



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
49

Folder
3

Goals Project. Jerusalem Goals Seminar. Expenses, 1994.

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

These are the corrected versions of:

- * Putting it all together
- * School Professionals (chart)
- * Community Professionals (chart)

Please recycle the old versions. Everything else you have is fine.

Michele



SEP 2 1994

Chair

Morton Mandel

Vice Chairs

Billie Gold

Matthew Maryles

Lester Pollack

Maynard Wishner

MEMO

To: Adam, Alan, Barry, Danny, Ellen, Ginny, Nessa

From: Gail

Honorary Chair

Max Fisher

Board

David Arnow

Daniel Bader

Mandell Berman

Charles Bronfman

Gerald Cohen

John Colman

Maurice Corson

Susan Crown

Jay Davis

Irwin Field

Charles Goodman

Alfred Gottschalk

Neil Greenbaum

Thomas Hausdorff

David Hirschhorn

Gershon Kekst

Henry Koschitsky

Mark Lainer

Norman Lamm

Marvin Lender

Norman Lipoff

Seymour Martin Lipset

Florence Melton

Melvin Merians

Charles Ratner

Esther Leah Ritz

Richard Scheuer

Ismar Schorsch

David Teutsch

Isadore Twersky

Bennett Yanowitz

Enclosed you will find the evaluations from the goals seminar. Michele typed up the participants actual remarks. She also tried to make some sense of the remarks by coding and categorizing their remarks.

What if anything comes next in this process?

Executive Director

Alan Hoffmann

◆ PUTTING IT ALL TOGETHER ◆

(AN ANALYSIS OF ITEMS WHICH SHOWED UP ACROSS ROLES)

The following are items which were mentioned by participants in all roles (i.e. lay communal leaders, school professional, and community professionals). A short description of the comments follows each item, and differences between the comments from those in different roles are noted.

READINGS - These were considered beneficial by all. People of all roles requested that they arrive earlier.

CONCRETE EXAMPLES - These were appreciated by all. It is interesting to note, however, that lay communal leaders made the most requests for more concrete examples, while school professionals made the least.

YESHIVA VISIT - This trip was appreciated by all.

DANIEL PEKARSKY'S COMMENTS - He was mentioned by people in all roles, but the school professional mentioned him the most.

MOSHE GREENBERG'S PRESENTATION - He was a controversial figure among lay communal leaders and community professionals. They both requested less time, a better translation, and more models for comparison. The school professionals were universally positive, although they also requested a comparison of his vision with other visions.

KYLA'S CASE STUDY - Everyone seems to have appreciated this concrete example of an institutional vision. She was confusing for the lay communal leaders, but the other two groups had no problems with her.

COMPARISON OF VISIONS AND INSTITUTIONS - This was a universal request. Everyone would have appreciated more of this.

COMMUNITY GROUP DISCUSSIONS - These were generally appreciated, and everyone seemed to feel that this gave them a wonderful opportunity for honest dialogue within their community.

SENSITIVITY TO LANGUAGE - One of the benefits of bringing these three groups of people together seems to have been their realization that each group speaks its own language and has its own priorities and that sensitivity to this is very important for dialogue.

EDUCATED JEW PROJECT - This was very controversial among people in all groups. There are almost as many requests for more Educated Jew papers as there are complaints about the confusing and unhelpful nature of the presentation.

LESS ANALYSIS - Everyone seemed to feel that there was too much analysis of topics already covered.

SEYMOUR FOX'S PRESENTATION - This was controversial. The community professionals seem to have appreciated him, but the other two groups both cite him as a positive and complain about him as a negative.

MORE SHARING OF EXPERIENCES - Everyone would have appreciated more time for networking and sharing in an informal way.

SENSITIVITY TO PECULIARITIES OF NORTH AMERICAN JEWISH EDUCATION -

There was a feeling among some of the school professionals and community professionals that the CIJE/Mandel staff was not familiar enough with the North American Jewish educational scene to understand its idiosyncrasies or to appreciate its positive qualities.

MICHAEL ROSENAK'S PRESENTATION - This is cited by community professionals and school professionals as a very positive experience.

PUTTING THEORY INTO PRACTICE - All groups wanted more exercises and information regarding how to go about doing this.

FEWER FRONTAL PRESENTATIONS - Everyone seems to have gotten restless. There is a general feeling that they could have been more productive if the style of the sessions had varied more.

A READING LIST - Both the school professionals and the community professional requested a bibliography of important works that one should read if one is interested in implementing a vision.

ROLES OF LAY LEADERS AND PROFESSIONALS - The professionals seem to have been extremely grateful for the opportunity to interact with their lay people and to learn more about their point of view. They would like a further exploration of how people in each of those roles should contribute to the process of building a vision.

AMICHAH - The evening with Amichai is cited as one of the more pleasant treats of the seminar.

ISRAEL - There is a controversy among the three groups about the value of meeting in Israel. Many thought it greatly enhanced the experience, while some felt that the cost wasn't worth it.

SCHOOL PROFESSIONALS - TRANSCRIPTION

Question One: How well were the goals of the seminar met? Which materials, presentations, discussions were helpful in addressing the objective? What else could have been done?

Goal A: The participants will better understand the concept of visions and its importance for effective educating institutions.

*Senge readings - These should have been required. They were the most useful and inspiring of all the readings.

*Opening day with Daniel Pekarsky - especially his method of engaging participants (worksheet, simulation)

*This was very inspiring and thought-provoking. But after the visit to Har Etzion, the point was belabored and the life was nearly knocked out of it.

*Please share the other papers in the Educated Jew project with participants.

I came here with a strong commitment to the concept of vision and its importance. This commitment was reinforced by the seminar and I return home with energy to pursue the process institutionally, a sense of shared commitment at a community level, some strategies, and additional resources. (*Ray Levi*)

The complexity of the nature of "visioning" and the concept of vision in its many manifestations was well illuminated. Having always been a strong proponent of visioning for effective education, you were preaching to the converted. However, I walk away more firmly ensconced and certainly better equipped to re-meet the challenges that "visioning" presents.

*More so, to get a better handle on some of the visions in the field and how they are translated into the educational process. I especially enjoyed and learned from our visit to Yeshiva Har Etzion and our dialogues with Rabbi Lichtenstein, Ruti and Moti, and our conversation with Moshe Greenberg.

*I had already been fortunate to participate in readings and discussions on vision-driven institutions which were not really further clarified by the proceedings of our first day.

A very good job was done with this objective. The readings prior to the seminar were especially helpful, along with analysis of models. However, I felt that there was over-analysis of the Greenberg piece, which served to slow the discussion somewhat. Although over and over again the staff said "this is just an example," it was treated with the kind of reverence that implied exclusivity and attached importance to the paper as something that needed deep analysis with Rashi and Tosafot instead of as purely an instrument for springboarding a vision. Another suggestion would be to have provided copies of vision statements or mission statements, or to describe vision-driven institutions that have more similarity to the institutions represented around

the table thereby making them (or the process) more available for replication.

Goal B: The participants will appreciate the importance of vision in relation to educational design.

*Trip to Har Etzion and meeting with Ruth and Motti.

*This was also fairly obvious and simplistic. this aspect of the seminar didn't address the complexities faced in North American communities, nor did it take into consideration (at least in most discussions) existing institutions in N. America which do accomplish this. (Particularly lacking was an appreciation for the positive aspects of the liberal N. American Jewish educational system.)

A challenge has been to help members of the school community see the value of articulating vision (as opposed to nebulously acknowledging) and to using that vision as a window for determining educational design. the seminar underscored the significance of - perhaps power would be a better word - using vision as a window beyond the traditional curriculum - i.e. to the athletic field, in building design, and as a constant source of supporting the values we hope to develop; vision as a dynamic element of school life and a source of community building was also supported. (Ray Levi)

Struggling with the idea that a "Theory of Jewish Education" or a general philosophy of Jewish Education DOES NOT EXIST to inform general Jewish educational design. Also realization that in any education design a vision can exist (even if unarticulated and unknown to all). However, the notion that educational design will be better, of higher quality, or more significant/effective or have greater impact SIMPLY because it is vision-driven is erroneous.

