



THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE  
**AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES**  
A DIVISION OF HEBREW UNION COLLEGE – JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION

**MS-831: Jack, Joseph, and Morton Mandel Foundation Records, 1980-2011.**

Series F: CIJE Accrual, 1981-2011, undated.  
Subseries 2: Dan Pekarsky, 1981-2011, undated.

---

Box  
78

Folder  
2

Lead Communities Project. Goals seminar, 1994.

For more information on this collection, please see the finding aid on the  
[American Jewish Archives](http://AmericanJewishArchives.org) website.

## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS ACCORDING TO COMMUNITY

COMMUNITY	ATTENDING	POSITION	CATEGORY
<b>BALTIMORE</b>			
Chaim Botwinick	Yes	Executive Director of BJE	Professional/Federation
Marci Dickman	Yes	Director of Education Services	Professional/Educator
Searle Mitnick	Yes	Incoming president of CJES	Lay Leader
Ziporah Schorr	Yes	Principal, Orthodox Day School	Professional/Educator
<b>MILWAUKEE</b>			
Ruth Cohen	Yes	Project Director (MJF)	Professional/Federation and Educator
Jane Gellman	Yes	Co-chair of Commission on Vision & Initiatives	Lay Leader
Larry Gellman	Yes		Lay Leader
Richard Meyer	Yes	Executive Vice president Milwaukee Fed.	Professional/Federation
Ina Regozin	Yes	Executive Director - MAJE	Professional/Educator
Jay Roth	Yes	Executive Vice-Pres.	
Jerry Stein	Yes	Pres. Elect - Milwaukee Jewish Fed.	Lay Leader
Louise Stein	Yes	Co-Chair of Commission on Vision & Initiatives	Lay Leader
<b>NEW YORK</b>			
Aryeh Davidson	Yes	Head of Education at JTS	Professional/Educator (Conservative)
Beverly Gribetz	?	Headmistress Ramaz Day School	Professional/Educator (Orthodox)
Robert Hirt	Yes	Vice-President - Yeshiva University	Professional/Educator (Orthodox)
Rowana Scharavsky	?	Principal of A.J. Heschel Day School	Professional/Educator
<b>CLEVELAND</b>			
Kyla Epstein	Yes	Director of Fairmont Temple	Professional/Educator

Mark Gurvis	Yes	Cleveland Federation	Professional/Federation
Ray Levi	Yes	Head of Agnon Day School	Professional/Educator
Dan Polster	Yes	President - Agnon School	Lay Leader
Lifsa Schachter	(may not attend - family illness)	Director of Cleveland Fellows	Professional/Educator
Robert Toren	Yes	Director of Judaica - JCC Cleveland	Professional/Educator
Susan Wyner	Yes	Educational Director	Professional/Educator
<b>LOS ANGELES</b>			
Isa Aron	?	Prof. of Education - HUC	Professional/Educator (Reform)
<b>BOSTON</b>			
Irving Belansky	Yes	Co-chair, Commission on Jewish Continuity	Lay leader
Carolyn Keller	Yes	Director Commission on Jewish Continuity	Professional/Fed
<b>PALM BEACH</b>			
Barbara Steinberg	Yes	Executive Director - Commission for Jewish Education of the Palm Beaches	Lay Leader
<b>ISRAEL</b>			
Barbara Penzner	Yes	Representing Reconstructionist	Professional
<b>STAFF</b>			
Gail Dorph	Yes		
Ellen Goldring	Yes		
Roberta Goodman	Yes		
Barry Holtz	Yes		
Ginny Levi	Yes		
Daniel Pekarsky	Yes		

## CIJE GOALS SEMINAR

My apologies, but time-constraints precluded spell-check and proofing.

### POINTS TO BE MADE -- SESSION BY SESSION

#### SUNDAY AM

#### WELCOME

Alan Hoffmann:

Welcomes participants to Jerusalem and to the conference.

Talks about the place of the Goals Project in the overall CIJE initiative.

