



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
50

Folder
2

Goals Project. Milwaukee, Wis., 1994-1996.

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

FROM: "Dan Pekarsky", INTERNET:PEKARSKY@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu
TO: (unknown), 73321,1220
DATE: 8/30/94 4:29 PM

Re: Milwaukee

Sender: pekarsky@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu
Received: from VMS.HUJI.AC.IL by dub-img-1.compuserve.com (8.6.4/5.940406sam)
id QAA18254; Tue, 30 Aug 1994 16:26:58 -0400
Received: by HUJIVMS via SMTP(128.104.30.17) (HUyMail-V6n);
Tue, 30 Aug 94 22:27:03 +0200
Received: by dogie.macc.wisc.edu;
id AA18552; 5.57/42; Tue, 30 Aug 94 15:25:50 -0500
From: "Dan Pekarsky" <PEKARSKY@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu>
Reply-To: PEKARSKY@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu
To: ALANHOF@VMS.HUJI.AC.IL
Cc: 73321.1217@CompuServe.Com, 73321.1221@CompuServe.Com
Date: Tue, 30 Aug 1994 15:24:00 -600
Subject: Milwaukee
X-Gateway: iGate, (WP Office) vers 4.03 - 1032
Mime-Version: 1.0
Message-Id: <2E639599.8A97.0002@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu>
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; Charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

To Alan, Gail and Barry:

As agreed, I spoke with Ruth Cohen at the end of the week concerning next steps with the Goals Project. I indicated a willingness to come down to Milwaukee to meet with them (a "them" to be determined) to determine the character of the seminar. I didn't, by the way, say anything about who would be leading the seminar - and she didn't ask.

When I asked her what had been done since the Goals Seminar in this area, the gist of her answer was that the group that came to Jerusalem (minus the two male lay-leaders) had gathered and were eager to go further. That's about it!

She seemed eager for me to come to town to help them develop a strategy to engage local institutions in the enterprise. So far nothing has been done to reach out to, or energize these constitutencies. I expressed some surprise at this, since it was my impression that this was the community's responsibility -- Stage 1 of the process. But I did say that I'd be willing to meet with her group around this -- reminding her, though, that they would probably know a lot more than I would about how to engage their local constituencies.

In the course of the conversation, I mentioned my recollection that they had a few institutions that were chomping at the bit to get involved with the project. So at least, I had been led to

believe. Well, said, Ruth, actually these institutions have expressed a desire to get involved in strategic planning as more traditionally understood; their potential interest in the Goals Project has yet to be determined. (I suggested to her that some efforts in this direction might be advisable.)

The upshot of all this is that they've done very little to date - and I felt somewhat (and perhaps naively) disappointed. Ruth is checking out some dates for right after the holidays for me to meet with their folks around planning next steps.

As for the desired clientele for the Goals Seminars locally, she suggested two models: 1) three or so institutions they've identified already as being especially promising; 2) developing a marketing plan that would reach out to a host of institutions, from among which some would self-select to participate in the seminars.

Anyway, I thought this might be useful as an update. I hope you're all doing well.

I am assuming that my own immediate assignment is to develop (as agreed with Barry) a shorter version of the Goals Seminar summary, so that it can go out prior to the Board Meeting in October. Beyond this, I'm feeling the need to coordinate with you folks around Goals Project assignments for the months ahead. I would be happy to draft a proposal, but to do so, it would be helpful to get clarity concerning a) how we'll relate to Agnon; b) what Baltimore has in mind; c) how we propose to deal with Atlanta. How should we be biting into these issues? We need to do something quick -- or else we'll lose momentum.

I look forward to hearing from you soon.

D.P.

October 16, 1994

MEMO TO: Ruth Cohen
FROM: Daniel pekarsky
RE: Goals Seminars in Milwaukee

When I returned from Milwaukee on Friday, I found waiting for me your summary of our recent meeting concerning the Goals Seminar. I felt that you did an admirable job of summarizing what was agreed to at the meeting, and I am already hard at work drafting a document that may be helpful to you in generating a clientele for the seminars. I did, however, have one significant reservation concerning your summary. The reservation is that the question of Rabbinic participation in the local seminars was, as I recall it, left unresolved.

As I recall this discussion, a number of Milwaukee representatives expressed some concern that the Rabbis might refuse the project if their attendance was made a condition of attendance. They added that they felt that it might well be sufficient if the rabbis were brought "on board" in the role of supporters of the project.

My own response to this suggestion began by expressing appreciation and some sympathy for the view that had been articulated. But I also indicated that I wasn't yet ready for closure on this point. My reasons were: 1) a need to take the time to process this very difficult issue; 2) my belief that in a matter of such significance, the CIJE/Mandel Institute staff that has been involved in conceptualizing the Goals Project should be involved in thinking through the issue; and 3) that there may be good reasons for wanting Rabbinic participation. There is at least reason to wonder whether serious changes are likely to happen without serious rabbinic involvement, and whether such involvement is likely to be forthcoming in the absence of the kind of knowledge and commitment that is the aim of participation in the seminars. Such matters need to be thought through.

In any event, I will be meeting with CIJE staff this week in NY and will share with you their thoughts on this matter when I get back.

Let's be in touch soon.

Dear Barry, Gail, Nessa and Alan:

As you know, I've agreed to draft some background materials to be used by Milwaukee to generate a clientele for the local seminars. Here is a draft of what I had in mind. Any thoughts?

