



THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE
AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

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

Series E: Mandel Foundation Israel, 1984 – 1999.

Box
D-1

Folder
1877

CJENA. Documents related to its beginnings, 1986-1988; 1993.

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

18/5/93 2051

כחמשה ואזרני

החומר הרצ"ה הינו חלוצי ביותר

אלה מסמכים לבין מסמכים
 עכנוולוסיה של ה Commission -
 giving מצאה אורחם בארכיון
 של הקליפס (הנקלה היא מלבן)
 מחזלים! . נא עא לברק - אלה
 כצ' להנין עורק - וכלים קרובים
 ה. Chronology גאון המסמך
 של ה Commission קחצ'ה

ואזה רחב
 אף

Confidential

CHRONOLOGY OF THE COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION

The Idea of a Commission

[When was the idea of the Commission first raised?]

- ✓ Nov. 20, 1986 Mtg. in Cleveland: MLM, SF, HLZ, Steve Hoffman, Barry Shrage, Carol Willen (sec'y). Discussion centered on issue of shortage of qualified personnel and how a Mandel initiative could address it. An "informal, inside group" was proposed: Art Rotman (JWB), Jonathan Woocher (JESNA), Carmi Schwartz (CJF), Charles Ratner, HLZ, MLM, SF, Carol Willen. Suggested that by May 1987 a full commission be appointed. [18M]
- HLZ proposed outline for the Commission's document:
- The rationale: Jewish education is the principal tool for ensuring Jewish continuity.
 - Present the macro picture; list critical shortages and needs;
 - Recommend ways of remedying problems.

Towards a Design Document

- ✓ Jan. 12, 1987 Discussion paper prepared by AH and SF: "Senior Personnel in the Field of Jewish Education/Jewish Continuity - A Program for the Mandel Associated Foundations". Preliminary overview of the situation and the possible response. [55BM]
- Jan. 22, 1987 Mtg. of "inside group" in New York. (get minutes from Cleveland)
- ✓ Mar. 5, 1987 Meeting in Cleveland: MLM, Jack Mandel, Joseph Mandel, SF, HLZ, Steve Hoffman, Barry Shrage, Charles Ratner, Jonathan Woocher, Ann Klein, John Coleman, Carol Willen. Review of discussion paper on personnel. Discussion of composition of the Commission. SF, HLZ, Barry Shrage assigned task of writing first draft of design document, in consultation with Rotman, Schwartz and Woocher. [17M]
- ✓ Apr. 1, 1987 Mtg. in Cleveland: SF, HLZ, BS, Carol Willen to discuss writing draft of the design document. Proposed composition of the Commission, proposed budget. [16M]

May 4, 1987 SF sent first draft of design document to Cleveland, plus preliminary suggestions for papers to be commissioned and possible candidates for the Commission. [51BM, 53BM]

✓ May 6, 1987 HLZ and Carol Willen respond to SF first draft of design document. [95C]

May 10, 1987 First full draft of design document, including list of papers to be commissioned and candidates for membership on the Commission. [47BM, 50BM]

May 29, 1987 Mtg. in Cleveland to discuss design document. Proposed lay leaders for Commission discussed. (Get minutes from Cleveland.) [22C]

June 5, 1987 Design document revised; list of candidates for director of study suggested; list of candidates for Commission membership revised. [48BM]

✓ Sept. 5, 1987 Mtg. in Cleveland: MLM, SF, AH, HLZ, HDS, VFL(Sec'y). Decision to establish two commissions: MI-NA and MI-G. Stein invited to be director of MI-NA, but declined. SF named director of MI-G. Suggested that first MI-NA meeting take place shortly after January 1988. [15M]

Oct. 20, 1987 Design document revised. [57 BM]

✓ Nov. 9, 1987 Design document revised. [58BM]

✓ Nov. 11, 1987 Mtg. in Cleveland: HLZ, SF, AJN, VFL, Arthur Blum, candidate for director of the Commission. Discussion of design document; AJN proposed outline for document. [names of all four candidates]

✓ Nov. 17, 1987 Mtg. in Cleveland: MLM, SF, AH, AJN, HLZ, HDS, VFL. Review design document. Discussion of MI-NA's goals. Review of MI-G document. Timetable for MI-NA and MI-G.

Nov. 30, 1987 Design document revised.

Dec. 4, 1987 Design document revised.

Dec. 10, 1987 MLM met with Perry Davis - interview for position of Commission Director.

Dec. 14, 1987 Mtg. in Cleveland: MLM, SF, AJN, HLZ, HDS, AR, CS, DA, JW, VFL, Bennett Yanowitz. Review of design document. Discussion about choosing a director - qualiities needed, candidates. Draft letters to boards of JESNA, JWB. First mtg. of Commission tentative for March 1, 1988.

Dec. 30, 1987 SF and AH consultation with Lee Shulman, Jerusalem: the MI-NA process, potential problems. Suggestion of a MI-NA simulation. Discussion about MI-G.

Jan. 5, 1988 AJN redraft of design document.

Jan. 14, 1988 Design document revised.

Jan. 18, 1988 Design document revised.

Jan. 24, 1988 JESNA board authorized JESNA's participation in the Commission.

[How do the documents relate to the reality that was?]

Establishing the Commission

Feb. 4, 1988 Mtg. in Cleveland: MLM, SF, AH, AJN, HLZ, HDS, SH, JW, DA, VFL, Charles Ratner. Review of design document - final changes. Discussion about selection of Director. Discussion of Commission Memebership - should be no more than 40. Three lay leaders to every one professional. First mtg of Commission proposed for June 1, 1988. [24M]

[The "grid process"]

Feb. 25, 1988 Design document revised. [76BM]

Mar. 1, 1988 Official Launching of Commission? [107 C]
Design document revised. [73BM]

Mar. 2, 1988 Perry Davis appointed as Commission Director. Began work immediately. [106C,75 BM]

Mar. 14...1988 Briefing PD [10PC,11PC]

Mar. 22-23, 1988 Meeting Perry - Cleveland [69BM,72 BM]

Mar. 24, 1988 Mtg. in Cleveland: MLM, SF, AH, AJN, HLZ, VL. Review of potential commission members. Concern abt. lay-professional ratio, abt. which professionals to invite. Idea of liason representation. Decision to disband larger

planning group and to name Senior Policy Advisors. (Steve Hoffman? AH?) Review of design document. [23M,25COM]

Mar. 30, 1988 Mtg. in N.Y.: MLM, PD, AR, CS, JW. "Formal Kickoff". June 23 tentative date for first meeting of Commission. Review list of Commissioners. [21M]

Apr. 6, 7 1988 Mtgs. in N.Y.: PD with JW, AR, CS to discuss an "improved design document", resources their agencies can offer, first Commission mtg.

Apr. 22, 1988 Mtg. in Cleveland: MLM, SF, AJN, HLZ, PD, VL. Selection of first 13 critical lay leader commissioners. Assignments for inviting them. Discussion of first meeting. [13M]

[when did actual inviting begin?]

Apr. 28, 1988 Draft of Commission's budget by PD. [34 BM]

Planning the First Meeting

May 20, 1988 Mtg. in Cleveland: MLM, AJN, HLZ, VL. Date for first meeting of Commission set for August 1. Draft of agenda. Discussion of budget, staff, PR. etc. [12M]

May 25-26, 1988 Mtg. in Cleveland: SF, AH, AJN, HLZ, VL. Discussion of goals for first mtg. Agenda, materials needed for mtg. Interviews assigned. [12M]

[when was idea of interviews suggested?]