Reminds participants that this is but the first stage of a process. Follow-up in local communities is part of *raison d'etre* of this conference. What we anticipate in the way of follow-up (on their part and our own)

We will be partners exploring territory that is, unfortunately, relatively unexplored, We are hopeful that CIJE and the various individuals will learn a lot from each other.

Comments about the diversity, the knowledge, and the experiential base represented by members of this group.

What to Expect: Conceptual and Practical dimensions. While the "how to" dimension is something we will be exploring, we believe that understanding the conceptual and substantive issues is also critical.

"Goals" -- one dimension of a complex array of variables, all of which must be addressed in their inter-relationship. Focusing on goals is important but it won't do the trick!

Nor are there "quick fixes": there are no gimmicks for develop a set of goals that are believed in by key stake holders; nor is the process of translating goals into educational practice necessarily easy. These processes require patience, thought, and ingenuity. The seminar is a starting-point to our shared work in this area, not an end-point.

The community-dimension: many of you come as members of community-delegations

+ Partnership  
Mandel  
Josh

in process of developing a plan of action for the improvement of Jewish education. Such should reflect your vision of yourself as a community concerned with Jewish continuity. We believe that encouraging local educating institutions to become more organized around thoughtfully developed goals is a critical component of this community-vision.

Introduces Pekarsky

Daniel Pekarsky

*Walk through the 2:30.*

Will take people briefly through the seminar -- explaining the things we will be doing, the reasons for doing them, the rhythm of the seminar; basic ground-rules, e.g., attendance.

Kinds of institutions we'll be considering (age of participants, religious ideology, formal/informal, Some sessions more open-ended, more exploratory than others, etc.)

Stress the importance of struggling in personal terms with some of the issues; of seeing local community through the lens of the seminar's categories and themes; of arriving at a plan of action --- hence, importance of the Work Groups.

## INTRODUCTIONS

Pekarsky will invite participants to go around the room and identify themselves: name, community, institutional affiliation.

(Perhaps ask them to briefly say what they hope to get out of seminar - but this might take too long. The alternative: after they've introduced themselves, ask them to turn to someone they don't know and trade information concerning hopes/expectations vis-a-vis the seminar.)

## INTRODUCING THE PROBLEM: Seymour Fox

Offers his own welcome to participants.

This seminar -- as important way-station in a process I've been involved in for years....Perhaps a milestone.

Some comments concerning the origins and relationship

between Educated Jew and Goals Projects. Articulate perceptions, convictions, and concerns that gave rise to these ventures. Perhaps here some attention can be paid to the importance of accountability and the need for goals if there is to be accountability.

The Goals Project/Educated Jew Project as pioneer:  
wrestling with a problem that haunts general education as well -- i.e. a) the lack of clear, compelling, consistent instructional goals; b) the importance of same to a quality-education. Reference to the Smith and O'Day piece might be relevant: there are some great quotations concerning the multitude of conflicting demands that are pressed on any given school.

Did I say "school"? Much too narrow. The Goals Project/Educated Jew Project does not assume that education ought to go on primarily in school-like institutions. Importance of informal institutions like the JCC (represented in our group)

Perhaps mention the expansion of the Educated Jew Project to include a Reform dimension.

A brief comment concerning the social dimension of the "Educated Jew" Project and the Goals Project might be useful: the fact that we focus on "the Educated Jew" does not mean that we are unaware of the importance of the social dimension. This point can be explained as you see fit.

## SMALL GROUP EXERCISE

## LUNCH

## DEFINING THE PROBLEM

In this session, Pekarsky acknowledges that there are many happy exceptions, but that the field as a whole suffers from some serious problems -- many of them represented in the exercise. As I summarize the major points, keep in mind some of the examples you came up with.

Pekarsky's discussion highlights, with the aid of examples the extent to which:

- a. goals are not part of classroom teaching assignments.
- b. the extent to which the goals that are supposed to offer guidance are too vague.