Daniel

LOCAL CIJE GOALS SEMINARS

The Goals Project is one of several initiatives developed by the Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education which are designed to catalyze, encourage, and support improvement in Jewish Education. The two guiding assumptions of the Goals Project are straight-forward:

1. As significant educational research suggests, educational effectiveness depends substantially on whether or not educating institutions are organized around goals that are clear and compelling to the key stakeholders. Without clear goals, assessment of our efforts is rendered impossible. In addition, goals ought properly to play a critical role in the making of basic decisions concerning personnel, in-service education, curriculum design, pedagogy, and the organization of the physical and social environment in which learning takes place.

2. Educating institutions (both in general and in Jewish education) suffer from a failure to be meaningfully organized around educational goals that are clear and compelling to the major partners in the enterprise - the children, the parents, and even the educators. In the case of Jewish education, the failure is typically of various kinds simultaneously. For example, sometimes the enterprise is not guided by any clear goals; sometimes there are goals but they are only marginally or symbolically represented in day-to-day institutional life; and oftentimes the goals are not identified with even by the educators. Numerous problems flow very naturally from such weaknesses.

Growing out of these twin-assumptions, the Goals Project is an effort to encourage serious attention to goals on the part of educating institutions in the Jewish community. While addressing our weaknesses in this domain is no substitute from addressing other needs such as the personnel crisis, it is essential to any serious effort at educational improvement.

The Goals Project began with a seminar in Jerusalem for lay and professional communal and educational leaders from a number of Jewish communities around the country. In the second, and upcoming, stage of the project, CIJE, in conjunction with these

leaders, will sponsor seminars in these communities for the leadership of local educating institutions. These seminars are designed with the following purposes in mind:

role goals ✓ 1. to offer the representatives of participating institution an opportunity to develop a heightened appreciation of the important roles that goals can and should be play in education, as well as the conditions under which they can effectively play these roles.

self-study ✓ 2. to provide participants with an opportunity to acquire questions, concepts and tools that will make possible thoughtful institutional self-studies that are sensitive to goals-related issues. Along with this there will be assignments designed to encourage this kind of self-study.

process ↓ 3. to provide participants with a chance to better understand the process that leads from a vision of the kind of person and community one hopes to nurture to a statement of educational goals, and thence to the development of curricular and pedagogical practices. The seminar will include opportunities to work through this process in relationship to concrete cases.

4. to surface and address the difficult issues and dilemmas that must be dealt with if the kinds of institutions many of us work in are to become more effectively organized around a Goals-agenda.

5. finally, to encourage and offer support to efforts to become more effectively organized around a goals-agenda.

In short, CIJE believes that participation in this seminar offers representatives of educating institutions a special opportunity to grow much clearer about what they are fundamentally about, to identify weaknesses, and to work towards the kind of systematic improvement that we need in Jewish education. Through their participation, lay and professional leaders of an educating institution will be helped to approach more effectively many of the difficult decisions they face. In addition, it is prepared to work with a select group of institutions that complete the seminar on a very intensive effort at educational improvement that is organized around a goals-agenda. The nature of this stage and conditions for participation will be discussed in seminar.

The seminar will consist in four sessions, and participants are expected to be present for all four. While the precise character of each session will depend on a number of variables, including who the participant-institutions are and what transpired at the preceding sessions, the general design of the

seminar is to allow for a different theme for each session.

Session 1: An examination, with careful attention to examples, of the major ways in which goals figure inadequately in Jewish educating institutions and on the ways in which this contaminates their efforts at education. Juxtaposed with this will be an opportunity to look at the opposite: to examine "vision-driven institutions, that is, educating institutions which are guided by a compelling vision of what they are after, a vision which is reflected in their goals and practice.

Session 2: With the help of homework assignments completed between Sessions 1 and 2, an examination of the way goals do and don't figure in the work of the institutions represented in the seminar. Participants will also have a chance to explore their own personal visions of the aims of Jewish education and how these do and don't fit with the institution's vision and with practical realities.

Session 3: From Vision to Practice. Participants will have a chance to study and reflect on two very powerful but different visions of the aims of Jewish education, and then to consider - indeed, experiment with - what might be involved in a serious and systematic effort to use a vision as a guide to educational practice. Findings from organizational psychology and the field of curriculum will be drawn on.

Session 4: Content will depend on preceding sessions. As projected, however, this session will involve two components: a) a look at research that bears on the difficult problem of arriving at a shared and compelling vision in an institution featuring great diversity, and b) drawing on homework assignments, an examination of efforts planned by participating institutions to forward a Goals Agenda.

FROM: "Dan Pekarsky", INTERNET:pekarsky@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu
TO: Alan, 73321,1220
DATE: 12/12/94 4:26 PM

Re: Enclosure file: ENCLOSURE

Sender: pekarsky@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu
Received: from VMS.HUJI.AC.IL by dub-img-3.compuserve.com (8.6.9/5.940406sam)
id QAA17364; Mon, 12 Dec 1994 16:24:56 -0500
Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V7a); Mon, 12 Dec 94 23:21:31 +0200
Received: by HUJIVMS via SMTP(128.104.30.18) (HUyMail-V7a);
Mon, 12 Dec 94 23:16:57 +0200
Received: from mail.soemadison.wisc.edu by wigate.nic.wisc.edu;
Mon, 12 Dec 94 13:36 CDT
Message-Id: <2EECA611.CF87.0005.000.1@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu>
Date: Mon, 12 Dec 1994 13:15:00 -600
From: "Dan Pekarsky" <pekarsky@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu>
Reply-To: pekarsky@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu
Subject: Enclosure file: ENCLOSURE
To: 73321.1221@CompuServe.Com
CC: 73321.1217@CompuServe.Com, ALANHOF@vms.huji.ac.il
X-Gateway: iGate, (WP Office) vers 4.04b - 1032

Date: 12/11/1994 06:04 pm (Sunday)
Subject: Milwaukee update

Attached is an update concerning recent developments in Milwaukee. On balance, despite some frustration concerning their lack of initiative, I'm feeling somewhat upbeat right now about the upcoming goals seminars.