A very valuable exercise was our work as institutional leaders in implementing an educational design a la Greenberg - it helped clarify the thought processes.

How does this differ from A?

Goal C: the participants will understand what the next steps are in encouraging vision drivenness at the communal and institutional levels.

This is still fuzzy - more complex than the seminar allowed for. The attempt to focus on this during Wednesday afternoon's breakout session was not handled in a clear or directed way. More sharing among institutions by the participants would have been very valuable - to see how others have accomplished this. This should have received more attention than the first two goals.

The community dialogue and for me, the opportunity to interact with a lay leader from my institution, have given focus to both of these components of the goal: I believe we have a goal for our community and the beginning of a strategy. I feel much more connected to strong people in our community. On an institutional level, I feel more articulately in harmony with our lay

leadership, feel that we have had an opportunity (usually late at night) to clarify institutional strengths, to agree to goals, and perhaps most importantly, to indicate what kinds of risks we would like to take. (Ray Levi)

Would liked to have spent some focused time on the role of the individual lay person/ professional in leadership roles of being vision driven in both arenas. It might have been helpful to "play out" the nature of negotiation, charismatic leadership, conflict resolution etc...in some simulated scenarios. Provided many very helpful alternative frameworks/approaches to "next-stepping." My dead ends are no longer dead ends - they've turned into junctions.

This understanding was most directly clarified by our wonderful community-based discussions. I found Michael Rosenack's presentation on ways of perceiving an approach to community to be an excellent resource.

Although I think I have a sense of this, I am not certain that it is true all around the table. That remains to be seen from the upcoming presentation.

Question Two: A - What is something new you learned during the seminar?
B - What made this learning meaningful and beneficial to you?

Daniel Marom's presentation on Tu B'shvat was enlightening. Not only was the information charming, the dynamic of the development of tree planting on Tu B'shvat was instructive. Fine collection of sources.

I'm not sure what I've learned (i.e. strategies for approaching the vision and translation process) is as important as what I'm thinking about - the questions I'm focusing upon, the connections I want to explore in greater depth - these relate in particular to the inter-connections between philosophy, vision, content, curriculum (in its broadest sense) and on-going evaluation (this would be a place for a model rather than a linear listing). Of great benefit was the opportunity to interact with a broad range of strong minds who offered varied perspectives and challenged assumptions. (Ray Levi)

- A. Always thankful for the opportunity to think and consider in serious ways.
- B. Demanded greater investment on my part in the communal arena of grappling with vision.
- C. I find the interaction between lay leaders and professionals to be invaluable.

*To ask my constituency what their idea of an educated Jew would be.

*In our discussion of "portraits" one of our participants read excerpts from questionnaires completed by prospective participants in an adult education series. they were very enlightening and showed how much we can learn as well as sensitize participants to the educational process in

such exercise. I plan to use our opening teacher orientation to permit groups of teachers (primary, Shabbat, high school) to come together to create portraits of the "end product student" in their arena to use as a mirror for what they teach. This could serve as an excellent base for a teacher in-service series (or even better use of faculty meetings) throughout the year.

I must admit that some of the learning went on in informal ways, primarily through networking. I would have liked more opportunity for that to have taken place. Further, I gained some insight into the workings of and structure within the Reform community. I found this exceptionally beneficial, in that it was a window on a movement that I have not had much knowledge of (on a movement level; obviously I have read a good deal on the theological level). Because we have a large constituency of children from a Reform background in our institution, this will prove very helpful. Finally, I learned that there are many visions, and each one of them can be driven by the same passion; they can even generate wildly different institutions that can have equal validity, even if they bear absolutely no resemblance to your own. I think we "visionaries" need to be exposed to that concept.

Question Three: What suggestions would you make for us that would have improved this seminar?

1. Fewer meals should have been devoted to working groups. Meals are a prime opportunity for mixing groups and networking.
2. The group should have engaged in more informal educational opportunities, like the trip to Har Etzion. Too much frontal learning, too much domination by CIJE/Mandel staff. Not enough use of Yerushalayim and/or Eretz Yisrael as either a text or a lab. Perhaps even optional field trips of Tiyyulim should have been included. Another prime opportunity for networking.
3. Final day should have included an open-ended discussion with minimal staff participation to share experiences, learning, and concerns, as well as to engage the participants in dialogue with each other.
4. The CIJE should compile and send us a bibliography, including books and articles mentioned during sessions such as other works by Greenberg, On Human Potential, Fullam, Schein, Schoem - as well as a resource library of participating communities and institutions' vision statements, planning documents, and strategic plans.
5. Use Daniel Pekarsky (and his method) more. He is a master facilitator, minute-taker, listener, and agenda shaper. He was especially open to suggestions and change. In general, all CIJE staff, including Abby and Caroline, worked hard and their efforts were appreciated.
6. Logistics - if you wanted people to be on time and had to move them from one location to another (i.e. from Mishkenot to Zionist Conference House) you should have helped people get

there. Many people got lost and/or confused in Yemin Moshe and were therefore late (and frustrated).

7. Lay-professional seminars are not easy to carry off. The staff showed some responsiveness to concerns that arose during the seminar. However, the initial approach of the seminar did not carefully address this mix.

Much more small group discussions would have been valuable - not just as communities, but to vary the pace, to allow people to synthesize contributions. I don't think the Greenberg model activities were as focused as they could have been. *(Ray Levi)*

*Real need to model "good educational design and methodology.

*If the process of visioning necessitates disclosure and honest "stock-taking" then CIJE needs to meet that challenge as well.

*Would like to understand purpose/vision of Educated Jew Project better. Possibility to begin with all visions - compare/contrast use as a range of possibilities - role of this in helping to set vision - for who/what/where/why?

*Use an institution (vision driven) and bring us through a complete analysis (from vision to examples of classroom teaching).

The long sessions sitting and listening often made it difficult to concentrate on the discussion. Perhaps a different kind of organization of activities might have helped (I know this is always a tough choice). Often the dialogues/conversations were a sharing of views by Mandel staff or consultants that "squashed" the creative participation and at times interfered with the progress of the discussion at hand.

1. Less verbiage and more "tachlis;" the last two days highlighted Tuesday's failure.
2. I felt staff was so busy revamping that they were not available for individual discussions - which sometimes would have clarified things for the participants.
3. Since we are in Yerushalayim - which in and of itself was enormously enriching - some way should have been found, even for an hour, to make the city a meaningful part of the experience programmatically.
4. I would have liked to hear about Isa's project; it would have perhaps been helpful to use it as another model as a counterpoint to Kyla's.

Question Four: As you continue to think about your role and your work with the Goals Project, what areas, topics, and issues would you like to learn more about? In what format?

1. CIJE needs to be clearer about its role vis-a-vis the movements, and to understand better how the movements (both collectively and individually) work both nationally and locally (or regionally). The training institutions, for example, do not necessarily represent the movements.
2. CIJE can be a clearing house for "best practices" in a number of areas, including best vision statements and best vision-driven institutions, best articulation of goals, best proponents of change in institutions, best "congregational learning communities."
3. Sit back and let the "process" work! You can help initiate it and nurture it, but strict oversight may kill it.

On an institutional level we want to see how we can establish a partnership with CIJE: how we can look at the effectiveness of our translation of vision (the clarity of its expression) while sharing where we have come so far in the process. (Ray Levi)

*Evaluation

*Construct of "Jewish" Educational Philosophy

Our community will continue to create a formula for using our participation within our educational home base - this area is still unclear to all of us and was the source of some good discussions. I still worry more about translating vision into the institution even more so than creating a vision and getting others to buy in. The complications of transforming existing institutions remains ???? Even our furniture is all wrong for the vision of education that our school committee has been discussing.