June 6, 1988 * Begin work on data sheet for first meeting. [81 C]

June 10, 1988 MLM sent letter to all Commissioners who had accepted, plus design document. [17COM]

June 15, 1988 Joe Reimer interviewed for assistant director.

June 1988 * Interview Schedule for interviews of Commissioners [48I]. All commissioners interviewed during the months of June and July. [see Interview File]

June 20, 1988 Debby Hirshman interviewed for assistant director. [75C]

June 22, 1988 Joe Reimer invited to be assistant director.
[92C]

June 26, 1988 Data paper revised. [36BM]

July 5, 1988 First draft of Two-Year Plan [98 BM]

July 6,7 1988 Meetings of Senior Policy Advisors, Cleveland:
MLM, SF, AH, AJN, PD, VFL, JR, DA, SH.
Logistics for Aug. 1st. Each commissioner will
be assigned to a staff person for ongoing
contact. Goals of first meeting, agenda.
[39M]

July 12, 1988 AJN's letter of invitation to first meeting to
all commissioners, along with final version of
"Design Document to Establish the Commission
on Jewish Education in North
America. [162C,109BM]

July 12-14, 1988 Mtg. of Sr. Policy Advisors [get minutes from
Cleveland] Mtg. of MLM, SF, AH [38M]

July 18, 1988 AJN mtg. with JW, N.Y. Discussion about task
forces. [161C]

July 22, 1988 Draft of MLM's opening statement for Aug. 1st.
[110BM]

July 26, 1988 Final draft of "selection from interviews"
paper. [107BM]

July 31, 1988 Pre-Commission meeting in N.Y.: MLM, AJN, HLZ,
SF, AH, JR, VL, AR, CS.

TO:

FROM: Carol K. Willen *CKW*

SUBJECT: New Initiative - Senior Personnel in the Field of
Jewish Education/Jewish Continuity

DATE: December 5, 1986

Attached is a brief summary of the highlights of our meeting with
Professor Seymour Fox on Thursday, November 20, 1986.

SUBJECT: NEW INITIATIVE: SENIOR PERSONNEL IN THE FIELD OF
JEWISH EDUCATION/JEWISH CONTINUITY

DATE OF MEETING: November 20, 1986 - 4 p.m. - Premier Corporate Headquarters

PRESENT: Professor Seymour Fox, Steve Hoffman, Morton Mandel,
Barry Shrage, Henry Zucker, Carol Willen, (Sec'y)

KEY POINTS OF MEETING

1. Studies have identified two critical problems in the field of Jewish education/Jewish continuity:
 - a. A shortage of well-prepared teachers.
 - b. A shortage of competent senior personnel.

Because of the enormity of the teacher shortage problem, the practical place to begin is with the senior personnel issue.
2. It has been estimated that there are 4,000 to 5,000 senior people worldwide, and that only half of them are well qualified. Less than 150 students are currently enrolled in undergraduate and graduate training programs in the field of Jewish education. There are probably 1,000 professors of "Jewish studies" in North America, but possibly fewer than ten full-time professors of Jewish education.
3. A major Mandel initiative could help to convince lay leadership of the need for trained, high quality senior personnel, and could be the first step towards systemic change.
4. We should consider doing our own "Flexner study" in order to (a) describe the vision, and (b) identify with some specificity the steps that would lead to the desired result. This might include recommendations on where dollars should be strategically placed.
5. Annette Hochstein is currently studying the senior personnel situation. First, she will gather data that is descriptive of the macro picture. Second, she will assemble information on training institutions worldwide. The Hochstein report will form the basis of our "case."
6. The dearth of training facilities is the deep-seated problem underlying the shortage of competent senior personnel.
7. The Jerusalem Fellows program, which has been highly successful, trains ten students per year. Its graduates are very much in demand. We need to multiply our capacity to produce leaders of this type in order to build the kind of critical mass that can change the education system as a whole.

8. To achieve change, we must build an awareness, particularly among Jewish lay leaders, of the shortage of senior personnel and the need to establish and/or up-grade training facilities.
9. There is a good possibility that a grant from the Mandel Associated Foundations could leverage other funds. Potential partners have been identified.
10. Seymour Fox has good relations with academicians who could provide advice and direction. Among those mentioned were David Cohen, Lee Shulman, Israel Scheffler, Ernest Boyer, Ralph Tyler, and John Coleman.
11. The following is the proposed plan of action:
 - a. Seymour Fox will confer privately with several of these experts.
 - b. An informal "inside group" consisting of the following individuals will meet in New York on January 22, 1987: Art Rotman-JWB; Jonathan Woocher-JESNA; Carmi Schwartz-Council of Jewish Federations; Chuck Ratner-Commission on Jewish Continuity, Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland; Morton Mandel-Chairman; Henry Zucker and Carol Willen-Staff; Seymour Fox, Consultant. (This group is comprised of persons representing institutions that are not potential recipients of funds.) The purpose of the meeting will be to examine a brief document that Seymour Fox will prepare, and to "up-train our own internal team."
 - c. The third step will be a meeting of the informal inside group and the experts, to be held in February or early March 1987.
 - d. The fourth step will be the appointment of a Commission, possibly in May. The Commission, which will consist of outstanding lay and professional leaders, will approve the design for our "Flexner study."
 - e. The study will then be conducted by a blue-ribbon staff.
 - f. After the Commission has approved the report submitted by the professional team, the Mandel Associated Foundations will help to introduce the findings to lay and professional leaders of the Jewish community.
12. HLZ proposed an outline for the Commission's report. First, the rationale: Jewish education is the focus of our attention because it is the principal tool for insuring Jewish continuity. The report would then present the macro picture, list critical needs and shortages, recommend ways of remedying these problems, and offer suggestions on how to develop the needed cadre of senior professionals.
13. Seymour Fox is willing to participate in any way that he can be helpful. It was noted, however, that there may be some advantage to placing an American scholar in the forefront.

File in
Mandel Assoc.
Foundations

1/14/87

ULLM copy

MEMO TO: Trustees, Mandel Associated Foundations

FROM: Henry L. Zucker

HLZ

At last night's meeting, it was suggested that we send you the attached paper which was prepared by Professor Seymour Fox for presentation to a meeting on January 22nd.

Distribution: Jack N. Mandel
Joseph C. Mandel
Henry J. Goodman
Bennett Yanowitz
Howard R. Berger
David Freiman
Philip Sims

A copy was sent earlier to each of the following:

Morton L. Mandel
Stephen H. Hoffman
Charles Ratner
Carol Willen

1/13/87

MEMO TO: Seymour Fox, Stephen H. Hoffman, Morton L. Mandel,
Charles Ratner, Arthur Rotman, Carmi Schwartz,
Barry Shrage, Carol Willen, Jonathan Woocher

FROM: Henry L. Zucker

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to be 'HLZ', is written over a horizontal dashed line.

This is to confirm our meeting with Seymour Fox in New York City
on Thursday, January 22 from 2:00 to 4:30 p.m. at the office of
the Council of Jewish Federations, 730 Broadway.

Dr. Fox has submitted the attached paper which you should read
in advance of the meeting.

We expect perfect attendance and look forward to your participation.

2332

1 of 12

FOR THE ATTENTION OF MR. HENRY ZUCKER



הוועדה לחינוך יהודי של הסוכנות היהודית
THE JEWISH EDUCATION COMMITTEE OF THE JEWISH AGENCY

Mr. Henry Zucker
Premier Industrial Corp.
4500 Euclid Avenue,
Cleveland, Ohio 44103
U.S.A.