Due to the fact that I'm pretty blunt about my frustration with some of the local powers-that-be, I trust that this memo will be treated as confidential.

Also, I am eager to get feedback from the CIJE-gang concerning my memos relating to Gerstein and to next steps. If we are to move ahead, it's important that we agree on a list of people to recruit as resources to the Goals Project and contact them ASAP, with an eye towards spring and summer activities. I also want to get back to Gerstein soon, etc. In any case, I'd value your collective impressions.

Best to all of you.

DP

Files: C:\WP60\WP}\WPC\{.TWP

From: Daniel Pekarsky at 608-233-4044
To: CIJE at 12125322646

12-12-94 07:57 pm
002 of 008

TO: Alan, Barry, Gail
FROM: DP

Here is the Milwaukee material I've been trying to send you unsuccessfully via email. I would be grateful if you could inform me as soon as an email transmission accompanied by an attachment arrives straight-forwardly.

I am eager to talk with any and/or all of you concerning the matters alluded to here and in the Gerstein memos (which I hope did arrive ok).

All the best,

D.



Dec.11, 1994

MILWAUKEE UPDATE

The seminar for Milwaukee principals took place under the auspices of MAJE, which holds a monthly meeting for principals. The thought behind the seminar - Gail's, I think - is that the seminar would help give closure to the Boston experience and might also elicit interest in the Goals Seminar. In fact, both of these things happened, and there were some additional benefits as well.

SLOUCHING TOWARDS THE LOCAL GOALS SEMINARS

The most important of these additional benefits is that this event seemed to rouse Ruth Cohen out of her lethargy with respect to the local Goals Seminars. Ruth had not been in touch with me for two months. At our last meeting, organized in early October at their request to help mobilize them to organize the local Goals Seminars, it had become clear that they had done virtually nothing as yet. By the end of that meeting, we had agreed that, following conversations with CIJE, I would respond to their request to exempt rabbis from the local seminars and that I would draft some material for them to be used for recruitment purposes. For their part, their leadership team would proceed to recruit institutions, so that in early December I would meet with representatives of interested institutions and with the local "rabbis' group" (the name of which eludes me right now). A week before the Boston seminar, I sent Ruth the material I had promised. When after more than a month I heard nothing at all back from her, I consulted with Gail about whether to take the initiative to move the process along, and she - wisely, I think - counselled against this. It was only the prospect of the seminar for the principals that challenged this equilibrium.

A few days before the seminar I finally hear from Ruth. She is calling to express her concern that the seminar not cover ground that the local Goals Seminars will be covering. I reassure her on this score, and then ask her what progress they have made in generating the clientele for the local seminars. The gist of what she said (without a hint of apology, at least initially) was that "We haven't done anything; we've been too busy with other things -- notably, with developing grant proposals for the Bader Foundation." I expressed my disappointment, reminding her of the homework and time-line to which we had agreed in early October. She apologized and said they would soon be moving on this matter, and that although we'd be starting later than planned, she felt there would still be time to do the seminars. When I asked about whether there was a clientele, she was vague.

Near the end of the Dec. 7 Principals' Seminar, one of the principals publicly asked a question, the gist of which was,

"What's going on here? Didn't you tell us we'd be having these seminars starting in December or early January? How in the world can we plan for them or gather a team if you don't give us lead-time?" I sensed that both Ruth and Jane Gellman (who was also in attendance) were embarrassed by the question. They admitted that they were behind schedule but said that the seminars would begin in early February (on a date we had discussed in my last phone conversation with her).

The good news here is that we're making some progress: my sense is that as of now there may be 3 institutions interested in participating, and possibly more. The interested institutions, I think, are two Day School and the JCC; there is also talk of participation on the part of the group trying to start a new high school. (As of yet, I'm not sure that any of the congregations have agreed to participate.) The bad news is that it took an external goad to move the process along. At this point, the plan is for me to come into Milwaukee in early January to meet with representatives of interested institutions and then to hold the first seminar in early February, to be followed by others at intervals of about a month.

SOME PERCEPTIONS OF LOCAL SENIOR PERSONNEL

Nothing in this latest round has given me more confidence in Ruth or has otherwise changed my perceptions. What I did want to note, though (and this probably comes as no news to any of you), is that she and Ina don't have much of a relationship; in fact, there seems to be considerable tension between them. Ina, by the way, has resisted Ruth's suggestion that MAJE participate in the local Goals Seminars. According to Ina, "This would not be best for us at this time." What she means by this is beyond me; in fact, I would think she should want to take advantage of anything that offers some hope of raising the level of discourse among her lay and professional leadership. But this is clearly not the way she views the situation. I am also perplexed by the fact (of which I had been unaware until last week) that Ina was not present at most of the Boston Seminar. Why was this??? That seminar offered such a wonderful opportunity for her to learn and to develop stronger relationships with the local principals!! Was there a good reason for her non-participation? (And who paid for her trip? Bader money??)