I would like some additional educational philosophy, information regarding models that have been successful, an opportunity to hear how various communities are progressing.

Question Five: Additional Comments

*CIJE (and Mandel) need more representatives espousing the American perspective and needs to listen and learn more about the positive accomplishments in Jewish Education in North America, especially in the non-Orthodox community.

*Moshe Greenberg's personal presentation was stimulating, uplifting, and very valuable.

*The food was the best I've had in any Jewish communal meetings (not too heavy, lots of fresh fruits and vegetables).

*The evening at Alan Hoffmann's with Yehuda Amichai was delightful - a high point of the seminar.

*Accommodations were also first-rate (though Beit Shalom was too crowded, chairs were uncomfortable)

I appreciate the effort that went into planning, the flexibility of adapting plans to meet needs, the opportunity to participate, and the setting. Much of what we achieved could not have been accomplished in Cleveland - and could especially have been attained in Jerusalem. I'm anxious to see how some of the trust built within our community group plays out on our return. I want to underscore the value of bringing lay and professional people together - yielding greater diversity of perspectives, but more significantly, strengthening partnerships. (Ray Levi)

Coming to Jerusalem for this discussion was a stroke of genius. The opportunity has provided for:

1. spiritual uplifting
2. awe-inspiring awakening to the agenda
3. a thrill to study and participate in collegial discussions with people whose names and articles I've been very familiar with for so long

4. taking us so far from family and work provided opportunity for creative growth and broke down confining barriers.

Staying in Yemin Moshe is a dream come true!

Thank you for providing this wonderful opportunity for vision-building and professional growth. It has been wonderful.

Dan Pekarsky's summaries were outstanding in and of themselves; even more, they served to focus us, and served to highlight the substance of our discussions, and to demonstrate to us that they were substantive.



SCHOOL PROFESSIONALS (RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE)

Question One:

Goal A: The participants will better understand the concept of visions and its importance for effective educating institutions.

<u>How well was it met?</u>	<u>Which materials or activities were most useful in meeting this goal?</u>	<u>What else could have been done to achieve this goal?</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Well.....4 <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Well.....1	<input type="checkbox"/> No Response.....2 <input type="checkbox"/> Senge Readings.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Daniel Pekarsky's comments ^♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Visit to Yeshiva *♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Greenberg Presentation *^♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Dialogue with Rabbi Lichtenstein.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Conversation with Ruti and Moti *.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Readings ♦.....1	<input type="checkbox"/> No Response.....2 <input type="checkbox"/> Share other papers from Educated Jew project ^+♦.....1

Key: * items that were mentioned more than once in the same question
 + items that were mentioned more than once, but not always with the same intent
 ^ items that were mentioned in the context of a different question
 ♦ items that appear in answers from people of different roles (*i.e. lay communal leaders, school professionals, community professionals*)

SCHOOL PROFESSIONALS (RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE)

Question One, contd.:

Goal B: The participants will appreciate the importance of vision in relation to educational design.

<u>How well was it met?</u>	<u>Which materials or activities were most useful in meeting this goal?</u>	<u>What else could have been done to achieve this goal?</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Well.....2 <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Well.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Not Well.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> No Response.....1	<input type="checkbox"/> No Response.....3 <input type="checkbox"/> Visit to Yeshiva *♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Conversation with Ruti and Moti *.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Implementing an educational design according to Greenberg's model *^♦.....1	<input type="checkbox"/> No Response.....4 <input type="checkbox"/> Take into consideration N. American educational institutions which <u>do</u> accomplish this +^♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Point out positive aspects of N. American liberal Jewish educational system +^♦.....1

Key: * items that were mentioned more than once in the same question
 + items that were mentioned more than once, but not always with the same intent
 ^ items that were mentioned in the context of a different question
 ♦ items that appear in answers from people of different roles (*i.e. lay communal leaders, school professionals, community professionals*)

SCHOOL PROFESSIONALS (RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE)

Question One, contd.:

Goal C: The participants will understand what the next steps are in encouraging vision drivenness at the communal and institutional levels.

<u>How well was it met?</u>	<u>Which materials or activities were most useful in meeting this goal?</u>	<u>What else could have been done to achieve this goal?</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Well.....3 <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Well.....2 <input type="checkbox"/> Not Well.....1	<input type="checkbox"/> No Response.....3 <input type="checkbox"/> Community group meetings *♦.....2 <input type="checkbox"/> Alternate frameworks and approaches provided ^+♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Michael Rosenak's presentation ♦.....1	<input type="checkbox"/> No Response.....3 <input type="checkbox"/> Give this more time.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> More sharing among the participants ♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Role plays involving conflict resolution, negotiation, charismatic leadership.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Discuss roles of lay people and professionals who are vision-driven ^.....1

Key:

- * items that were mentioned more than once in the same question
- + items that were mentioned more than once, but not always with the same intent
- ^ items that were mentioned in the context of a different question
- ♦ items that appear in answers from people of different roles (*i.e. lay communal leaders, school professionals, community professionals*)

SCHOOL PROFESSIONALS

(RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE)

Question Two:

<u>What was something new that you learned?</u>	<u>What made learning it meaningful or beneficial?</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Strategies for approaching vision and the translation process ^♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> To ask my constituency for their idea of an "Educated Jew" +^♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Gained insight into the workings of the Reform Jewish community.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> There are many visions and all may be equally valid +^♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Similar visions may generate very different institutions +^♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> New questions to think about.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> No Response.....1	<input type="checkbox"/> The opportunity to think about this topic in a deep, meaningful way *.....2 <input type="checkbox"/> The opportunity to interact with a broad range of strong minds.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> The challenging of previously held assumptions.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> It demanded great personal investment.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> The interaction between lay leaders and professionals ^.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> It generated many good ideas for use back home.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> No Response.....1

Key: * items that were mentioned more than once in the same question
 + items that were mentioned more than once, but not always with the same intent
 ^ items that were mentioned in the context of a different question
 ♦ items that appear in answers from people of different roles (*i.e. lay communal leaders, school professionals, community professionals*)

SCHOOL PROFESSIONALS

(RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE)

Questions Three, Four, and Five:

Question Three: Do you have any suggestions for improvement?	Question Four: What would you like to learn more about?	Question Five: Additional Comments
<input type="checkbox"/> Less domination by CIJE/Mandel staff *.....4 <input type="checkbox"/> Less frontal/formal learning *♦.....3 <input type="checkbox"/> More exposure to Israel/Jerusalem *^♦.....3 <input type="checkbox"/> Fewer meals devoted to working groups.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> A reading list ♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> More attention to issues resulting from mixing professionals and lay people ^.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Better explanation of Educated Jew project +^♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Contrast different visions ^♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Show how vision works in all arenas (classroom, policies, role models, decor, etc ♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Less verbiage; more tachlis ♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Contrast different models of vision-driven institutions ^♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Use Dan Pekarsky more ^+♦.....1	<input type="checkbox"/> More best practices in a variety of arenas (i.e. vision statements, learning communities, etc.).....1 <input type="checkbox"/> How to establish a partnership with CIJE.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> How to translate vision into institutional practices ^♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Educational philosophy.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Information regarding successful models of vision-driven institutions ^+♦.....1	<input type="checkbox"/> CIJE needs to learn more about the positive accomplishments in N. American Jewish education ^♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Moshe Greenberg's presentation was very valuable ^♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Great food ♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Amichai was delightful ♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Great accommodations ♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> The flexibility to change was appreciated ♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Being in Jerusalem was great ^♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Thank you for the opportunity ♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Dan Pekarsky's summations were outstanding ^♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> The amount of planning was appreciated.....1

Key: * items that were mentioned more than once in the same question
 + items that were mentioned more than once, but not always with the same intent
 ^ items that were mentioned in the context of a different question
 ♦ items that appear in answers from people of different roles (*i.e. lay communal leaders, school professionals, community professionals*)

SCHOOL PROFESSIONALS

(ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE)

This is a rough analysis of the information gathered through the questionnaire. Responses that appeared three or more times are considered significant in some way. An attempt is made here to assess their significance and how this knowledge might shape future CIJE seminars involving school professionals.