January 12, 1967

Dear Mr. Zucker,

I am enclosing a draft of a paper that could serve as the basis for our discussion on January 22nd. If you think it is useful, you might want to distribute it to the participants before the meeting.

I will be calling you on either Tuesday or Wednesday to discuss next steps, and whether I should send to you a list of questions that might be helpful for the discussion on the 22nd.

With best regards and looking forward to our phone conversation.

Sincerely,

Seymour Fox

SENIOR PERSONNEL IN THE FIELD OF
JEWISH EDUCATION/JEWISH CONTINUITY
A PROGRAM FOR THE MANDEL ASSOCIATED FOUNDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

Personnel is the key to any improvement in Jewish education. There is wide agreement both in the field of general and Jewish education, that the educator is the determining factor in the success or failure of any educational endeavour. This holds whether we are dealing with a classroom, a school, a community center, a summer camp or an entire educational system. The teacher, the principal, the informal educator, the educational leader or policy-maker, play a determining role in terms of school achievement, education for character, commitment of teachers and the involvement of parents. These conclusions are supported by research and by reports of the people working in the field.

In Jewish education it is clear that there is a severe shortage of qualified, trained personnel to perform the necessary tasks:

-- There are almost no teacher-trainers or scholars of education (this in contrast to the hundreds of scholars that have been trained and are working in the field of Jewish studies).

-- There are very few trained and capable developers of curriculum and educational materials.

-- There is a serious shortage -- throughout the world -- of headmasters and school principals.

-- Teachers in many communities are poorly trained, unable to interpret the great ideas of the Jewish tradition or lead a discussion in the Hebrew language. In many cases teachers are college students, yordim or Israelis temporarily abroad, who were neither trained as teachers nor are they currently preparing themselves for work in the field of education.

-- The status of the Jewish educator -- particularly of the teacher, is extremely low. This situation is compounded by very low salaries.

As for Jewish education in informal settings:

-- The recent report on "Maximizing Jewish Educational Effectiveness of Jewish Community Centers" places a very high priority on the education and re-education of personnel, if the Community Center in the United States is to fulfill its potential as an institution for Jewish education.

Though this shortage of Jewish educators is a global one and exists on all levels -- from early childhood education through the university -- and for all educational settings, formal and informal, the following arguments support a first effort in the area of senior personnel (for description of senior personnel see appendix 1):

1. Inspired and well trained senior personnel will attract and retain appropriate candidates for the teaching profession and for the field of informal education.
2. Qualified senior personnel will introduce new ideas and programs which could change the nature of the profession and the image of the field of Jewish education.
3. The numbers involved as compared to the need for teachers and youth leaders make this assignment a feasible one.

The Jewish Education Committee of the Jewish Agency decided to undertake a project to offer suggestions for dealing with the acute shortage of qualified senior personnel for Jewish education in the world, with particular reference to the contribution Israel can make in meeting this problem.

As part of this project the following data has been gathered (see appendix 2):

1. There are approximately 4,000 people holding senior Jewish educational positions in the world. Three quarters of them in North America -- as follows:

Day schools -- 800 positions
Supplementary schools -- 1,300
Community centers and youth movements -- 600
Central communal organizations -- 400
University teaching and research -- 100

It is estimated by experts and by knowledgeable community and educational leaders that a significant proportion of these positions -- probably one third to one half of the total number -- do not meet criteria of qualification in Jewish studies, educational theory and practice and/or leadership and administration.

Furthermore, we have discovered that only a very small number of students participate in and graduate from existing programs for the training of senior educators (see Appendix 3). There are no more than 100 graduates annually throughout the world from all the institutions that train senior educators. No more than sixty in North America.

To respond to immediate needs for North America alone we would need minimally 300 graduates per year for a period of ten years. This estimate assumes that educators hold senior positions for 30 years and that there is no attrition due to burnout. //

THE OPPORTUNITY

Though the challenge is immense, some may even believe overwhelming, there are opportunities available today that have never been available before:

1. Jewish education is moving closer and closer to the top of the agenda of the organized Jewish community.
2. Some of the most outstanding community leaders in North America and throughout the world are prepared to assume leadership in developing the field of Jewish education.
3. There may be funding available for creative and well-planned programs of intervention.

SOME OF THE ISSUES:

Though training is clearly a key issue in meeting the problem of senior personnel it cannot be considered without dealing with the broader issues of the need to build the profession of Jewish education, and the problems of recruitment and retention of qualified people. A comprehensive treatment of our problem will require careful study and may include the following elements :

1. THE PROFESSION

In order for an occupation to evolve into a profession it is necessary to develop and formalize forms of collegiality, agreed upon standards of knowledge, training and expertise and a code of ethics. These elements must be intensified and expanded for the field of Jewish education.

2. RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION

At present there is a very small pool of people from which to recruit candidates for training programs or for senior positions in Jewish education. In addition, the rate of attrition of qualified personnel is high. Issues such as status, salary, ladder of advancement and low morale deter talented people from considering a career in Jewish education or for remaining in it for a significant amount of time. The feeder system (youth movements, summer camps) is not effective. Any solution will have to consider these problems and locate and develop new sources for manpower such as students in programs of Jewish studies, general education, women, etc.

3. TRAINING

There are very few training institutions for senior personnel in North America (see appendix 3). No more than sixty people graduate annually from training programs in North America. People must be trained for existing positions, for the needs of an emerging profession (professors of Jewish education, teacher-trainers, family educators, curriculum developers, experts in Jewish content for informal education, etc.) The variety of needs requires multiple solutions. Strategies for development should be outlined and plans should be considered and could include proposals for :

- ** the expansion of existing full-time training programs
- ** the development of new training programs
- ** the design of systematic comprehensive approaches to in-service training

4. THE COMMUNITY

Though a consensus is emerging concerning the need to upgrade Jewish education, any dramatic change will require the development of community awareness and commitment. To achieve change we will have to involve Jewish lay-leaders, educate them so that they understand the shortages in the area of senior personnel and the need to establish and/or upgrade training facilities.

A RESPONSE FOR NORTH AMERICA

In 1910 the Carnegie Foundation for the Study of Teaching commissioned a study of American medical education.

The result of that study was the now-famous "Flexner Report" which revolutionized American medical education and has served as the guide for medical education to this day. It is proposed that a commission be established that might after careful and systematic study issue a report that would set guidelines for the kind of interventions that could dramatically change the condition of the Jewish educator in North America.

The Commission would consist of outstanding lay and professional leaders and scholars, and should enjoy the support of institutions of higher Jewish learning, teacher training institutions and the appropriate Jewish organizations.

The report of the Commission might consist of a list of objectives, opportunities and interventions. The Mandel Associated Foundations could conceivably undertake to sponsor and fund one or more of these opportunities or interventions. No less significant is the fact that it might serve as the leverage to involve other foundations to join in this enterprise.

We must remember that as a result of the Flexner Report the Rockefeller Foundation invested \$50 million in 1910 and convinced other sources to invest \$500 million in American medical education.

At our last meeting Mr. Zucker proposed a possible agenda for the work of the Commission: First, the rationale: Jewish education is the focus of our attention because it is the principal tool for insuring Jewish continuity. The report would then present the macro picture, list critical needs and shortages, recommend ways of remedying these problems, and offer suggestions on how to develop the needed cadre of senior professionals.