THE DEC. 7 SEMINAR

I don't know the principals well enough to be able to tell you exactly who participated, but my sense is that the turn-out was good: there were no empty places around the table, and all but Jane Gellman, a new principal, and myself had been in Boston. There were two parts to the seminar: in the first part, I led them through an exercise designed to encourage some reflection concerning the Boston seminar. In the other, I did "some Goals-stuff" with them (to be described below). I had a total of an

hour and a quarter or so in which to work, not really enough time to do justice to both topics. But as noted above, my sense is that, in general, both parts went well.

Processing Boston. The "processing-Boston" segment of the session was organized around the following assignment: 1. Jot down one or two important things that you learned in Boston. 2. How, if at all, have these learnings affected (or might in the future affect) your approach to your work as an educator? 3. As a result of the Boston experience, what do you feel a desire/need to learn more about? The group took about 10 minutes to jot down their thoughts on these matters, and then we went around the room to share responses. Prior to this sharing of responses, we spoke briefly about why they should not feel troubled if they were unable at this point to identify a relationship between what they had learned and their practice as educators.

In a nut-shell, a month or so after the Boston seminar, it continues to elicit strongly enthusiastic on the part of the participants. For most of them, it was an exciting, intellectually and otherwise rewarding experience that they look back on fondly and even with nostalgia. It was not only what they learned and thought about that they valued, but the opportunity to speak with one another in an atmosphere that encouraged trust, reflection, "seeing the big picture," and dialogue, an atmosphere that is hard to recapture in the work-a-day world of everyday life. One of the themes expressed repeatedly in this session was their wish to recreate at home the kind of dialogical atmosphere they felt in Boston.

As for what they learned, thought about, and/or wanted to explore further, here are some principal themes that emerged and that I summarized orally after hearing what they had to say:

1. Many spoke of having acquired invaluable lenses through which to view their own conduct as leaders and that of other educational leaders. "Leadership styles" was a term often referred to. Using the 4 categories identified by Deal, they have been able to look at their own strengths, weaknesses, and challenges in new and very fruitful ways.

2. The discussion concerning "Vision" at the seminar was helpful to the participants. They felt that they became more aware of how important it is to have a vision. At least one participant reported that after the seminar, he had pulled his institution's vision out of the closet and subjected it, in the company of his colleagues, to some serious reflection. He has found this to be a very revitalizing experience.

3. In relation to the vision-theme, one participant expressed her insight that the search for vision may take us inside ourselves -- that is, that we often

already have an operating vision. I used this as an occasion to stress the CIJE view that while looking inside ourselves in this way is necessary and invaluable, the development of a vision should also involve wrestling with the views of others, including Jewish thinkers and denominational representatives, who have struggled with the question of a meaningful Jewish existence. I thought it was important to stress this as an antidote to Barth's overly-introspective approach to developing a personal vision. Nobody seemed to resist my formulation.

4. A number of people noted the difficulty of moving from personal to shared vision. After observing that, in her opinion, the session in Boston dealing with group vision, or building consensus, was not very strong, one person added that perhaps this was no accident (since this was probably the most difficult part of the work). This was certainly an area they wanted to learn more about.

5. While the exercise of thinking about an ideal school was very exciting to one of the participants, she found herself struggling with the implications of this activity for someone like herself who worked in a very less-than-ideal educational setting that would be impossible to tailor to her ideal.

6. One person wondered about whether, despite differences in ideology, there might be universal and non-trivial shared elements that cut across Jewish educational institutions [I was reminded of Rosenak's piece.]

7. A question was raised concerning reliance on categories deriving from general education to understand Jewish educational institutions. Might there be categories within the tradition that might be better-tailored to the task of interpreting and guiding practice in Jewish educational institutions?

8. At least one person came away from the experience hoping for a more active role for this very group of individuals in guiding the progress of Jewish education in Milwaukee.

FURTHERING THE DISCUSSION ON VISION AND GOALS

I decided prior to the session that I would focus the session on the two directions in which "goals" points: to practice, on the one hand, and to an underlying vision, on the other. After a few introductory comments concerning the Goals Project (with which many were already familiar), I began with an

exercise that took the following form:

Assume that you are responsible for a Jewish educating institution and did not have substantial resource constraints. Explain how you would go about realizing one of the following goals:

a. to cultivate facility with Hebrew and a love of the Hebrew language;

b. to cultivate an appreciation for the importance of Israel and a love for Israel.

Nobody had any questions or apparent concerns relating to the exercise and I gave them some 10 minutes to work on it. When they were done, I told them that we would not be looking, at least immediately, at the implementation strategies they had concocted. Instead, we would focus on the ways in which the goals-statements I had presented them with were inadequate.

I think this caught some of them by surprise, and it took a couple of minutes before they got into the spirit of critiquing the goals; but soon they seemed animatedly engaged in reflecting on the ways in which these goals were problematic. We began by focusing on the goal related to Hebrew, and within a few minutes were able jointly to articulate the goal's essential vagueness: modern street Hebrew, modern literary Hebrew, Biblical Hebrew, and/or Prayer Book Hebrew? Hebrew as a language of everyday life, as a Holy Language or both? Facility reading, facility praying, facility reading with understanding, facility speaking, facility writing? Etc.

Once it was clear how very vague the original goal-statement had been, I moved on to the question: "Why is it important to have facility with Hebrew - or, for that matter, to love the Hebrew language?", and I contrasted the radically different love for the language found in a traditional Yeshiva with that found in the Tarbut School in Mexico City. Here the point I tried to stress is that to be meaningfully interpreted and motivating, the goal needs to be anchored in some conception of a meaningful Jewish existence.