- c. The extent to which the goals are only symbolically represented in the life of the institution.
- d. The extent to which key stake holders don't believe in the goals.
- e. The extent to which goals are not anchored in vision.

Against this background, Pekarsky articulates the critical role that goals play in education: story of the Zen Master whose major challenge in becoming an expert archer is fully understanding what he's aiming at.

THE GOALS PROJECT: 1. What we're aiming at; 2. how we get there.

#### VISION-DRIVEN INSTITUTIONS: GIVE ME A FOR INSTANCE

We have just seen the dimensions of the problem. But what would a solution look like? Some of us are so used to institutions that float along without a clear sense of direction that we may not know what an institution it is genuinely clear about what it is about would look like.

In this session, two examples: along the way, an opportunity to highlight major features of vision-driven institutions, clarify some key terms.

Later in the day a chance to apply the basic principles to one or more other institutions.

Begin by explaining concept of "vision", making sure to distinguish existential, institutional, communal visions.

Pekarsky then describes the Dewey School, with attention to the vision, pertinent goals, pertinent practices. (Perhaps people should be given the grid at beginning of this session with instruction to fill out as we go along).

For a summary of the major features of a vision-driven institution, see the InHouse Document, p.

#### MAROM, SECULAR-ZIONIST EDUCATION

Marom explains early Secular-Zionist education, with careful attention to a) the nature of the animating vision; b) the ways in which this vision affected i. goals, 2. practices, 3. educational deliberation, etc. The grid may prove helpful in thinking of relevant points to stress.

Since our programs leans religiously rightwards, the secular character of the movement you're looking at is important to stress.

## END OF SESSION

Pekarsky summarizes the main points concerning vision-driven institutions and invites questions, comments which he and Marom field.

Participants are reminded (by Dorph, I think, because she's the community-liaison for a number of communities) that after the break they will meet in their work groups for the first time. The purpose of these work groups is reiterated, and a sheet explaining same is handed out, along with their initial assignment. This person also explains logistical matters, such as a) where they will meet, b) what happens to non-community folks. BE ON TIME.

## PREPARATION FOR ALLON-SHEVUT:


Shmuel tells them something about Yeshivot and how Hesder Yeshivot differ from other varieties. With attention to seminar themes, he offers them "eyes" to look with, questions to be asking. He also asks them to put their own questions on the table -- some of them for now, others for Rabbi Lichtenstein. I am assuming no more than 1/2 hr. for this session.

## YESHIVAT HAR ETZION

It is important that their initial lookings-around be actively informed by seminar-issues. It is also critically important that Rabbi Lichtenstein is informed in advance of the seminar's interest in vision and goals and their relationship to institutional and curricular design -- and that he be prepared to guide the discussion of his institution in this direction.

Ruth Calderon and her partner also need to know very clearly what we are about and what we are interested in discovering. The non-traditional character of Ellul needs to be emphasized, the vision that guides it, and the way that vision plays out in practice. The way in which differences at the level of fundamental vision (between the Yeshiva and Ellul) translate into differences in goals and practice should be highlighted.

PROCESSING SESSION (Holtz and Wygoda): An open-ended conversation of reactions to the experience. This might give us a good sense of the pulse of the group a day and a half into the seminar.

 At end of processing session, participants need to be reminded of schedule for rest of day -- and especially what they are expected to do in their Work Groups. In addition to continuing to process the day's experience, they should today identify a locally-grounded insight, concern, or experience which they would like to share/discuss with the group as a whole on Wednesday. There will be

further opportunities to elaborate the topic over the next few days.

## AFTER DINNER

### INTRODUCING THE EDUCATED JEW PROJECT

(Marom)

Range of the Educated Jew's Project's Activities

Educated Jew Project as Resource to Goals Project in the following ways.

Time permitting, illustrate the power of one's conception of the ideal product of a Jewish education on one's educational efforts with aid of an example -- perhaps one that builds on something you worked with in secular-Zionism example. Or else, possibly, the Holocaust example. Note, though, that this

Introduction to the Greenberg-activity. We look at a single vision and its relationship to education.....