Appendix 1

7 of 12

DEFINITION OF SENIOR JEWISH EDUCATORS, BY SETTINGS AND LEVEL

SETTINGS	SCHOOLS	COMMUNAL ORGANIZATIONS IN JEWISH EDUCATION	MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNAL ORGANIZATIONS*	UNIVERSITY, R & D CENTERS AND TRAINING INSTITUTIONS	INFORMAL EDUCATION; COMMUNITY CENTERS, YOUTH MOVEMENTS, CAMPS
LEVEL 5	SUPERINTENDANT (SYSTEM OF SCHOOLS)	DIRECTOR OF INTERNATIONAL / NATIONAL ORGANIZATION IN JEWISH EDUCATION		DEAN, PROFESSOR OF JEWISH EDUCATION	DIRECTOR, NATIONAL COMMUNITY CENTER ORGANIZATION DIRECTOR, NETWORK OF CENTER NATIONAL DIRECTOR, JEWISH CAMPS NETWORK NATIONAL DIRECTOR, YOUTH MOVEMENT
LEVEL 4	HEADMASTER/PRINCIPAL (LARGE SCHOOLS)	DIRECTOR OF LOCAL COMMUNAL ORGANIZATION IN LARGE CITY	NATIONAL DIRECTOR -- EDUCATION DEPARTMENT	DIRECTOR, JEWISH EDUCATION INSTITUTE, TRAINING INSTITUTE	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, LARGE COMMUNITY CENTER DIRECTOR, LARGE CAMP
LEVEL 4	HEADMASTER/PRINCIPAL (SMALL SCHOOLS)	DIRECTOR OF LOCAL COMMUNAL ORGANIZATION IN SMALL CITIES	REGIONAL DIRECTOR EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR, LOCAL CENTER	ASSOCIATE, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, SMALL COMMUNITY CENTER ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, LARGE CENTER BRANCH DIRECTORS PROGRAM DIRECTOR
LEVEL 3	ASSOCIATE, DEPUTY/VICE PRINCIPAL (1 SCHOOL; SUPPLEMENTAL ROLE)	DEPUTY DIRECTOR			EDUCATION DIRECTOR, LARGE COMMUNITY CENTER
LEVEL 2	ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL (PART OF SCHOOL)	ASSISTANT DIRECTOR		TEACHER TRAINING SPECIALISTS	EDUCATION DIRECTOR, SMALL COMMUNITY CENTER
LEVEL 1	DEPARTMENT HEAD; BASIC SPECIALISTS (BIBLE, HEBREW, EARLY CHILDHOOD, ETC.) SUPPORT SPECIALISTS: (SPECIAL EDUCATION; PARENT EDUCATION; ADULT EDUCATION; ARTS EDUCATION; COMPUTER INNOVATION, ETC.)	STAFF PERSON, PLANNER, CONSULTANT		CURRICULUM DEVELOPERS, RESEARCHERS	EDUCATION SPECIALIST IN COMMUNITY CENTER

*Synagogues, Millei Centers, Madrasah Organizations' Adult Education Programs, National Council of Jewish Women, CAJE, Mavurot, etc.

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF SENIOR PERSONNEL IN JEWISH EDUCATION BY CONTINENT
AND AREA OF ACTIVITY

	Day Schools	Supplementary Schools	Community Centers Youth Movements Youth Centers	Central Communal Organization	University Teaching & Research	TOTALS
NORTH AMERICA	800	1300	614	400	100	3214
LATIN AMERICA	270	25	75	38	25	433
WESTERN EUROPE	136	34	34	31	12	247
SOUTH AFRICA	64	5	5	9	11	94
NEAR & FAR EAST	19	6	5	19	-	49
TOTALS	1289	1370	733	497	148	4037

Appendix 2

8 of 12

APPENDIX 3

TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES FOR SENIOR PERSONNEL — WORLD WIDE*

Program Name (Sponsoring Organization)	Description	Degree/Title Offered	Year Program Began	No. of Graduates 1985	No. of Graduates 1986	Anticipated Number of Graduates 1987	Acceptance Requirements
<u>ISRAEL</u>							
Senior Educators (World Zionist Organization & Melton Center for Jewish Education in the Diaspora of the Hebrew University)	A 1 year program of intensive study in Israel, to upgrade the ranks of Jewish educators for the Diaspora	Certificate of participation (can be done in conjunction with a degree at Hebrew University)	1979	18	11	11	3 years experience in field; letter of employ- ment; acceptance to institution for study (usually B.A.)
Melton Center for Jewish Education in the Diaspora (Hebrew University)	Full academic program in the graduate school	M.A. Ed./Jewish Ed. or M.A. Contemporary Jewry/Jewish Ed; Ph.D.	Early 70s		5 (approx. 12 writing theses)	(5)	B.A., plus <u>academic</u> background in education -- or pre-requisites
Jerusalem Fellows (World Zionist Organization & Bank Leumi)	A 1-3 year program of intensive study in Israel, to develop leadership for Jewish education in the Diaspora	Non-degree (can be done in conjunction with a degree at Hebrew University)	1982	8	16	14	M.A.; 3 years experience in field; rigorous interview
Beit Midrash for Judaic Studies (Mesorati Movement in Israel)	A 4-year course of study, in conjunction with an academic institution, for the training of personnel in Jewish Studies in Israel	Certification of "Educator"	1983	0	0	5	B.A. (can be done simultaneously), for Israeli citizens only
<u>REST OF WORLD</u>							
Rhea Hirsch School of Education (Hebrew Union College)	A full-time, 3 year course of study. The 1st year must be done in Israel.	M.A. Jewish Ed. Ph.D. -- (new program) (4 students, no graduates)	1970	9	5	(8)	B.A., interview

*Does not include in-service or on-the-job training opportunities.

Program Name (Sponsoring Organization)	Description	Degree/Title Offered	Year Program Began	No. of Graduates 1985	No. of Graduates 1986	Anticipated Number of Graduates 1987	Acceptance Requirements
School of Education (Hebrew Union College)	Similar to above -- study in Israel not mandatory	M.A. specialization in religious ed.			(4)		
Block Program (Yeshiva University)	A course of study over 3 summers, 1 in Israel, plus supervised work & study during the 2 intervening years	(Most students write a thesis for M.A. or Ph.D. level)	1980	17 (most students are still writing a thesis)	13	N.A.	Has shown promise in the field; generally invited to apply
Azrieli Graduate Institute of Jewish Education & Administration (Yeshiva University)	A full-time course of study leading to academic degree. Is also 1 option available to rabbinical students who must choose a "minor" course of study	M.A., M.S. in Jewish Ed. & Administration	1983	10	13 There is a higher number of graduates, but not all assume roles as senior personnel.		B.A.
Azrieli Graduate Institute of Jewish Education & Administration (Yeshiva University)	A graduate program to prepare teachers for administrative & supervisory roles	Ph.D.		2	1		M.A., 2 years teaching experience, Hebrew fluency
Principals' Program (Jewish Theological Seminary of America)	Course of study to be done in 2 summers plus study during year, to prepare for administrative, supervisory & other leadership roles in Jewish Ed.	Principal's Certification (can be done in conjunction with M.A.)	Early 1980s		9	(10)	Acceptance to Graduate School; experience in field. (M.A. must be completed for completion of program)
The Graduate School of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America	A full-time course of study leading to an academic degree.	M.A.; D.H.L.; Ph.D. in Jewish Ed.	1968		12 (Includes some from Principals' Program)	(11)	B.A. or equivalent in Jewish Studies or pre- requisite courses