We didn't have as much time with the second goal-statement but I suggested the ways in which we could critique it along very similar lines. My sense was that the concrete exercise helped make the session quite useful, and they seemed to feel that their time had been well-spent. At the end of the session, some questions were raised concerning the ways in which vagueness may function to maintain a sense of consensus among diverse groups. In response to this, one of the participants - Jane Gellman - suggested that vagueness may play this role, but that one would pay a price for this kind of vagueness at the level of practice.

The bottom-line: The principals seemed genuinely pleased with the Boston-seminar and with the session I spent with them. To the extent that any frustration was expressed concerning lack of progress, it seemed focused on local failures rather than CIJE's. On the part of the principals I sensed some real interest in being involved with the CIJE-effort. While my impressions of the professional leadership remain unchanged, I am nonetheless guardedly optimistic about getting these local seminars going this winter. Could be interesting!

I look forward to hearing from you.





**Lead Community Initiatives
For Jewish Education**

Commission Co-Chairs

Jane Gellman

Louise Stein

Project Director

Dr. Ruth Cohen

MEMORANDUM

TO: Gail Dorph and Alan Hoffmann

FROM: Ruth Cohen

DATE: February 3, 1995

RE: Update

Goals Seminar - The first session of the Goals Seminar was held on Thursday, February 2nd. The meeting was very successful. Danny's presentation was outstanding. He was able to capture the interest of all the participants and stimulate serious discussions among the members of the various teams. Thirty-two individuals representing seven organizations participated in the sessions. Participating organizations included:

Hillel Academy; Milwaukee Jewish Day School; Yeshiva Elementary School; Torah Academy of Milwaukee; Congregation Sinai; Congregation Beth Israel; JCC camping and youth departments.

According to one of the participants - "Seeing such a diverse group of individuals sitting around the same table to explore issues of visions and goals for Jewish education is an exciting experience..."

Family Education - Ina Regosin will contact Gail to refine the plan for the professional development of the institution family educators.

Long Distance M.A. Program - Two telephone conference calls are planned to work on the details of the plan for establishing a long distance M.A. program in Milwaukee.

- Friday, February 10, 9:00 AM (Milwaukee time)
Gail, Ina, Ruth
- Thursday, February 16, 2:00 PM (Milwaukee time)
Gail, Ina, Ruth, Lifsa

Ruth will initiate both calls.

Date: Tue, 07 Feb 1995 14:42:00 -600

From: "Dan Pekarsky" <pekarsky@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu>

Reply-To: pekarsky@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu

Subject: Milwaukee Goals Seminar

To: ALANHOF@vms.huji.ac.il

My initial sense is that the Milwaukee Goals Seminar (first of 4) got off to an excellent start. Much to my surprise, there were quite a few people, about 35 or so. Delegations of 3 or more came from 6 institutions (including one congregation, the JCC, and three Day Schools) and there was a rabbi present from another congregation (who hopes to round up a team). After a light supper from 6 to 6:20, the seminar began and lasted until 9 pm. After painting the context and the presuppositions of the Goals Project, the first part of the evening was spent painting a Vision-Driven Institution (Dewey), out of which I extracted the elements of a vision-driven institution (summarized in a concise handout). In the second part of the evening, I gave them the sheet I gave participants in Jerusalem that identifies 6 or so distinct goals-problems and leaves space to fill in examples. I exemplified each with attention to general education, and I then invited them to spend 10 minutes jotting down examples from out of their own institutions. I then broke them into institutional teams to share and compare their findings. I urged them to note but not to worry about disagreements. I'm not sure what went on at all the groups; but I was impressed that, as of 9 pm, some of them seemed to want to continue. In general, people seemed engaged and friendly.

Ruth and Jane also seemed to think it went very well...but we'll see whether time confirms this impression!

My plan for the next session, in March, is to focus on distinctively Jewish visions. I gave them the Portrait-assignment we used in Jerusalem, and I am also planning to send out the Greenberg-piece along with some questions to focus their thinking. Since we are giving it out in Atlanta, it would seem odd to me not to be able to give it out in Milwaukee; nonetheless, I'd prefer getting your okay on this. Let me know.

There are a number of matters I'd like to discuss with you. I hope we can talk soon.

Shabbat Shalom!

DP

FROM: Alan Hoffmann, 73321,1220
TO: Sandra L. Blumenfeld, 76322,2406
DATE: 2/12/95 8:25 PM

*Milwaukee
file*

Re: Copy of: Milwaukee Goals Seminar

Sunday,

Please clean up and print out for me
a.

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

From: "Dan Pekarsky", INTERNET:pekarsky@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu
TO: Alan Hoffmann, 73321,1220
DATE: 2/10/95 5:16 PM

RE: Milwaukee Goals Seminar

Sender: pekarsky@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu
Received: from VMS.HUJI.AC.IL by arl-img-2.compuserve.com (8.6.9/5.941228sam)
id RAA02084; Fri, 10 Feb 1995 17:09:00 -0500
Received: by HUJIVMS (HUyMail-V7b); Sat, 11 Feb 95 00:08:24 +0200
Received: by HUJIVMS via SMTP(128.104.30.18) (HUyMail-V7b);
Sat, 11 Feb 95 00:07:36 +0200
Received: from mail.soemadison.wisc.edu by wigate.nic.wisc.edu;
Fri, 10 Feb 95 15:54 CST
Message-Id: <2F397EFA.CF87.0001.000@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu>
Date: Tue, 07 Feb 1995 14:42:00 -600
From: "Dan Pekarsky" <pekarsky@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu>
Reply-To: pekarsky@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu
Subject: Milwaukee Goals Seminar
To: ALANHOF@vms.huji.ac.il
CC: 73321.1217@CompuServe.Com, 73321.1221@CompuServe.Com,
74671.3370@CompuServe.Com, marom@vms.huji.ac.il
X-Gateway: iGate, (WP Office) vers 4.04b - 1032
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; Charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