Whether you agree with Greenberg's vision is an is not important: it is not important because the critical point is what a vision is and addresses and how it can guide education; it is important because how you react to Greenberg's views may help you to clarify your own.

STUDY SESSIONS -- in your hands, except to stress the importance of their arriving at an understanding of some basic Greenberg ideas. End by giving them a chance to formulate questions/concerns that they might want to ask Greenberg.

### TRANSLATING GREENBERG/RAMAH (Fox)

Emphasis should not be exclusively on the way the product - Ramah - reflects the vision, but also and especially on the way the translation came about. What kinds of curricular theories, guiding principles, psychological, sociological ideas entered in? What kinds of social processes? What kinds of individuals bringing what kinds of expertise were brought together - and in what forums and via what processes? What was the role of leadership in the process? In other words, what are the dimensions of translating?

Second part of this session: elements of translation. Systematic formulation of points made in first part, along with emphasis on the fact that we need not begin with vision; exemplification is critical. Attention to the kinds of guiding principles that might inform the translation-effort may be pertinent here (I'll speak to this point at our meeting).

Participants should come away with the sense that translation is difficult but doable -- and that certain

kinds of theories and helpers may prove invaluable.

#### CONVERSATION WITH GREENBERG: OPEN-ENDED

--but it is crucial for Fox, Marom et al to be prepared with questions, comments, etc. that will help enliven or re-direct the discussion if this proves necessary. Before participants conclude the preceding evening's session in which they study Greenberg and/or at the end of the morning session, they should have a chance to frame questions. This might be as simple as giving them 5 minutes to jot down questions they may want to raise.

#### ALTERNATIVES TO GREENBERG (Marom---and Fox?)

The key here is

- a) to highlight the diversity of views represented in the Educated Jew Project, with some attention to one or two powerful examples of fundamental differences of opinion.
- b) This might be an occasion to highlight the formal elements that enter into a vision. For example,
  - i. each vision, however differently, takes a position concerning the importance of the Land of Israel, the status and importance of Mitzvot, "God", the desirability and kind of study that's desirable, the amount of pluralism that's desirable, etc.
  2. each vision encourages a particular constellation of skills, understandings, and attitudes; each may differently understand the relationship between the individual and the group.
  3. Equally important, implicit if not explicit in each vision is a different conception of why Jewish continuity is important, about what meaningful Jewish continuity is, and about what a meaningful Jewish existence is
- c). One powerful example of the way differences in vision translate into differences in goals and educational design.
- d) Reiterate, if the point has not been strongly made in earlier sessions, that a Reform alternative is now being developed.
- e) Brief preparation for Brinker.

ALTERNATIVES TO GREENBERG (2): OPEN-ENDED CONVERSATION WITH BRINKER.  
YOU WHO KNOW HIM KNOW MUCH BETTER THAN I DO HOW BEST TO ENGAGE HIM.  
THIS SAID:

1. It's important that some of his differences with Greenberg emerge;
2. It is important that the pluralistic dimension of his emerge clearly, as well as his emphasis on autonomy.

For many of our participants, this will probably be an issue from the very beginning -- and Brinker will speak to this concern very well. This may put on the agenda the question: "What might a "liberal" approach to Jewish education that encourages autonomous choice look like in a U.S. synagogue or in a JCC? In the U.S., where a prior sense of belonging to the Jewish people cannot be assumed, could such an approach be problematic? What implications would the Liberal approach have for curriculum design, etc.?"

#### TOWARDS SHARED VISION (1)

Holtz and Dorph introduce the exercise, explaining that the point is to surface insights, an understanding of obstacles (and possible ways around them), concerns, and strategies. Each group will need a facilitator and someone who is prepared to report back to the group what they have come up with. Conceivably, a grid with different categories/questions will be helpful. For example:

1. Who are the stakeholders that need to be engaged initially?
2. Through what processes will you engage these stakeholders in the effort to begin thinking about goals and vision?