Program Name (Sponsoring Organization)	Description	Degree/Title Offered	Year Program Began	No. of Graduates 1985	No. of Graduates 1986	Anticipated Number of Graduates 1987	Acceptance Requirements
University of Judaism (affiliate of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America)	A 2-year academic program leading to an academic degree	M.A. in Jewish Education		7	10	8	B.A., no part-time students permitted
Hornstein Program (Brandeis University)	This is an educational track of the Jewish Communal Service Program. Its emphasis is on communal service. A 2 year course includ- ing a 4 week seminar in Israel during the summer.	M.A. in Jewish Communal Service with a speciali- zation in Jewish Education	Resumed in 1980	4	3	3	B.A.; no part-time studies permitted
Gratz College	A supervised program of M.A. credits including courses in supervision & administration	M.A. in Jewish Education	1983	1	0	(3)	B.A.; interview
Boston Hebrew College	Individually designed program including 30 credits in graduate studies	M.A. in Jewish Education		2	4	(2-3)	B.A.
Baltimore Hebrew College	This is a joint program leading to a degree	M.A. in Jewish Studies and M.A. in Jewish Education	1984	0	0	(2)	B.A.
New York University (part of Judaic Studies Department)		B.A.; M.A.; D.Ed.; Ph.D.		10 (Includes B.A. students)	12	-	The program has been suspended.

Program Name (Sponsoring Organization)	Description	Degree/Title Offered	Year Program Began	No. of Graduates 1985	No. of Graduates 1986	Anticipated Number of Graduates 1987	Acceptance Requirements
--	-------------	-------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	---	----------------------------

In addition, some senior personnel receive training at graduate schools of secular universities such as Harvard or Stanford Universities	Students train for & write dissertations on Jewish Ed.	M.A.; Ph.D.					
--	---	-------------	--	--	--	--	--

Figures in parentheses are estimates.

3/10/87

SUBJECT: NEW INITIATIVE - PERSONNEL IN THE FIELD OF
JEWISH EDUCATION/JEWISH CONTINUITY

DATE OF MEETING: March 5, 1987 - 2 p.m. - Premier Corporate Headquarters

PRESENT: John C. Colman, Seymour Fox, Stephen H. Hoffman,
Ann G. Klein, Jack N. Mandel, Joseph C. Mandel,
Morton L. Mandel (Chairman), Charles Ratner, Barry Shrage,
Carol K. Willen (Sec'y), Jonathan Woocher, Henry L. Zucker

COPIES: Arthur Rotman, Carmi Schwartz

HIGHLIGHTS OF MEETING

I. INTRODUCTION - MORTON L. MANDEL

- A. The future of our Jewish peoplehood is at risk unless we can ensure an environment that causes us to elect to be Jewish. The right types of interventions can help to ensure the continuity of Jewish life.
- B. There is general agreement that Jewish education is the key to Jewish continuity. It would be an understatement to say that Jewish education is in a state of disarray.
- C. Two major challenges are: first, to establish the problem of Jewish education as a priority in the minds of the people who set the agenda of the organized Jewish community; and second, to address the issue of personnel in the educational field. The personnel issue may become the focus of a new initiative for Mandel family philanthropy.

II. REVIEW OF DISCUSSION PAPER

Morton L. Mandel highlighted the key points of a paper (entitled "Senior Personnel in the Field of Jewish Education/Jewish Continuity: A Program for the Mandel Associated Foundations") that Professor Seymour Fox had prepared for discussion at the January 22, 1987 meeting:

- Personnel is the key to any improvement in Jewish education. There is wide agreement, both in the field of general and Jewish education, that the educator is the determining factor in the success or failure of any educational endeavour.
- In Jewish education it is clear that there is a severe shortage of qualified, trained personnel to perform the necessary tasks.
- The status of the Jewish educator--particularly of the teacher, is extremely low. This situation is compounded by very low salaries.

- The recent report on "Maximizing Jewish Educational Effectiveness of Jewish Community Centers" places a very high priority on the education and reeducation of personnel.
- Though this shortage of Jewish educators is a global one and exists on all levels--from early childhood education through the university--and for all educational settings, formal and informal, the following arguments support a first effort in the area of senior personnel:
 1. Inspired and well-trained senior personnel will attract and retain appropriate candidates for the teaching profession and for the field of informal education.
 2. Qualified senior personnel will introduce new ideas and programs which could change the nature of the profession and the image of the field of Jewish education.
 3. The numbers involved, as compared to the need for teachers and youth leaders, make this assignment a feasible one.
- The Jewish Education Committee of the Jewish Agency decided to undertake a project to offer suggestions for dealing with the acute shortage of qualified senior personnel for Jewish education in the world, with particular reference to the contribution Israel can make in meeting this problem.

The discussion paper prepared by Professor Fox further states that only 4,000 senior management positions exist throughout the world. Three-quarters of these are in North America. "To respond to immediate needs for North America alone, we would need minimally 300 graduates per year for a period of ten years."

Morton L. Mandel indicated that outstanding Jewish lay leaders are prepared to place Jewish education at the top of the agenda of the organized Jewish community. Bob Lupe, Mendel Kaplan, Shoshana Cardin, Phil Granovsky, and Esther Leah Ritz are supportive of such efforts.

III. COMMENTS OF PROFESSOR SEYMOUR FOX

- A. Professor Seymour Fox stated that no more than 50% of the people who hold the 4,000 senior management positions throughout the world are appropriately trained.
- B. Although there is a need for 300-400 graduates a year in North America alone, not more than 60 people are currently being trained.
- C. Professors of Jewish education are the key to the training and re-training of Jewish educators. There may be as few as 20 full-time professors of Jewish education in North America today; by comparison, there are about 700 professors of Jewish studies.

- D. Professor Fox noted that the notion of training cannot be separated from that of "building a profession." Such issues as recruitment, retention, salaries, and "burnout" must be addressed.
- E. While teachers' salaries are generally poor, excellent salaries (in the range of \$30,000-\$80,000 per year) are available for principals of Jewish day schools. Despite the promising salary picture, there is still a shortage of senior administrators.
- F. Professor Fox cited two reports as potential models: the 1910 Flexner Report that revolutionized American medical education, and a May 1986 report commissioned by the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, "A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century."
- G. After describing a particular vision, one must ask what would be the necessary steps, in terms of policy decisions, that would be required to implement the program.

IV. KEY POINTS OF DISCUSSION

- A. Dr. Jonathan Woocher stressed that this is an opportune time to address the issue of educational personnel.
- B. In North America, leadership positions are often filled by persons who are not necessarily trained Jewish educators. (Some of them may be public school administrators.) Moreover, because of the shortage of trained senior personnel, some of the people who graduate from training programs may be placed in slots for which they are not yet ready.
- C. We may need to look at differentiated staff training: we need both competent full-time professionals and well-prepared "avocationalists." There are 1300 supplementary schools in North America (in addition to the 800 day schools), so a large percentage of the necessary teachers and administrators are, and will continue to be, part-time. One should not operate on the assumption that all Jewish educators are full-time professionals.
- D. As we look at the balance between "content" (knowledge of Judaica) and pedagogy, a variety of configurations are possible (Bachelor's degree in Judaica, Master's degree in education, or the converse).

V. PLANS FOR A COMMISSION

- A. In his discussion paper, Professor Fox proposed

that a commission be established that might, after careful and systematic study, issue a report that would set guidelines for the kind of interventions that could dramatically change the condition of the Jewish educator in North America.

The Commission would [could] consist of outstanding lay and professional leaders and scholars, and should enjoy the support of institutions of higher Jewish learning, teacher training institutions, and the appropriate Jewish organizations.