My initial sense is that the Milwaukee Goals Seminar (first of 4) got off to an excellent start. Much to my surprise, there were quite a few people, about 35 or so. Delegations of 3 or more came from 6 institutions (including one congregation, the JCC, and three Day Schools) and there was a rabbi present from another congregation (who hopes to round up a team). After a light supper from 6 to 6:20, the seminar began and lasted until 9 pm. After painting the context and the presuppositions of the Goals Project, the first part of the evening was spent painting a Vision-Driven Institution (Dewey), out of which I extracted the elements of a vision-driven institution (summarized in a concise handout). In the second part of the evening, I gave them the sheet I gave participants in Jerusalem that identifies 6 or so distinct goals-problems and leaves space to fill

in examples. I exemplified each with attention to general education, and I then invited them to spend 10 minutes jotting down examples from out of their own institutions. I then broke them into institutional teams to share and compare their findings. I urged them to note but not to worry about disagreements. I'm not sure what went on at all the groups; but I was impressed that, as of 9 pm, some of them seemed to want to continue. In general, people seemed engaged and friendly.

Ruth and Jane also seemed to think it went very well...but we'll see whether time confirms this impression!

My plan for the next session, in March, is to focus on distinctively Jewish visions. I gave them the Portrait-assignment we used in Jerusalem, and I am also planning to send out the Greenberg-piece along with some questions to focus their thinking. Since we are giving it out in Atlanta, it would seem odd to me not to be able to give it out in Milwaukee; nonetheless, I'd prefer getting your okay on this. Let me know.

There are a number of matters I'd like to discuss with you. I hope we can talk soon.

Shabbat Shalom!

DP



Goals Are

Date: Fri, 10 Mar 1995 09:18:00 -600
From: "Dan Pekarsky" <pekarsky@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu>
Reply-To: pekarsky@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu
Subject: Goals -Reply
To: 74671.3370%compuserve.com@mail.soemadison.wisc.edu
CC: 73321.1217@CompuServe.Com, 73321.1221@CompuServe.Com,
ALANHOF@vms.huji.ac.il
X-Gateway: iGate, (WP Office) vers 4.04b - 1032
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; Charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

Well, last night was the second of the projected 4 sessions in Milwaukee, and I think it went extremely well. It got off to a somewhat awkward start for two reasons: 1) Some institutional teams were not represented by the identical folks who came to session #1, and 2) I had not been forewarned that there was an entirely new team on hand. But once things got moving, I think it was a very fruitful evening.

The session began with some general points concerning why attention to issues of vision is anything but impractical. Then, prior to launching into the theme of vision, I took them through a summary of some major points from the preceding session as background to tonight's work.

Following this, I did succinct - but I think quite effective - presentations of both Brinker and Greenberg. After each one they had a chance to raise questions designed to clarify their respective views, as well as a chance to write down their reactions to the ideas presented. Then they broke into institution-based groups to trade reactions and to discuss the portrait-assignment that they had done in preparation for tonight's session. I emphasized the importance of an interplay between their own ideas, as developed in the portrait assignment, the ideas of other members of the group, and the ideas of thinkers like Brinker, Greenberg.

As best I can tell, the break-out groups were extremely fruitful, as was the evening as a whole....but time will tell whether my perceptions are accurate.

I was impressed by the interest people have in thinking seriously about different visions of a meaningful Jewish existence which might guide the educational enterprise -- and I am coming to identify more and more strongly with your notion that this might be a very fruitful vehicle for engaging lay-leadership. We really need to discuss this further.

I look forward to talking with you soon.

Shabbat Shalom.

Jack Pigeon

From: Dan Pekarsky
TO: Alan
DATE: 4/8/95 10:13 PM
RE: 3rd Mlwk. Goals Seminar

Yesterday was the third of the projected four sessions. Though I think that it was more than adequate, I was less happy with it than I was with the first two sessions. For one thing, attendance was down (even among those who are enthusiastic about the seminar), and I think this has largely to do with the fact that we are so close to Pesach. In fact, this was explicitly stated by some representatives of the Orthodox community who were there. The absence of certain key people, combined with the fact that we changed locations and that the seating-arrangement was not to my liking, perhaps contributed to my sense that the kind of energy -- almost electricity - that I sensed in the first 2 sessions didn't seem to be present. Another problem is that notwithstanding the ground rules concerning regular attendance, some people have been erratic -- and in at least one case someone showed up for the first time at the third session; needless to say, this can disrupt continuity. By the way, both Louise and Jane were out of town, though Ruth was present. As for my contribution to the problem, it may be that I talked a bit too much in the first part of the session, but other than this I think I did basically okay and in fact was able to use my preparation for this session to develop some new materials to be used at future seminars.

Anyway, the above is "the bad news." Now for the good news. Notwithstanding what I just said, a lot of good things happened at this seminar. Let me briefly summarize what we did: After an overview of the general point of the seminar and our work to date, we returned to compare Greenberg and Brinker, with special attention to the very different ways they would approach the selection and use of curriculum materials. Where would Freud, Portnoy, Theodore Hertzl, or the Dreyfuss Affair fit into their respective educational environments? How, if at all, would the Bible fit in to Brinker's educational universe. I think this was quite illuminating.