ETC.

Developing this set of questions might be worthwhile for Barry and Gail. It might help give the participants guidance.

Perhaps the sub-groups are asked to articulate their conclusions on large sheets which are taped in the room.

**TOWARDS SHARED VISION II (Dorph and Holtz)** In this session, Barry and Gail process the work accomplished in the small sub-groups, looking for convergence of opinion, differences, issues, strategies and insights.

This is also a session in which they articulate some guiding CIJE principles in this domain -- so that the participants do not come away thinking, "Nice discussion - but no emerging sense of direction."

## SHARING LOCAL CONCERNS AND EXPERIENCES

Dorph

This session offers them an opportunity to share with the group what they've chosen to share concerning local efforts, insights, issues. Gail moderates -- but this is their session. I am assuming that in this session no more than 4 communities are represented -- Baltimore, Milwaukee, Cleveland -- and possibly Boston. But I'm nervous about including Boston, which is a very small delegation -- it might not leave enough time for the others.

## DAY 5

### CASE-STUDY (Pekarsky and Epstein)

Kyla will present a recent effort on the part of her very large Reform Congregational Community in Cleveland to develop a guiding vision that includes but goes beyond the school. She stresses that, for them, the whole synagogue, and not just the school, is the educational institution. She takes them through the process with attention to such questions as: what concerns gave rise to it? Whose concerns were they? Who initiated the process - and how? What did the process look like? What were problems along the way? What were the outcomes? How, if at all, did the outcomes feed back into the life of the institution? etc.

She will raise some of her own questions and concerns and invite comments from the group.

It is possible that we will break into smaller sub-groups to discuss what ideas, strategies might be generalizable beyond this case-study. These ideas would then be brought back to the group as a whole.

## TOWARDS A COMMUNITY-WIDE AGENDA

This session is designed to prepare them for their effort to articulate a community-plan (over lunch). There are two parts to the session, although the precise content of each may vary depending on what happens over the week. As of now:

### MIKE ROSENAK

The plan is that Mike will speak about a language that can be shared and create a measure of unity among the diverse groups in a community even as they set about interpreting the key concepts very differently in light of their own views and commitments. The possibility of a community-wide vision that is articulated in this shared language -- and is more than fluff - is discussed.

## HOFFMANN

Returns to theme that developing a plan for encouraging vision-drivenness in local educating institutions is only one part but an important part of developing a community-wide vision in the domain of Jewish education and beyond.

Hoffmann articulates the planning task, to be accomplished over lunch. A series of guiding questions (Dorph and Holtz might prepare this) might be helpful. These questions might to some extent parallel the kinds of questions they used for their exercise the day before (even though the exercise dealt with the institutional level).

## WORK GROUPS

### DISCUSSION OF COMMUNITY PLANS

Here Gail moderates. Representative of each community puts the community's plan on the board, and there is an open-ended discussion. Things that haven't been decided but need to be raised -- for example, who within the delegation will take the lead.

### CIJE AND THE LOCAL COMMUNITIES: NEXT STEPS

I leave this to Alan; but some discussion of the Local Seminars might be useful - including their views on their possible value and character.

### EVALUATION SESSION

We may want to develop a short questionnaire for them to answer, followed by an opportunity to meet in small groups for a few minutes to reflect on what they've gotten out of the experience and how it might have been strengthened.

### RECEPTION AT HOVEVEI ZION

Annette greets everyone and make some comments about the Mandel Institute.

### DINNER AND SUMMATION

???

**Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education**

**Israel office: POB 4556, Jerusalem, ISRAEL tel: 972-2-617-418 fax: 972-2-619-951**

**FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**

Date: June 20, 1994

No. of pages incl. cover: 3

To: Prof. Danny Pekarsky

From: Abby Pitkowsky

Organization: University of Wisconsin at Madison

Fax number: 972-2-619-951

Fax Number: 608-262-9074

**\*\*URGENT\*\***

The attached text is from Daniel Marom.