The report of the Commission might consist of a list of objectives, opportunities, and interventions. The Mandel Associated Foundations could conceivably undertake to sponsor and fund one or more of these opportunities or interventions. No less significant is the fact that it might serve as the leverage to involve other foundations to join in this enterprise.

- B. Recorded in Professor Fox's paper was Henry L. Zucker's suggestion that the Commission first describe the rationale for focusing on Jewish education as the principal tool for ensuring Jewish continuity. "The report would then present the macro picture, list critical needs and shortages, recommend ways of remedying these problems, and offer suggestions..."

- C. The following comments were made during the ensuing discussion:

1. The process itself should be conducted so as to garner support from many sources.
2. It was pointed out that the Commission would need to establish the reason(s) why a study was being initiated. (As self-appointed investigators, upon what authority do we undertake this task?)

This would be the first time in American Jewish life that a private body (as opposed to an institution) took a leadership role in the examination of a critical issue.

3. The need to engage outside professional researchers was emphasized. In addition to a core staff, there should be consultants or adjunct professionals.
4. There was a difference of opinion as to whether the Commission would limit its focus and scope to senior staff, or look at the whole field of Jewish educational personnel.

A number of participants felt that this was a real opportunity to examine the broader picture. It was also pointed out that the Trustees of the Mandel Associated Foundations had agreed to the concept of a more general overview.

D. Ideas on the composition of the proposed Commission:

1. The group discussed the size and possible composition of the Commission. It would consist of about thirty people, including both lay leaders and professionals representing the major institutions of higher learning and pertinent Jewish organizations. This would not only give many constituencies a sense of ownership, but would also help to validate the process.
2. We will seek to establish a Commission that is as prestigious as possible. The selection of Commission members is therefore of strategic importance.

We wish to have the right institutions represented, but invitations to serve on the Commission will be ad personum. The group will include preeminent scholars, institutional leaders, lay leaders from various communities, persons with a knowledge of prospective funding sources, etc.

3. There was some disagreement as to whether non-Jews would be invited to serve on the Commission. (Their participation as consultants to the process is not precluded.)

VI. NEXT STEPS

Until the Commission is created and professional staff is engaged, Seymour Fox, Henry Zucker, and Barry Shrage will provide administrative support. This "triumvirate" will be responsible for suggesting an initial design. The design document (approximately 6-8 pages in length) should address the following issues:

1. Scope of Study
 - Senior personnel only?
 - How far out are we looking? The year 2000?
2. Purpose of Study
 - Mission
3. Method of Operation
 - How Commission will function
 - Include timetable
4. Makeup of Commission
 - Size
 - Type

5. Staffing

- Anchor staff
- Administrative staff
- Consultants

6. Budget

7. Groups to Involve

- "Wise Men"?

8. Communications

- Who are the publics?
- How to communicate with each?

Zucker, Fox, and Shrage, in consultation with Rotman, Schwartz, and Woocher, will see that a design proposal is drafted, refined, and circulated to today's group (plus Carmi Schwartz and Art Rotman) in advance of the next meeting, which will be held in Cleveland on Friday, May 29, 1987.



Revised 11/9/87

MANDEL ASSOCIATED FOUNDATION - PROPOSED INITIATIVE
IN CONJUNCTION WITH JWB AND JESNA
DESIGN DOCUMENT

INTRODUCTION

The Mandel Associated Foundations, supporting organizations of the Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland, were established in 1982 by Jack N. and Lilyan Mandel, Joseph C. and Florence Mandel, and Morton L. and Barbara Mandel. The Trustees of the Associated Foundations include leading lay and professional members of the Jewish community of Cleveland.

The Jewish Welfare Board (JWB) is the major service agency for Jewish community centers, YM and YWHAs, and camps in the United States and Canada. JWB is also the U. S. Government-accredited agency serving the religious and Jewish educational needs of military personnel and their families and Jewish patients in Veterans Administration hospitals.

Jewish Education Service of North America (JESNA) is the national association of the Bureaus of Jewish Education, the coordinating bodies for Jewish education in their local communities. At the national level, JESNA serves to coordinate and advocate support for Jewish education.

Together we plan to undertake a major initiative in Jewish continuity.

Jewish continuity--the meaningful survival of the Jewish people, their religion, culture, values, and traditions--is a prime concern of the Mandel Associated Foundations. In a dynamic, open, and mobile society such as ours, individual citizens enjoy a vast array of personal and professional options. The American

Jew faced with a wide range of competing demands--and opportunities--finds it increasingly difficult to maintain his or her religious and cultural identity. Given these conditions, how much of our Jewish heritage will be transmitted to future generations remains an open question.

In response to this situation, JWB, JESNA, and the Trustees of the Mandel Associated Foundations have decided to look closely at a key factor affecting the potential for meaningful Jewish continuity in America--Jewish education. For the purposes of this paper, Jewish education should be seen as including not only the formal instruction that is offered in the classroom, but also the learning that can take place in virtually any setting, informal or formal--within the family circle, at Jewish camps and community centers, through Israel-related activities, at community events, and so on. Effective Jewish education, when broadly defined in this way, can increase the level of commitment among American Jews and encourage the development of a positive identity.

The Mandel Associated Foundations, JWB, and JESNA, having identified Jewish continuity as a major programmatic interest, propose to establish a national Commission that will investigate selected aspects of Jewish education. We believe that the work-product of such a Commission--a report containing a series of practical recommendations--can guide us all in effectively applying our resources. The Associated Foundations will then be better prepared to select one or more initiatives for proactive grantmaking.

It is our hope that the Commission report will be a landmark study, of interest and value to Jewish educators, lay and professional leaders, foundations and interested funders.

This is an opportune moment for the Mandel Associated Foundations to join in a thoughtful study of Jewish education; because of a desire to invest in it in an intelligent way and because the subject of Jewish continuity is now widely perceived by American Jewish leaders as an issue of cardinal importance. Individual Jewish philanthropists and Jewish foundations such as ours are ready to become engaged in the issues of the day as dynamic and forward-looking grantmakers. This proactive stance is both a reflection and an outgrowth of a long-standing tradition in the history of American philanthropy, that of furnishing "venture capital" for the testing and development of new ideas. We believe that a number of funders, including both Jewish-sponsored foundations and philanthropically-minded individuals, may be prepared to apply greater resources to innovative programs and projects that will have a positive impact upon the quality of Jewish education in America.

JEWISH EDUCATION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

It is generally agreed that Jews have attained a status in North America rarely equaled in Jewish history. They have risen to the top of their professions, excel in the worlds of finance and industry, and are creative forces in the sciences, the arts, and the humanities. Their future appears promising in the open, democratic society which offers them innumerable possibilities.

This new reality, where Jews are fully integrated in their society, makes it possible for them to choose whether and to what extent they are to identify as Jews. Over the past few decades a considerable number of them have chosen not to associate with Judaism or to identify minimally with it. The multiplicity of options--and distractions--in our open society makes it increasingly easy for the marginally committed Jew to "slip away."

There has not been a sufficient investment of thought, energy, and money to respond to these new and different conditions. The organized Jewish community has not devoted the kind of attention required for developing a new education that could respond adequately to the new reality of Jewish life in North America.

It is true that there are encouraging signs. Jewish education appears on the agenda of every major Jewish forum. Key community leaders are beginning to devote increasing amounts of their time and resources to Jewish education.