I then gave them a diagnostic exercise: I invented a school which had just done an outcome-study and discovered that although the mission-statement affirmed the desirability of cultivate prayer-skills and the desire to participate in Jewish prayer as a goal, in fact, graduates, while havin some skills, felt very aliented from prayer. The exercise (which was written up) asked them a) to identify three hypotheses, any one of which - if true - might account for the phomenon; b) to figure out how they would go about deciding among these hypotheses; c) to consider the options that needed to be explored on the assumption that a particular hypothesis seemed plausible. This worked fantastically! The discussion was rich; I think they learned a lot; and I think that this could turn into a wonderful tool for stimulating some great reflection. A number of them commented to me during the break concerning the value of this exercise.

In the second half of the evening, I gave them a variant of the translation exercise used in

Atlanta to be done in their institution-based groups. The challenge of this assignment is to focus on what you'd have to do if you're really serious about realizing a particular goal. When they returned from the small groups, I stressed a number of points relating to this exercise, including the "Form should follow function" theme.

Also part of the second half of the evening was an overview of a number of different change-theories (including Senge, Schein, Sizer, Levin.) I suggested to them that I personally did not have any formulaic approach to change, but that the activities they've been engaged in all enter in as elements in the change process: 1) clarifying vision and goals, through a process that mixes introspection, study, and dialogue; 2) "taking stock" activities that look seriously and honestly at "current reality", including outcomes; 3) activities organized around the attempt to diagnose a problem; 4) deliberative activities that focus on moving from a diagnosis to action; 5) translation-activities, as when one seeks to embed a vision or set of goals in the life of the institution. I found this way of thinking about "the work" very helpful. I also suggested to them that where an institution chooses to begin the process of serious reflection may depend on a host of local variables. I pointed to a few possible starting-points, to illustrate the range of possibilities. This led to some comments concerning the 4th session, which will be with individual institutions and will be focused on their situation. The meeting will focus on how issues we've considered relate to their institution, what challenges/issues they face and would like to address, and how they think it might be fruitful to address them. They are being asked to meet once on their own prior to this meeting to draft their initial thoughts on these matters.

Of the participating institutions, at least 4 of them seem very excited about going further with this process -- the JCC, the Madison Jewish Day School, Lee Buckman's Conservative Congregation (Beth Israel), and the Yeshiva Elementary School. The Reform Temple that's participated seems interested but is in a state of flux because its rabbi is leaving and they have yet to appoint a new one. The Hillel Academy (Modern Orthodox Day School) seemed very skeptical at the outset and continues to seem so -- I don't think they'd be interested in going further, nor do I think it would be fruitful for us to work with them.

In this connection, I had lengthy conversations with both Jay Roth and with the principal of the Milwaukee Jewish Day School concerning future work together -- both meetings were very promising.

In any case, my sense is that there are at least 3 or 4 institutions who might be interested in working with us in the future - but I certainly made no commitments on our behalf beyond the upcoming fourth session. Also I made no mention at all of money-issues we've been discussing.

That's all for now.

BOAS (ll)

ORIGINS, CHARACTER AND IMPACT OF JCCA CAMPING RETREAT

November 1995

Daniel Pekarsky

In November 1995 CIJE ran a retreat for the professional leadership of several JCC summer camps on the question of Jewish educational goals for these camps. This report summarizes the background to the retreat, what happened at the retreat, and possibilities for follow-up.

Background

One of the participants in the CIJE Goals Seminar in Jerusalem in July 1994 was Jay Roth, the Executive Director of Milwaukee's Jewish Community Center. Excited by what he learned and eager to enhance the Jewish dimension of JCC programming, Roth brought some of his lay leadership and professional staff to a series of Goals Seminars run by CIJE for Milwaukee-area institutions in the spring of 1995. Towards the end of that series Roth approached CIJE with the suggestion that it work intensively with Milwaukee's JCC camp on a Goals Agenda; his thought was that this could serve as one of CIJE's Pilot Projects. As a result of the conversations with Roth, some preliminary activities were scheduled for January and February 1996.

But Roth did not keep his excitement to himself. In his conversations with the JCCA leadership, which shares his strong interest in strengthening the Jewish dimension of JCC programming, Roth's positive experience with CIJE led him to encourage the JCCA to sponsor a Goals Seminar organized around the needs of select JCC overnight camps from around the country. Roth's conversations with the JCCA in turn gave rise to conversations between the JCCA and CIJE around the possibility of such a seminar. Believing that JCC camps represent an important and interesting potential player in the field of Jewish education, CIJE was extremely interested in exploring the possibilities. In the end it was decided that a two-day seminar would take place at the tail-end of the JCCA's annual meeting, to be held in Washington in early November.

Planning for the retreat began with CIJE proposing some ideas that seemed promising; these ideas were then reviewed by the JCCA leadership, after which a final program was developed. The program that was agreed on was organized around a number of desired outcomes. These included: a deeper appreciation among the participants for the ways in which having determinate and compelling goals can guide educational practice; 2) greater self-consciousness concerning the kinds of goals associated with the participants' camps and the ways these goals have and have not been reflected in practice; 3) an understanding of what might be involved in approaching the realization of a goal strategically in a camp setting; and 4) an interest in making more progress on a goals-agenda beyond the retreat itself, along with some thoughts about how to go about this.

The retreat

Scheduled for November 8 and 9, the invited participants included institutional teams associated

with five JCC camps. In most cases, camp directors were accompanied by the JCC executive director and by the agency's Judaic educator. Participating institutions included the JCC's of Atlanta, Milwaukee, and St. Louis, and Pittsburgh, along with the leadership of New Jersey's Y Camp. Also participating were five staff members and consultants associated with the JCCA and four CIJE staff members. All in all, there were approximately 23 participants.