A. VISION

The concept of vision in one form or another appears eight times in the school professionals' responses. Their concerns fell into four main categories:

1. They are interested in analyzing the different roles lay leaders and school professionals should play in creating and implementing a vision.
2. They are concerned with the practicalities of translating a vision into institutional policies.
3. They have become aware of the variety of types of visions that can exist.
4. They are interested in contrasting a variety of visions and in analyzing their effects on the various aspects of an educational institution.

B. LESS DOMINATION BY CIJE/MANDEL STAFF

The school professionals seem to have felt that the staff dominated the sessions to the detriment of the group process. This item was mentioned four times.

C. BEING IN ISRAEL

Three of the Israel-related comments praised the location of the site and said it enhanced their experience. The fourth comment indicated that it detracted from the experience.

D. EDUCATED JEW CONCEPT

The Educated Jew presentation is mentioned four times. Three of those times indicate that the presentation was beneficial to the school professionals. Two of those times consist of requests for more Educated Jew papers. One comment indicated that the presentation was confusing.

E. MOSHE GREENBERG'S PAPER

Greenberg's paper is mentioned three times, always positively. His contribution seems to have greatly enhanced the experience for the school professionals.

F. DANIEL PEKARSKY

Pekarsky's comments were mentioned three times, always positively. His contribution seems to have greatly enhanced the experience for the school professionals.

G. LAY/PROFESSIONAL ROLES

The issue of lay and professional roles appeared three times, always positively. It seems to have been very valuable for the school professionals to be able to interact with their lay leaders in this way.

SCHOOL PROFESSIONALS

(ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE)

H. NORTH AMERICAN JEWISH EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

This item appears three times and each time implies that the CIJE staff do not fully appreciate the positive aspects of North American Jewish educational institutions.

FYI:

Regarding items that appeared twice:

The conversation with Ruth and Moti was mentioned twice as a positive experience.

The visit to the Yeshiva is mentioned twice as a good example.

The time in community groups is cited as helpful.

An appreciation for the opportunity to think about this topic seriously is mentioned twice.



COMMUNITY PROFESSIONALS - TRANSCRIPTION

Question One: How well were the goals of the seminar met? Which materials, presentations, discussions were helpful in addressing the objective? What else could have been done?

Goal A: The participants will better understand the concept of visions and its importance for effective educating institutions.

*Both Dannys did wonderful jobs at presenting visions and their relationships to creating institutions.

*Meeting the Elul Foundation was a highlight of the conference and effectively presented vision (other sessions on this topic lacked focus).

Helpful - Sunday sessions

Reading materials - Senge, Feinstein

No need for more. Over done.

*Well done both conceptually and through examples. The opportunity to hear first-hand from brilliant thinkers was an important element of the seminar.

*Rosenack's presentation would have been very helpful earlier in the seminar inasmuch as the issue of community vision is extremely complex and difficult to get one's arms around.

Yes as it relates to "vision" in general terms but the specific linkage to "educating institutions", for me, became less clear as the criteria seemed to be generic to many other areas (i.e. business, politics, etc.) Now that may be o.k., but going in I had an expectation and/or hope to find more specificity.

This objective was very well met. The philosophy and the application in terms of the visit to Har Etzion and the Elul presentation worked together to reach the objective.

I think the presentation of the positive exemplars of vision through the Yeshiva, Elul, and the readings was helpful to those who might not have understood how a vision could guide the development of an educating institution. I think the Greenberg paper would have been helpful if we had seen it in the contexts of other written pieces about vision. I hope that all the papers written in the Educated Jew project will be made available to all the participants in this seminar. Since the question (A) is framed as "the concept of visions," I feel it's important to note that the concept was never clearly defined (at least in my mind: do I know what you mean by "vision?" Yes. Can I define it? Also yes, but not because of the seminar. The positive exemplars were helpful. Are we to assume that we all know too well what the negative exemplars are? With all of the philosophical concepts, I find that insufficient time (and perhaps thought) was given to

definition of terms.

1. Materials which were pre-circulated added a significant dimension to the deliberations as well as more comprehensive understanding of the nature and scope of the concept of visions.
2. The Greenberg presentation and subsequent dialogue greatly enhanced the process.

Effective: two guest speakers
field trip
reading materials

Not effective: educated Jew

Introduction, visit to Alon Shvut, conversation with Elul founders, and with Moshe Greenberg were excellent. Fox's introduction to the Educated Jew project and facilitation of translation of Greenberg were not helpful at best, and confusing and disappointing, especially for lay people.

Goal B: The participants will appreciate the importance of vision in relation to educational design.

While I certainly feel I came here understanding the relationship between the two, the concrete examples helped reinforce this again.

Missed the mark somewhat in the process of explicating or translating Greenberg. Presentation was too diffused, disorganized and not detached enough. Beyond that, importance was conveyed - opportunity to hammer home an example was not maximized.

Helpful: field trip to the Yeshiva, Feinstein's article, Ramah article, a little.

Needed a simulation more structured: Example: Let's take Greenberg's vision - what would the building look like? Ideal educational director? Who are the role models? What do the kids do? The families? Etc.

Yes, I do have greater appreciation as to its significance and importance. I also believe all educating institutions must give it greater weight and consideration when preparing their education design. However, again, I am left a bit uneasy that the amount of time and energy necessary (as defined or felt by certain groups) to consider all, each, every nuance before jumping into, may be to overbearing to get started.

Several applications or models in which participants worked through the vision with an institution (or institutions) would have been most helpful. The objective could have been better met through longer work sessions. I would have liked to return to my community better equipped to run a workshop/seminar on this.

I think I have had this appreciation for a long time. I don't think that the translation exercise was all that well done - although it was practical and probably because it was practical, everyone

seemed to enjoy it. I think we could have been introduced to a variety of visions and a variety of translations. For example, I am enthusiastic about the ideas from Seymour and the small group about what the institution might look like that is driven by Greenberg's vision. At the same time, I am left with the feeling that Seymour's concept of what the Greenberg ran school would look like is just one interpretation - we could be challenged to develop alternate interpretations that may be equally valid.

1. Although very serious attempts were made to present paradigms of "theory to practice," more time should have been spent in this area.
2. I walked away with a great appreciation and understanding of the importance of vision in relation to educational design.

Field trips, reading materials, guest speakers.

See "A" above.

Goal C: the participants will understand what the next steps are in encouraging vision drivenness at the communal and institutional levels.

I would like to have spent more time on how our community could help individual institutions become more vision-driven. The outline that was passed out as an afterthought (Gail's) may have been useful to look at in depth. The "Educated Jew" papers may be helpful tools but it is still unclear since we only saw one. The papers need to be sensitive to the realities of the American Jewish community. Not addressed here: What is the status of the "Best Practice" survey? What is its link to creating more vision-driven institutions?

*The nature of this intense kind of experience is such that additional reflection is definitely needed before proceeding. However, several concrete steps have emerged, particularly through the community group meetings.

*Still have an open question of the value, need or feasibility of developing a "community vision."

Helpful - work groups, discussions.

Needed more structure: What are the obstacles to implementing this in a community; in an institutions? How to overcome the obstacles? How to approach people who do not think their school is broken, etc?

Absolutely met in terms of the outline of "translating: some of the theory of this seminar into practice.

A great deal of time was spent on this. I'm not sure that we were given the tools or strategies to adequately address this - although the time in work groups did much to force the issue.

I think there was a lack/shortage of theoretical knowledge about viable processes and an absence /shortage of advice from the practitioners about what seems to work at various stages. I am not in favor of "sharing," but I do think that the wealth of practical experience around the table should have been tapped in some meaningful way. I think the notion of community-wide vision is something we are all struggling with and I am not coming away with any more clear definition or direction than I came with.