Though there are notable and impressive examples of programs and institutions that excel, these are exceptions and do not reflect the general situation. The institutions that educate are often staffed by poorly trained, underpaid, uninspired personnel. Those who have developed the curriculum and educational methods of many institutions have not taken advantage of promising advances in the field of education and the social sciences. They have not learned how to use the contribution of Jewish scholarship or the enormous educational potential of the state of Israel. The structure, the content and personnel of many institutions are not able to meet the challenge that must be faced if we are to avoid losing large numbers of Jews.

Only if Judaism is able to compete in the marketplace of ideas can we expect young Jews to engage in exploring what a serious Jewish commitment would entail. Only if the ideas of Judaism are seen in the context of those issues that engage the hearts and minds of thinking people in an open society can we expect Jews to invest the time and energy required to understand what it means to decide to live as a Jew.

To meet the challenge of educating Jews who are fully accepted in an open society, the organized Jewish community must be prepared to make a greater investment of thought, energy and money in the agencies that have the greatest potential for rallying our youth and their parents--schools, camps, community centers. Our goal must be to develop a new kind of education that can respond adequately to the new reality of Jewish life in America.

It is true that there are encouraging signs. Jewish education appears on the agenda of every major Jewish forum. Key community leaders recognize the critical nature of the situation, and are beginning to devote increasing amounts of their time and resources to Jewish education.

Because ensuring the meaningful continuity of Jewish life is a high priority of the Mandel Associated Foundations, we plan to respond to today's educational crisis in the ways we feel we can be most helpful. As a first step, we will participate in establishing a Commission, the purpose of which will be threefold: to suggest policies that will guide the development of a new thrust for Jewish education; to detail the necessary steps and interventions; and to develop plans and programs for the implementation of these policies.

It is not our intention to become operational except in encouraging practical means to implement the report's recommendations; the role we have chosen is to help develop a knowledge base, and to engage in the kind of strategic thinking and advocacy that will lead to positive change.

THE PURPOSE OF THE COMMISSION

To impact Jewish education so that it can respond to the new reality of Jewish life in North America will require interventions on many different fronts and on several levels. The institutions involved in education will need to be strengthened and supported. It may even be necessary to design and develop new institutions in response to emerging needs. The discoveries and insights of the humanities and the social sciences, as well as those of Jewish scholarship, will help to enrich the content, curriculum, and pedagogy of tomorrow's Jewish education.

Above all else, it is the personnel of Jewish education who hold the key to change. It is they who will lead in the development of new strategies. Working in close collaboration with community leadership, they will help to create new institutions and invigorate existing ones. Most importantly, it is they who will attract, inspire, and engage students and their families.

There is wide agreement, in the fields of general and Jewish education, that the educator is a critical factor in the success or failure of any educational endeavor.

It is clear that, for Jewish education, there is a severe shortage of qualified, inspired, and trained personnel. The shortage is a global one that exists on all levels--from early childhood education through the university--and in all educational settings, whether formal or informal. Jewish education in the United States is staffed by more than 30,000 teachers, principals, youth leaders, and community center directors. While some of these educators are dedicated, competent, and enthusiastic, they are generally insufficiently trained, inadequately paid, and sometimes demoralized. Under these circumstances, recruitment is extremely difficult. The institutions that prepare Jewish educators have fewer students and faculty today than they did in the past; no more than a few hundred people are being trained at this time for positions in Jewish education.

The first target of an effort to improve Jewish education should therefore be the recruitment, training, and retention of the outstanding personnel required to meet the challenge.

In turn, these topics cannot be considered without dealing with the broader issue of the need to build the profession of Jewish education.

The following topics should be considered by the Commission:

1. The development of the profession of Jewish education.
2. The recruitment and retention of qualified personnel.
3. The education of educators.
4. The environment and the agents for change.

1. The development of the profession of Jewish education.

For an occupation to evolve into a profession and acquire the appropriate status and authority, it is necessary to develop and formalize agreed upon standards of knowledge, training and expertise, a code of ethics, and institutionalized forms of collegiality. The elements that are missing from Jewish education will have to be introduced; other elements will have to be developed and expanded. A system of certification, based upon accepted norms and standards, is an essential step towards the professionalization of the Jewish educator.

2. The recruitment and retention of qualified personnel.

At present, there is a very small pool of people from which to recruit candidates for training programs. In addition, the rate of attrition of qualified personnel is high. Such factors as low status, morale, and salary and a limited potential for advancement have a twofold effect: they deter potential candidates from entering the field and give incumbents good reason to leave it. Moreover, the feeder system (youth movements, summer camps, etc.) is not effective. Any solution will have to consider these problems and locate and develop new sources of manpower (for example, students in programs of Jewish studies and in general education).

3. The education of educators.

There are very few institutions for the preparation of Jewish educators in North America. Fewer than 100 people graduate annually from these institutions. Students must be trained for existing positions as well as for the emerging needs of the field of Jewish education (professors of Jewish education, teacher-trainers, family educators, curriculum developers, experts in Jewish content for informal education, etc.). The variety of needs require multiple solutions. Strategies for development should be outlined and plans should be considered that could include proposals for:

- * the expansion of existing institutions
- * the development of new programs
- * the design of systematic, comprehensive approaches for in-service education.

4. The environment and agents for change.

Though a consensus is emerging concerning the need to upgrade Jewish education, any dramatic change will require the development of community awareness and commitment. The key opinion makers, community leaders, academics and educators will have to be identified. They will have to be engaged in the process initiated by the commission and convinced to join and play an active role in support of this effort. They are indispensable if the process is to lead to change. One of the important assignments of the commission will be to identify those individuals, constituencies, institutions and organizations that can help effect change. Strategies will have to be devised to involve them in all of the stages of the commission's work and ultimately in the implementation of its findings.

THE SCOPE OF THE COMMISSION'S STUDY

If a study is undertaken now, we can hope to impact significantly the effectiveness of Jewish education. The Commission will need to decide how to undertake the assignment, what is the appropriate point of entry, and whether to examine the entire range of Jewish educational personnel, or focus on a strategic segment, such as senior personnel.

It could be argued that a first effort should be undertaken in the area of senior personnel for the following reasons:

1. Inspired and well-trained senior personnel will attract and retain appropriate candidates for the teaching profession and for the field of informal education.
2. Qualified senior personnel will introduce new ideas and programs which could change the nature of the profession and the image of the Jewish education field.

3. The numbers involved, as compared to the need for teachers and youth leaders, make this assignment a feasible one.

The counter-argument would claim that:

1. The teacher and youth-leader are the front-line educators.
2. Improvements to date in status and salary have been made only in the area of senior personnel.
3. The work of so important a Commission could impact Jewish educators as a whole, and therefore the problem of the teacher should remain within its scope.

A third approach might be to create a new category of "leading educators" that could encompass senior educators, administrators, curriculum specialists, outstanding classroom teachers, and camp and Center staff. These leading educators would be persons whose influence extended throughout a school, a city, a region, or the entire country. For example, they might include innovative teachers who could create and develop new methods; their classrooms could serve as demonstration centers and training facilities. Leading educators could also address themselves to the promising area of family education.

THE OUTCOME OF THE WORK OF THE COMMISSION

We believe that the establishment of a Commission at this time could have enormous impact. If the report produced by the Commission not only projected a vision, but also offered concrete recommendations for strengthening the field of Jewish education, there is every reason to believe that resources would be made available so that key findings could be operationalized.

We are reminded that in 1910 the Carnegie Foundation for the study of teaching commissioned a study of American medical education. The result of that study was the now-famous Flexner report which revolutionized American medical education. As a result of the Flexner report, the Rockefeller Foundation invested fifty million dollars and convinced other sources to invest an additional five hundred million.

