team should have somebody like that.

AG: I want to hear Mike, Seymour, Annette. Mike, we would like your continued feedback.

MI: I want you to concentrate on a level of the question. My question is: (1) Community - is a failure now; (2) Have you scheduled time to finish this? It ought to be addressed. There are a number of points which are problematic. We need to discuss this. - My question is, who is in charge of *transforming* the research report into a *policy* question. This phase is missing. You at CIJE are responsible to decide.

SF: This is the role of your advisory committee. They should respond to it. Alan learned from this - if you don't have a committed person on your committee, nothing happens.

AIH: Mike, what is the forum which raises the findings to Policy? Maybe data is not deep enough? There are many ways the committee can function. What Mike is saying: 'Take this research and make policy agenda out of this.'

MI: Or if not, then say how the next report should be...

BH: This is what MEF is about.

AIH: If we had a meeting (CIJE, MEF, etc) put on the table what your agendas are ...

MI: The Atlanta experience is a good *case study* to clarify your mind.

AIH: How do we proceed now, so it will not be too far in the future?

SF: They wrote the Policy Brief on the phone.

AG: It is a matter of the priority list.

I think we could do it this summer - maybe it will not be timely.

AIH: It has to be in real time.

GD: We have to bring in new people.

AIH: I suggest (to AH, AG) we should have a meeting schedule, build an agenda, etc., which becomes a part of an ongoing work-plan.

SF: A thought - Is there a way to enlarge the capacity?

AG: Under the current design we have no field researchers, we have less new material.

GD: We may have taken the wrong decision in terms of people we want to [tap]... (personnel).

MI: We will have policy driven research data...

SF: It is open for discussion: How lead communities are chosen, etc., etc... There is a seminar (scheduled for) March 6-12.

.....  
AIH: This brings our two days to a close. Thank you Israel Scheffler, Vernon Howard, PERC-Mandel Program.