*Better understanding re: next steps.

*Provided strategic concepts for implementation.

*Provided a comprehensive analysis regarding the differentiated approaches: communal vs. institutional and in select cases where they overlap.

Effective: small group discussions. We were able to identify the major steps. We need to spend much more time thinking about the detail, development of individual approach to the various organizations, etc.

The one session with communal leaders was helpful. Especially noteworthy was D. Margolis' current efforts at such a project. It would have been most helpful to have had him present his work as a case study. Kyla's session was excellent as were many of the comments by Fox, Ackerman, and other "thinkers" in reaction to her.

Question Two: A - What is something new you learned during the seminar?
B - What made this learning meaningful and beneficial to you?

It is always important and helpful to engage in a process allowing one to reflect on one's achievements in relation to those of others, and to be validated and confirmed on the value of how we are doing.

A. Rosenack's formulation opened up an insight into a way of thinking about community vision which changed the way I was approaching the issue.

B. Degree of consensus within and among my own community for this direction and the extent which it can and should be pursued.

1. Daily proceedings which force a review and reflection of the previous day are crucial.
2. The challenge is so much greater. The process so complex. I must be patient.
3. Learning with lay leaders provided me with many insights into the "other side of the coin."

I learned that in terms of "building a Jewish community" (in and of itself an extremely difficult term to define and gain acceptance of) many of the stakeholders, both as individuals and institutionally, speak different languages. I used to think of that only for synagogue and

communal entities. Now I see that it applies, as well, to educators and educational entities. It was meaningful because the style of discourse was different than what I'm accustomed to and in several areas, helpful to my work environment.

Rosenack's presentation was particularly enlightening. I saw for the first time some practical ideas and suggestions in the "core universe" concept. The idea of a community vision - or at least a community commonality - could be achievable.

1. I have for some time been stymied by the "community" vision issue - I was comforted to find that I am not alone in my struggle with this issue.
2. I don't think we have seen a model of a vision that was developed by a group - unless Kyla's experience is supposed to have exemplified that concept. Perhaps what I've learned is that vision must be developed by passionate people who can articulate their vision in a way that makes others want to get involved. I also do not believe that every institution will be driven by a clearly articulated vision - not every institution has visionaries. But every institution must have clearly identified goals. If the relationship between goals and vision is such that knowing your goals may eventually enable you to develop a vision - then maybe every institution will have a vision to drive it. I don't know - but I'm having a good time thinking about it.

A. The multi-faceted complexity in both process and content necessary for effective visioning and goal-setting.

B. Nature of presentation, ability to share with participants, openness of dialogue and environment (Ha-Aretz)

My feeling that this issue is very complex and sensitive has been reinforced. The seminar helped me identify an approach for initiating this project in the community.

The importance and feasibility of a communal vision statement. Alon Shvut visit and lecture from R. Lichtenstein, Moshe Greenberg, Mike Rosenack, Kyla's session were instructive and inspiring. Indispensability of visions for serious education was not news to me. It was enormously important for my community.

Question Three: What suggestions would you make for us that would have improved this seminar?

- More dialogue between communities.
- More dialogue between role-alike people, perhaps during a meal (the structured activity was not appropriate for the group).
- The readings should have been prioritized and arrived earlier.
- More activity - small group discussions rather than being talked at.
- We spent 3 sessions on Greenberg (reviewing, translating, and meeting with him). I would

Question Four: As you continue to think about your role and your work with the Goals Project, what areas, topics, and issues would you like to learn more about? In what format?

- How one successfully engages lay and professional leaders in discussion of goals and vision. How do you inspire institutions to change? How do you help build trust between professional and lay leaders?
- What additional strategies beyond the "Educated Jew Project" can be used to help foster visioning?

Will need help thinking about how to translate into the local community, particularly:

1. help with training local communal professional to facilitate process
2. help with identifying and making available resources (scholars, papers, etc.) which can fuel local processes.

I need the practical. How do you take what exists - people, schools, curricula, goals, etc. and help a team in that institution to change, help them to reexamine their goals and how the goals do or do not line up, help them to dream in the constant cry for personnel and dollars. In other words, there is frustration out there and that needs to be dealt with simultaneously.

Helpful hints (crib notes) on techniques for coalition building, model statement variations for vision-driven institutions, general progress reports (both in written form and through well-prepared short phone conference calls) on participating communities experiences following the seminar. And, of course, recommendations on potential funding sources.

More examples of vision-driven institutions and goals - dissection of a curriculum within a "best practices" site - the actual transformation of the ideas into reality needs to be analyzed more. Create a short course which combines lecture, field trip, analysis, and practical application.

I think I've addressed most of this above.

Written materials including:

1. Realistic expectations and corresponding timetables (i.e. what to expect by when).
 2. More thought needs to be given to ways in which my community leaders will work together towards the reality of the project (process).
 3. The need to strike an ideological and institutional balance regarding "communal goals."
-
1. Developing a community vision - a think tank with scholars, professionals, and lay leaders.
 2. Evaluation, identifying indices of success - a future seminar with community representatives

who have initiated the "goals project."

3. Appropriate reading materials.

What does CIJE really know about training a goals facilitator, in terms of:

1. knowledge base required (Jewish sources, sociology, history, etc.)
2. skills
3. structures, institutional and communal relationships

Question Five: Additional Comments

The Amichai reading was a delightful evening. I truly enjoyed him and the Hoffmanns' hospitality. All our settings were beautiful, the meals very good. While it would have been easier to be at one site, the variety enhanced the experience. Yasher Koach to Abby and Caroline for their hard work. The North American CIJE team exhibited their good working relations and professionalism. Their flexibility to change the agenda as needed was appreciated.

By and large, well done. CIJE will need to aggressively pursue next steps even as it does so in a consultative, supporting fashion rather than a directive one.

Why Jerusalem? It's a lovely city. Yehuda Amichai was inspiring and enjoyable. Neither of these added to my understanding of the goals project. I believe Jerusalem detracted:

1. \$\$ - lots of travel \$ of Jewish ed \$.
2. Attitude that Jerusalem knows best is not well received - sometimes it seemed that Jerusalem experts didn't really know American institutions.
3. It would have been nice to host experts on our turf, the turf "they" are trying to help "us" change. This is instructive to me when we go back to the States to try to encourage others to change.

Food was great. Arrangements were great. Staff is talented. Daily proceedings were extremely beneficial.

Thank you for your hospitality, intensity and seriousness. All in all I enjoyed being a participant.

This seminar was extremely well planned. The attention to detail, the concern for the comfort and appetites of the participants was very much appreciated. The need to balance large group and small group activities as well as meet the needs of such a diverse group was an enormous challenge. I congratulate the team for their overall attempt.

P.S. Danny's summaries were wonderful!!

Great Seminar!! Exceeding my expectations.

Overall this was a valuable experience. The day proceedings were excellent.

Alan should be more forthcoming about what they really know and what they don't. There is

considerable doubt among many as to the honesty and forthrightness of the CIJE process.



COMMUNITY PROFESSIONALS (RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES)

Question One:

Goal A: The participants will better understand the concept of visions and its importance for effective educating institutions.