-Abby

**if there are any problems receiving  
this transmission, please call  
972-2-617-418**

Dear Alan, Barry, Danny, Gail, and Shmuel:

The following are my thoughts on what a "simulation" for the goals seminar might be. It is based on an exercise which Shmuel and I undertook on the mission statement for Jane Gellman's new school in Milwaukee. What emerged from that exercise was that it could be possible to enter into a goals searching process by setting up an interchange between outside experts and representatives of an educational institution.

In this particular exercise, the focus of the interchange was a mission statement. Our conclusion, however, was that it would be possible to create such an interchange around any authentic expression of the institution's vision or even only a part of its program. Sources for this may include a curriculum, a model lesson, or a "thick" description or set of observations on what goes on in the institution's culture.

What we tried to simulate was the role of the outside experts. That is, we tried to latch on to gnomic hints of a larger vision in the mission statement and respond to them in a way which could lead to a deeper goals formulation process.

For example, we considered how we could "explode" this specific mission statement's reference to the aim of generating "the ability to engage in independent Jewish study." We asked ourselves questions such as, "What constitutes the capacity for independent Jewish study?" "Does it include the motivation for that study?" "What specific subject matter does it focus upon?" "Does it assume that a pluralism of Jewish values - i.e. that the learner can and should reach whatever conclusions s/he may as long as they are based on study of authentic texts?"

Then we considered various possible answers to these sorts of questions as they emerge from the conceptions of the educated Jew or from systems of Jewish education with which we are acquainted. These, we thought, could provide us with content for an interchange beyond merely asking questions. Finally, we considered how the discussion of this specific aim might be fruitful with different constituents from within an educational institution, so as to develop a strategy for an effective response (administrators, educators, lay leaders). In each case, the question was how we might ignite the goals formulation process for each of the constituents in a constructive way and how we might bring the various discussions together.

My suggestion is to actually undertake a similar kind of exchange in relationship to a specific mission statement, lesson plan, curriculum, etc. The audience and the staff would be given the focus-document in advance. Then they would witness the simulated interchange between a representative or group of representatives. Finally, they

would respond to the simulation by commenting on its applicability to their local communities and institutions of education.

The first problem here is obviously which focus-document and representative to choose. It would be possible to use Sam Heilman's "Inside the Jewish School" as an example of a reading of a given school's culture and then to try to demonstrate what it would mean to engage in a goals seeking process in response to this document. In a way, Heilman's piece may expose deep chords in the American Jewish educational agenda - a desire to keep the family together, but through just being together rather than through specific Jewish content. Consequently, it could have significance for many people in our audience. However, I would rule out this possibility because it would be impossible to simulate the other side of the discussion. We have no representative for the school Heilman was describing.

So the question really is if there is somebody in our audience who would be willing to enter into this kind of simulation. You suggested Kyla, whom I do not know. From those I do know, we may consider Ray Levi or Beverley Gribbetz, both of whom have claimed to be doing goals searching in their institutions (and have some written materials to show for it). Another possibility would be for us to ask a group of the participants to design a mission statement for a theoretical institution and to play make believe all the way. However, I think that this might fail to carry across an authentic portrait of what such an exchange may involve. Finally, an exciting possibility would be to bring in outsiders - people who do not know what the seminar is about - to participate in this simulation. A possibility would be Melitz, which has an "ideology" statement. Since I worked there, I think I know how this "ideology" does and does not reflect what the institution is about. Other Israel experience programs may be an alternative.

An important point to take into account is that in the simulation, the role of the "outside experts" would not be that taken by the CIJE, but rather by those whom the CIJE will train. We have said it a number of times, but it is important to remind ourselves constantly that CIJE cannot promise more than it can deliver. On this level, it may be important to consider as well, how the simulation addresses political realities in the goals development process. Still, it would be enough to raise the issues without giving answers other than to say "this is what we hope to deal with in the local goals seminars and in the coalition of goals driven institutions."

Let me know if there is anything else I can do on this.

Lehitraot, Daniel 