The program itself included a short frontal presentation concerning the importance of vision and goals for Jewish education, but it was otherwise highly participatory. It also featured a structured opportunity for participants to scan their institutions with attention to their difficulties and dilemmas in the Judaic realm, as well as an opportunity to experiment with what might be involved in systematically trying to use the camp setting as a vehicle of realizing a particular goal. These activities generated some exceptionally interesting discussions concerning what are - and what are not - appropriate Jewish goals for a JCC camp serving a very diverse set of constituencies. Indeed, so very interesting were these discussions that it was decided mid-stream to let the participants continue these discussions at the price of omitting a planned session organized around the question "Are Community Goals for Jewish Education Possible?"

Towards the end of the retreat, institutional teams met by themselves around questions designed to stimulate honest reflection and deliberation concerning their own camps. These questions focused on a number of themes, including the following: the official Jewish goals of their camps; the goals implicit in their actual practices; the outcomes of the camp-experience undergone by campers; the two goals which, on reflection, seemed to them the most important.

A final session, organized around the question, "Where do we go from here?" elicited a strong interest on the part of the participants to go further with this process. Many of them feel pressure to develop a stronger Jewish presence in their camps, and many of them genuinely want to move in this direction. But there is considerable uncertainty among them concerning what an appropriate mission is for a non-denominational JCC camp. A hope was expressed by some that future deliberations would focus on this question, and that perhaps a mission statement could be developed that would offer JCC camps guidance in this important area.

Follow-up to the retreat

In preparing for it, CIJE had viewed the retreat as an opportunity to raise the consciousness of the participants concerning the need to wrestle with questions of Jewish content. However, the interest shown by many of the participants in going further with this process, combined with our own assessment that this is an important piece of the Jewish education puzzle, has led CIJE to think seriously about follow-up activities that would prove fruitful.

In addition to Pekarsky's projected work on a goals-agenda with the Milwaukee JCC camp, the following possibilities are under consideration:

1. A second retreat with the same constituencies as the first, possibly organized around the

question of identifying an appropriate mission for JCC camps.

2. A seminar dealing with goals that brings lay leaders in the JCC movement into the process. Conceivably such a seminar could be organized for the JCCA's biennial meetings scheduled for this spring.

3. A seminar or retreat on the model of the seminar held in Washington, but in this case aimed at the leadership of camps not represented at the first retreat.



FROM: Alan, [73321,1220]
TO: Debra abcPerrin, [76322,2406]
CC: Josie abMowlem, [102467,616]
DATE: 5/30/96 9:12 AM

Re: A number of items

new file: STEERING COMMITTEE - DAN BADER

KB CONFI

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

From: Nessa Rapoport, 74671,3370
TO: Alan, 73321,1220
Barry, 73321,1221
Gail, 73321,1217
Josie, 102467,616
DATE: 5/22/96 6:22 PM

RE: A number of items

5/22/96

1. Key contacts. We will indeed be meeting from 12 to 2 next Tuesday. Michael Paley will join Barry, Josie and me from 11:30 to 12:30, when he leaves for Milwaukee. I have prepared some tools for us to get at these names as efficiently as possible. This is just the beginning, but an important one. Josie and I will work together on implementation of a system.

2. Goals phone calls. Either the 28 or 29 are ok for me. I would just need to know the times.

3. Report on my call this morning with Dan Bader:

I sent Dan a large packet of material on Friday and began by asking him if he had any questions. He said he did not have a lot of questions, and then proceeded to ask 3 very smart questions, proving in my mind that he is terrific Steering Committee material. They were:

a. It seemed to him that in the Steering Committee minutes of the last year there was not much discussion of the Lead Communities. Why was that?

b. What is the status of the proposed Evaluation Institute? (I did not know precisely, but said I believed Barbara Neufeld was drafting a proposal. Would someone please tell me where we're at and include me in all e-mails about this?)

c. There is no mention of financial issues in these minutes. Does that happen at a different level?

I told him a bit about our reconsideration of the board and the steering committee, and he said: "So a progression to a new model of governance is just beginning?" I said yes, and told him that I thought we were going to take strong initiatives in the community mobilization side of our mission in the coming year, and that this reconsideration was part of com. mob. because we needed both local and national leaders involved. He understood and agreed. I told him a bit about Milwaukee's current initiative but didn't get into a lot of detail; just said it was

pioneering and exciting. (I didn't/don't know if there's a role he will play, so didn't want to say too much. Alan, I believe we should think about this actively now, as the process gets underway. And I don't know the answer.)

I also spoke a bit about the way our pilot projects were designed as solutions to problems or missing pieces on the landscape, which led me into CIJE 2003. He was very intrigued by this and asked a lot of questions, to which I said: "This is the current conversation at the Steering Committee. It is ongoing, and you're coming in at just the right time." I said that we have not arrived at definitive answers to questions he asked, such as: Will these institutions be free-standing? Would CIJE run them as service organizations? (No, we'll stay small.) Would the relationship be like the one between the Mandel Institute and CIJE? (Now how would YOU answer that question?!)

He is now able to say he will definitely be coming in June, and we are faxing him the subsequent dates. He is also having lunch with Esther Leah today, who will amplify the conversation.

I think he'll be a real asset.

I also want to reiterate what all of you know: Every contact, conversation, and mailing at the "camper" level takes real time and thought. As we undertake a recruitment process toward the "council of 100" and begin as a staff to take the "camper" process seriously, we need to recognize this.

Nessa