<u>How well was it met?</u>	<u>Which materials or activities were most useful in meeting this goal?</u>	<u>What else could have been done to achieve this goal?</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Well.....6 <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Well.....3	<input type="checkbox"/> Meeting the Elul Foundation *4 <input type="checkbox"/> Readings *♦4 <input type="checkbox"/> Visit to Yeshiva *♦3 <input type="checkbox"/> Moshe Greenberg's presentation *+♦2 <input type="checkbox"/> Daniel Marom's presentation.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Daniel Pekarsky's comments ^♦1 <input type="checkbox"/> Sunday sessions.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Good examples *♦1 <input type="checkbox"/> Guest speakers *1 <input type="checkbox"/> Visit to Alon Shvut *1 <input type="checkbox"/> No response.....1	<input type="checkbox"/> Define concept of vision more clearly *2 <input type="checkbox"/> Educated Jew presentation unhelpful *+♦2 <input type="checkbox"/> Greenberg poorly translated *+♦1 <input type="checkbox"/> Make "Educated Jew" papers available to participants *+♦1 <input type="checkbox"/> Present Greenberg along with other vision pieces *+♦1 <input type="checkbox"/> Michael Rosenak's presentation should have been earlier ^1 <input type="checkbox"/> Don't belabor the point ♦1

Key:

- * items that were mentioned more than once in the same question
- + items that were mentioned more than once but not always with the same intent
- ^ items that were mentioned in the context of a different question
- ♦ items that appear in answers from people of different roles (*i.e. lay communal leaders, school professionals, community professionals*)

COMMUNITY PROFESSIONALS (RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE)

Question One, contd.:

Goal B: The participants will appreciate the importance of vision in relation to educational design.

<u>How well was it met?</u>	<u>Which materials or activities were most useful in meeting this goal?</u>	<u>What else could have been done to achieve this goal?</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Well.....6 <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Well.....4	<input type="checkbox"/> No response.....4 <input type="checkbox"/> Good examples *♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Visit to Yeshiva *♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Feinstein article.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Seymour's presentation *♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Field trips.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Readings ^♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Guest speakers *.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Visit to Alon Shvut *.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Meeting with Elul Foundation *.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Greenberg presentation *+^♦.....1	<input type="checkbox"/> A model of how vision translates into all aspects of an educational institution ♦.....3 <input type="checkbox"/> Better translation of Greenberg *+♦.....3 <input type="checkbox"/> No response.....2 <input type="checkbox"/> Longer work sessions.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> More time spent on theory into practice +^♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Educated Jew presentation unhelpful *+^♦.....1

Key: * items that were mentioned more than once in the same question
 + items that were mentioned more than once but not always with the same intent
 ^ items that were mentioned in the context of a different question
 ♦ items that appear in answers from people of different roles (*i.e. lay communal leaders, school professionals, community professionals*)

COMMUNITY PROFESSIONALS

(RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE)

Question Two:

<u>What was something new that you learned?</u>	<u>What made learning it meaningful or beneficial?</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> The challenge of creating a vision is very complex.....3 <input type="checkbox"/> Rosenak's way of thinking about community vision +.....2 <input type="checkbox"/> An approach for initiating this project ^.....2 <input type="checkbox"/> The importance and feasibility of developing a community vision.....2 <input type="checkbox"/> The lay leader's point of view ♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Different stakeholders speak different languages ♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Visions must be developed by passionate people.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> No response.....1	<input type="checkbox"/> The style of discourse was helpful.....2 <input type="checkbox"/> Consensus achieved in our own community regarding a direction to take ♦.....2 <input type="checkbox"/> No response.....2 <input type="checkbox"/> It is helpful to be validated in one's efforts.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Daily review and reflection on previous day's proceedings.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Being in Israel +^♦.....1

Key: * items that were mentioned more than once in the same question
 + items that were mentioned more than once but not always with
 the same intent
 ^ items that were mentioned in the context of a different question
 ♦ items that appear in answers from people of different roles (*i.e. lay
 communal leaders, school professionals, community professionals*)

COMMUNITY PROFESSIONALS

(RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE)

Questions Three, Four, and Five:

<u>Question Three: Do you have any suggestions for improvement?</u>	<u>Question Four: What would you like to learn more about?</u>	<u>Question Five: Additional Comments</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> More Israel-based scholars *.....3 <input type="checkbox"/> Less frontal presentation *^.....2 <input type="checkbox"/> More concrete exercises *.....2 <input type="checkbox"/> Send readings earlier *.....2 <input type="checkbox"/> More dialogue between people with same roles *.....2 <input type="checkbox"/> More inter-community dialogue *.....2 <input type="checkbox"/> Prioritize readings.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> More small group discussion.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Less time on Greenberg *+^.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Better use of Greenberg *+^.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Fewer participants.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Lunch walks.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Clarify schedule earlier.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-seminar discussion of participants' goals and desires.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Teach skills to differentiate between complete and incomplete visions.....1	<input type="checkbox"/> How to translate this to a local community setting *.....5 <input type="checkbox"/> How to engage lay leaders/professionals in such a project.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Additional strategies for fostering "visioning".....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Another seminar.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> A reading list1 <input type="checkbox"/> Profile of a "goals facilitator".....1	<input type="checkbox"/> Very professional staff *.....3 <input type="checkbox"/> Amichai was delightful *.....2 <input type="checkbox"/> Great accommodations *.....2 <input type="checkbox"/> Great food *.....2 <input type="checkbox"/> A valuable experience *.....2 <input type="checkbox"/> Thanks to Abby and Caroline for hard work.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Flexibility to change was appreciated1 <input type="checkbox"/> Being in Jerusalem detracted from the experience +.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Daniel Pekarsky's comments were great ^.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeded my expectations.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> There is doubt as to the honesty of the CIJE process.....1

Key: * items that were mentioned more than once in the same question
 + items that were mentioned more than once but not always with the same intent
 ^ items that were mentioned in the context of a different question
 ♦ items that appear in answers from people of different roles (*i.e. lay communal leaders, school professionals, community professionals*)

COMMUNITY PROFESSIONALS

(ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES)

This is a rough analysis of the information gathered through the questionnaire. Responses that appeared three or more times are considered significant in some way. An attempt is made here to assess their significance and how this knowledge might shape future CIJE seminars involving community professionals.

A. VISION

The concept of vision in one form or another appears fourteen times in the community professionals' responses. Their concerns fell into four main categories:

1. Two responses indicated that the concept of vision was never clearly defined.
2. Eleven responses indicated that they wished more time spent on ways of putting the theory of vision-driven institutions into practice.
3. Three responses mentioned the complexity of creating a vision.

B. MOSHE GREENBERG'S PRESENTATION

Greenberg's presentation seems to have been somewhat controversial among the community professionals. He is mentioned fourteen times. Three of those times, he is cited as a positive aspect of the seminar, while four of those times he is cited as having been unhelpful. Two comments indicated that the time on Greenberg would have been better spent comparing his vision to other visions. There is one comment which indicates that he was interesting, but that too much time was spent on his paper and four comments which indicate that his presentation could have been more beneficial if the translation were better.

C. ELUL FOUNDATION

The Elul Foundation is mentioned five times and is cited as a positive aspect of the seminar in all cases.

D. READINGS

The pre-seminar readings are mentioned five times - each time as a positive aspect of the seminar, although several of those are requests that such readings be sent earlier in the future.

E. CONCRETE EXAMPLES

The concrete examples given during the seminar are cited five times as having been helpful to the process of grasping the concept of vision-driven institutions.

F. EDUCATED JEW CONCEPT

The Educated Jew project is mentioned five times, and seems to be a controversial issue among community professionals. Requests for more Educated Jew papers appear twice and the comment that the presentation was unhelpful appears three times.

COMMUNITY PROFESSIONALS

(ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES)

G. YESHIVA VISIT

The visit to the Yeshiva is mentioned four times and seems to have been a good vehicle for conveying the concept of vision-driven institutions.

H. COMMUNITY MEETINGS

The community meetings are cited four times as having been a helpful and productive aspect of the seminar.

I. MORE ISRAEL SCHOLARS

The request for more Israel-based scholars appears three times. The community professionals seem to have felt that this would have made the time in Israel better spent.

J. SEYMOUR FOX'S PRESENTATION

Fox's presentation is cited three times as a positive aspect of the seminar.

K. THE PROFESSIONALISM OF THE STAFF

The professionalism of the staff is mentioned three times.

FYI:

Regarding items that appeared twice:

Rosenak is cited twice as having been good.

Israel as a location is praised once and criticized once.

There are two requests for less frontal presentation

There are two requests for more time to speak with other people in similar roles.

There are two requests for more inter-communal dialogue.

There are two requests for more concrete exercises.

The evening with Y. Amichai is praised twice.

The guest speakers are cited twice as positive aspects of the seminar.

Alon Shvut is cited twice as having been a positive experience which helped convey the concept of vision-driven institutions.

The accommodations are praised twice.

The food is praised twice.

There are two comments saying that the seminar was a positive experience.

LAY COMMUNAL LEADERS - TRANSCRIPTION

Question One: How well were the goals of the seminar met? Which materials, presentations, discussions were helpful in addressing the objective? What else could have been done?

Goal A: The participants will better understand the concept of visions and its importance for effective educating institutions.

I feel I have gained an understanding of the concept which built on our Atlanta Meeting and Danny's presentation. The Dewey presentation, Greenberg presentation (and materials) were very useful. The concrete examples are the most helpful to me. I would have liked more concrete examples (perhaps shorter)

Good understanding was conveyed. Materials were good. Use of examples in "vision" was very important and done well (visit to Yeshiva, etc.). I would have elaborated on the fact that there are NO truly successful institutions unless there is a strong vision!!

The discussions were helpful but I think we spent too much time discussing visions in the abstract. *(Dan Polster)*

I believe the concept of visions is an extremely useful and important one and one that is important for effective educating institutions. I believe, however, that it is dangerous to imply that existing institutions which may have never thought about this issue per se are already vision driven to a great extent and would resent the implication that they aren't. This is certainly not to say that most could not be vastly improved. It is just very important how they are approached. *(Larry Gellman)*

Danny's introductory comments and his review, especially for day one, were very useful. The portrait exercise arrived weeks too late for me to deal with so that I could use it to inform my thoughts, the discussion. I feel, however, that this objective has been reached effectively. *(Jane Gillman)*

The goals was well achieved. The readings, especially for me as a lay person, really introduced me to new concepts. The site visitation and Kyla's case study were also helpful. I don't think that Professor Greenberg's appearance contributed to this goal although he certainly was interesting to hear. The who issue of putting so much focus on his paper will be discussed later. *(Searle Mitnick)*

Goal B: The participants will appreciate the importance of vision in relation to educational design.

I feel this is basic and crucial to possibilities of successful outcomes. I also have felt from the beginning that this is one of the building blocks of systemic improvement in voluntary systems. Everything flows from vision (or should) and frames each discussion in an intelligent way.

The examples given were great. The lack of a vision for a multifaceted agency or taking an agency that creates a vision in "mid-life" were important weaknesses. The dilemma of what vision for a pluralistic school is still there. How one overcomes the risks to create something meaningful might have been well served by an example. The translating of Moshe Greenberg was done very poorly. Having the opportunity to take two different, perhaps relatively close visions and compare and contrast how they might affect an institution would have helped me a lot. *(Jane Gillman)*

This is the single area where I believe I learned the most. *(Larry Gellman)*

The discussions were helpful but I think we spent too much time discussing visions in the abstract. *(Dan Polster)*

This also was a new concept to me that I think was best illustrated by the site visit to the Yeshivah. Although I was familiar with the Yeshiva set-up, I never realized how the various facilities contributed to realization of the institutional goals. *(Searle Mitnick)*

Case study did a great job of pointing this out - could have used other examples of problems that come from lack of vision or lack of use of vision.

Goal C: the participants will understand what the next steps are in encouraging vision drivenness at the communal and institutional levels.

It will take some time to work through the steps at institutional levels when we discuss this concept and encounter others' difficulty with accepting the concept and how it might work successfully in their setting. I also appreciate the complexity involved and the frustration and anxiety of those who will not want to have to concretize a vision.

Our work with Danny and Alan in our city group was very worthwhile. As Danny said, having Michael Rosenack earlier would have been an excellent idea. I would have like to have had the opportunity to play with his ideas. *(Jane Gillman)*

A community mandate must be obtained to establish Jewish education as a high priority. Then the role of CIJE as a forum and resource should be promoted while exercising almost paranoic caution that it is not perceived as an outside group trying to impose its vision and will on local institutions. *(Larry Gellman)*

This relates to the breakout community discussions. I found this to be one of, if not the most valuable, part of the seminar. We spoke with a degree of honesty and sensitivity that would not have been possible in Cleveland. (Dan Polster)

The focused discussions in our community groups, as well as the exploration by Alan today, were very helpful in achieving this. (Searle Mitnick)

This was the hardest to grasp!! Although there probably are not exact steps to follow, it would have been helpful to try to develop more specific ways to at least get started - certainly everyone now grasps the need to do so!!

Question Two: A - What is something new you learned during the seminar?
B - What made this learning meaningful and beneficial to you?

A - The further sensitivity to language, the problematic definition of community. I learned much from "Ackie" - I thought he added many useful insights. The contacts with the Learning Institutions was very important.

B - Receptivity on the part of the Seminar Planners to respond to our need for information and modification when necessary. I felt people cared about this being an important investment of time.

A - The potential scope for vision - the potential impact on an institution.

B - the opportunity for the milieu group to do this together makes it seem more likely that we will succeed in launching and then driving this process forward. I think it also will be very helpful in our ongoing efforts to build and maintain support for CIJE and lead communities. (Jane Gillman)

Last week I would not have conceived of considering Yeshiva University to assist Agnon in our never-ending process of improvement. Based upon the discussion this week I envision some very serious discussions about the way our institutions can assist each other. We are more alike than we are different. (Dan Polster)

The basic concept of goals/vision was never really understood by me on anything but a theoretical level. The seminar helped me to focus on the way the vision must/should infuse the entire education process. (Searle Mitnick)

A - The importance of trying to define what the educated Jew should be for each institution

driven institution. The flaws were too great. I think the example was great for educators to play with, but I would rather have seen an example of an institution where we could have thought more about how to move it along on its path to becoming more vision driven rather than one in need of emergency surgery. *(Jane Gillman)*

Question Four: As you continue to think about your role and your work with the Goals Project, what areas, topics, and issues would you like to learn more about? In what format?

Content issues, availability of materials, more examples of this type of work where it has "worked" if it's available, "communal concepts"

I have to think about this. I'm sure we'll need help along the way. I'd love to see more of the Educated Jew papers and implications for my own personal growth. *(Jane Gillman)*

Ray and I have already initiated a discussion with Alan about the relationship between Agnon and CIJE which w will be continuing in August. *(Dan Polster)*

Bringing seminar information to our local communities will be very important. *(Searle Mitnick)*

The Educated Jew project is critical to me and I believe the whole program of CIJE. We need more input from a variety of sources (i.e. denominations, scholars, lay people, both genders, and a variety of people both social and economic). This must then be collated and distributed so that each institution and community can set their own goals and conclusions.

Question Five: Additional Comments

Having given up essentially my summer to accommodate this trip, I am personally vert happy that I had this unique opportunity to learn and to grow, to understand this concept a little more, to learn once again more of what I don't know and to hear issues raised. I hope I can continue to contribute to the process of Jewish education improvement.

Excellent 1st two days. Having all the time for community meetings was really important. Isa, Bob and ArieH were great additions both for what they added and for our having made a relationship with them. *(Jane Gillman)*

I appreciate the invitation and encouragement to attend the seminar. It was beneficial to me personally and to my institution. *(Dan Polster)*

Great job - very professional! Good attention to detail including room set up, lighting, toilets, refreshments, and all logistics. Thank you.



LAY COMMUNAL LEADERS

(RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE)

Question One:

Goal A: The participants will better understand the concept of visions and its importance for effective educating institutions.

<u>How well was it met?</u>	<u>Which materials or activities were most useful in meeting this goal?</u>	<u>What else could have been done to achieve this goal?</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Well.....5 <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Well.....2	<input type="checkbox"/> Readings *♦3 <input type="checkbox"/> Good examples *^♦2 <input type="checkbox"/> Visit to Yeshiva *^♦2 <input type="checkbox"/> Daniel Pekarsky's comments *♦2 <input type="checkbox"/> Dewey presentation1 <input type="checkbox"/> Greenberg presentation *+♦1 <input type="checkbox"/> Kyla's case study *^+♦1	<input type="checkbox"/> Elaborate on fact: no successful institutions without strong vision1 <input type="checkbox"/> Portrait exercise should arrive earlier1 <input type="checkbox"/> More concrete examples *^♦1 <input type="checkbox"/> Less focus on Greenberg's paper *+♦1 <input type="checkbox"/> Less time on vision in the abstract *^1

Key: * items that were mentioned more than once in the same question
 + items that were mentioned more than once but not always with the same intent
 ^ items that were mentioned in the context of a different question
 ♦ items that appear in answers from people of different roles (*i.e. lay communal leaders, school professionals, community professionals*)

LAY COMMUNAL LEADERS

(RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE)

Question One, contd.:

Goal B: The participants will appreciate the importance of vision in relation to educational design.

<u>How well was it met?</u>	<u>Which materials or activities were most useful in meeting this goal?</u>	<u>What else could have been done to achieve this goal?</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Well.....5 <input type="checkbox"/> Moderately Well.....1	<input type="checkbox"/> Visit to Yeshiva *^♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Kyla's case study *^+♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Good examples *^+♦.....1	<input type="checkbox"/> More concrete examples *^+♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Less time on vision in the abstract *^.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Better translation of Greenberg's paper *+♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> A chance to compare two different visions and their potential effects on an institution ^♦1 <input type="checkbox"/> Need an example of a vision for a school changing in mid-life.....1

Goal C: The participants will understand what the next steps are in encouraging vision drivenness at the communal and institutional levels.

<u>How well was it met?</u>	<u>Which materials or activities were most useful in meeting this goal?</u>	<u>What else could have been done to achieve this goal?</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Well.....4	<input type="checkbox"/> Community group discussions *^♦.....3	<input type="checkbox"/> Need to develop more specific ways to get started.....1

Key:

- * items that were mentioned more than once in the same question
- + items that were mentioned more than once but not always with the same intent
- ^ items that were mentioned in the context of a different question
- ♦ items that appear in answers from people of different roles (*i.e. lay communal leaders, school professionals, community professionals*)

LAY COMMUNAL LEADERS

(RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE)

Question Two:

<u>What was something new that you learned?</u>	<u>What made it learning it meaningful or beneficial?</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> The impact vision has on an institution *^.....3 <input type="checkbox"/> Different institutions can help one another (Yeshiva U. & Agnon) ^.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> There is a need for sensitivity to language ♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> There is a problem in defining what a "community" is.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> The importance of defining "Educated Jew" for each specific institution and community ^+♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> No response.....1	<input type="checkbox"/> It was helpful to our ongoing efforts to lead *.....3 <input type="checkbox"/> It highlighted the importance of vision *^.....2 <input type="checkbox"/> No response.....2 <input type="checkbox"/> It was helpful to our efforts to help C.I.J.E.....1

Key: * items that were mentioned more than once
 + items that were mentioned more than once but not always with the same intent
 ^ items that were mentioned in the context of a different question
 ♦ items that appear in answers from people of different roles (*i.e. lay communal leaders, school professionals, community professionals*)

LAY COMMUNAL LEADERS

(RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES)

Questions Three, Four, and Five:

Question Three: Do you have any suggestions for improvement?	Question Four: What would you like to learn more about?	Question Five: Additional Comments
<input type="checkbox"/> More 1st person resource people.....2 <input type="checkbox"/> Less exhaustive analysis ^♦2 <input type="checkbox"/> The Educated Jew presentation was a gaping hole ^+♦1 <input type="checkbox"/> Seymour's presentation was not helpful ♦1 <input type="checkbox"/> Kyla's institution was not a helpful example ^+♦1 <input type="checkbox"/> Give an example of an institution whose vision needs assistance ^.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> More examples of communities with shared visions ^.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Ground rules about asking questions (rather than making speeches).....1 <input type="checkbox"/> More opportunity to share experiences with one another ♦1	<input type="checkbox"/> More educated Jew papers *^+♦2 <input type="checkbox"/> No response.....2 <input type="checkbox"/> Content issues.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Availability of materials.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Communal concepts.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Examples of use of vision where it has worked ^♦1 <input type="checkbox"/> More input from more varied sources.....1	<input type="checkbox"/> Having time to meet in communities was great ^♦1 <input type="checkbox"/> Bob was great.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Aryeh was great.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> The first 2 days were great.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Isa was great.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Thank you for the opportunity ♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Well worth the time ♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Great job ♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> Very professional ♦.....1 <input type="checkbox"/> No response.....1

Key: * items that were mentioned more than once
 + items that were mentioned more than once but not always with the same intent
 ^ items that were mentioned in the context of a different question
 ♦ items that appear in answers from people of different roles (i.e. lay communal leaders, school professionals, community professionals)

LAY COMMUNAL LEADERS

(ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE)

This is a rough analysis of the information gathered through the questionnaire. Responses that appeared three or more times are considered significant in some way. An attempt is made here to assess their significance and how this knowledge might shape future CIJE seminars involving lay leaders.

A. VISION

The concept of vision in one form or another appears thirteen times (more than any other topic) in the lay leaders' responses, indicating an understanding of the importance and centrality of vision to the educational process.

There is a strong indication of a desire on the part of the lay leaders to do more in-depth work about institutional visions, this time with a more concrete focus.

B. CONCRETE EXAMPLES

The response "examples" or "concrete examples" appears eight times indicating the fact that the examples given were extremely important for the lay leaders in coming to understand both the concept of vision and its importance in running educational institutions.

Six out of the eight places where the response "examples" appears is in the context of a request for more concrete examples. This should be taken into account when designing additional sessions with lay leaders. Some types of examples which were requested are:

1. A comparison of two different visions and their impacts on their respective institutions.
2. The vision a school changing in mid-life might have.
3. A vision in need of assistance.
4. A model of a community with a shared vision.
5. Descriptions of situations in which vision works well.

C. LESS ANALYSIS/LESS FOCUS ON THE ABSTRACT

The responses "less analysis" and "less focus on the abstract" appear four times, and seems to dovetail with the desire for more concrete examples cited above. This indicates that the lay leaders' needs for abstract analysis were more than met while their need for concrete examples to exemplify the abstract concepts they were given were not entirely met.

LAY COMMUNAL LEADERS

(ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE)

D. YESHIVA VISIT

The visit to the Yeshiva is mentioned four times - each time as a something which was unexpectedly positive and educational. This may indicate a number of things, two of which are:

1. It is easier to observe unfamiliar concepts in a setting in which one is a stranger, and so is a more impartial observer.
2. The lay leaders see helpful ideas coming out of an interaction between different Jewish movements and welcomed the chance to begin that process.

E. EDUCATED JEW CONCEPT

The response "Educated Jew concept" appears four times, three times positively and once negatively. The negative response is unclear, but seems to indicate that the presentation of the Educated Jew concept was lacking, not that the topic is unimportant. The responses indicate a desire on the part of some lay people to explore this concept in depth. Two responses indicated interest in a packet of readings.

F. KYLA'S CASE STUDY

The helpfulness of Kyla's case study is unclear. It would seem that while the lay leaders appreciated the concrete example of a case study, Kyla's was somewhat difficult for lay people encountering the concept of vision driven institutions for the first time.

MOSHE GREENBERG'S PAPER

There is a controversy as well over the helpfulness of Moshe Greenberg's paper. A synthesis of all the remarks indicates that his paper was interesting, but too much time was spent discussing it and the translation was poor.

FYI:

Regarding items that appeared twice:

The community time was cited twice as a helpful and beneficial aspect of the seminar.