Once the report of the proposed Commission on Jewish education and Jewish continuity has been issued, the Mandel Associated Foundations will undertake to sponsor and fund one or more recommendations. The report may also inspire other entities to join in the enterprise, thus producing a leveraging effect within the organized Jewish community.

The widespread recognition that change is essential, the receptivity of both lay and professional leaders, and the potential involvement of interested funders are important factors that conjoin to make this a truly auspicious moment.

THE COMMISSION AND ITS METHOD OF OPERATION

The Commission should consist of outstanding community and professional leaders, scholars, representatives of institutions of higher learning, teacher-training institutions and appropriate Jewish organizations. Its 30 members will be men and women, chosen *ad personam*, whose influence and institutional connections are clear. They will be expected to participate in meetings, be available for consultation between meetings, and respond to papers and reports.

The function of the Commission will be to undertake to study, guide and review its progress, report its findings to the Jewish community, and encourage the implementation of the plans and recommendations contained therein.

The study should take approximately eighteen months, during which the Commission would meet four to six times. Three meetings would be scheduled during the first year.

The staff will include a study director, consultants, and appropriate administrative and research personnel. They will be responsible for:

- ° Preparing the appropriate background papers and initiating individual and small-group meetings among members during the interval between meetings of the full Commission.

- ° Gathering and organizing the necessary data that is relevant to the work of the Commission, including existing studies and analyses.
- ° Initiating and inviting position papers and studies as required by the agenda and the decisions of the Commission.
- ° Undertaking a series of consultations among appropriate individuals and groups of scholars, educators, and policymakers, and reporting to the Commission on these consultations.
- ° Preparing a list of publics in North America that need to be informed and involved, including selected organizations and institutions, lay leaders, scholars, Jewish educators, and foundations. The Commission will determine how best to communicate with these publics, and whether to invite representatives from Israel and other countries to serve as corresponding members.
- ° Developing draft reports and preparing the final report of the Commission.

PAPERS TO BE COMMISSIONED

This list will be developed as we decide on the scope of the work of the Commission. The following suggested papers are meant to serve as examples:

1. A careful analysis of what is required to create a serious profession of Jewish education.
2. Alternative proposals for the training of Jewish educators. This will require visits and a very careful study of the programs, students and faculty of existing institutions. It will also require investigating innovative proposals in the field of general education and religious education.

3. A scenario for the year 2000: What Jewish education could be if optimal and feasible conditions were created. This paper could describe what tomorrow's institutions would be like, and how they would impact their constituencies.
4. The economics of Jewish education. Though the subject matter of this paper will have to be very carefully limited, it is important to develop some conception of what reform will cost.
5. The state of the field. This paper will establish the parameters of our problem, indicating the distance between the present situation and the desired situation (e.g., number of qualified personnel versus the number needed). The paper could document the rate of attrition, length of service, and other issues.
6. Building lay leadership. This paper could describe the present reality and suggest strategies for involving the top lay leadership in Jewish education.

Some or all of these papers would be discussed at workshops or consultations.

APPENDICES

- I. Proposed Candidates for the Position of Study Director
- II. Proposed List of Candidates for Commission Membership
 - A. Lay Leaders
 - B. Scholars and Educators
 1. General Scholars/Others
 2. Jewish Scholars
 3. Jewish Educators

I. PROPOSED CANDIDATES FOR THE POSITION
OF STUDY DIRECTOR

Blum, Arthur -- Professor, School of Applied Social Sciences,
Case Western Reserve University

Dorph, Gail -- Member of the Education Faculty, University of Judaism,
Los Angeles, California

Holtz, Barry -- Director, Melton Reseach Center, JTSA

Horn, Susan

Ingall, Clara -- Director of Rhode Island Jewish Education Bureau,
Providence (Technical Director)

Kelman, Vicky -- Teacher Trainer and Curriculum Specialist - Berkely, California

Lowin, Joseph -- Jerusalem Fellow

Moses, Larry -- Waxner Foundation

Riemer, Joseph -- Newly Appointed Professor of Jewish Education - Brandeis
University

Shevitz, Susan -- Brandeis University (Technical Director)

Sidorsky, David -- Columbia University

Stein, Herman -- Case Western Reserve University (Overall Director)

Tannenbaum, Abe -- Columbia University

Thurz, Danfel -- Executive Director, B'nai B'rith

II. PROPOSED LIST OF CANDIDATES FOR
COMMISSION MEMBERSHIP

A. LAY LEADERS

Appleby, Ronald -- Canada
Berman, Mandell L. -- Detroit
Busis, Sid -- Pittsburgh
Cardin, Shoshana -- Baltimore
Colman, John C. -- Glencoe, Illinois
Comay, Shalom -- Pittsburgh
Eisenman, Lillian -- New York
Feldman, Jesse -- San Francisco
Goodman, Henry J. -- Cleveland
Grossman, Steve -- Boston
Hermelein, David -- Detroit
Kleinman, Harold -- Dallas
Lainer, Mark -- Los Angeles

Laxer, Carl -- Montreal
Loup, Robert E. -- Denver
Mandel, Morton L. -- Cleveland (Chairman)
Mannikin, Richard -- Baltimore
Mintz, Donald -- New Orleans

Newman, Donald -- Tulsa
Ostrow, Gerald -- Pittsburgh
Peck, Judy -- New York
Pollack, Lester -- New York
Ratner, Charles -- Cleveland
Ritz, Esther Leah -- Milwaukee
Rosenthal, Harriet -- Metro West, New York
Rubin, Len -- New Jersey
Schlessel, Mark
Shalom, Steven -- New York
Sherman, Jane
Smith, Robert -- Washington
Tishman, Peggy -- New York
Wexler, Richard -- Chicago
Yanowitz, Bennett -- Cleveland

B. SCHOLARS AND EDUCATORS

1. General Scholars (and Others)

Arrow, Kenneth -- Nobel Laureate in Economics - Stanford University

Boschwitz, Rudy -- U. S. Senator

Chinitz, Benjamin -- Dean, School of Management - Lowell University;
Past President of Boston Bureau of Jewish Education

Cohen, David -- Distinguished Policy Analyst and Historian - Michigan
State University

Lawrence Cremin -- Distinguished Historian of Education; Past President of
Teachers' College - Columbia University; President of
the Spencer Foundation

Danishovsky, Sam

Eizenstadt, Stu

Glazer, Nathan -- Distinguished Sociologist on the Faculty of Harvard
University

Lipset, Seymour Martin - Distinguished Sociologist on the Faculty of
the Hoover Institute, Stanford University

Nobel Laureate -- From the Natural Sciences or Medicine

Nozzick, Robert -- One of the Distinguished Philosophers on the Faculty
of Harvard University

Putnam, Hilary -- One of the Distinguished Philosophers on the Faculty
of Harvard University; Key in Hillel

Sheffler, Israel -- The Outstanding Philosopher of Education in the
(Rabbi) United States; On the Faculty of Harvard University

Shulman, Lee -- Psychologist, Expert in Teacher Education; Consultant
to the Carnegie Foundation; Distinguished Member of the
Faculty of Stanford University

Stein, Herman -- Case Western Reserve University

Yalow, Rosalyn (Nobel Laureate)

Waltzer, Michael -- Distinguished Political Scientist; Political
Philosopher on the Faculty of Princeton University

2. Jewish Scholars

Alter, Robert -- Expert in Hebrew Literature and Comparative
Literature - University of California, Berkeley

Dash-Moore, Deborah

Gottschalk, Alfred

Lamm, Norman

Schorsh, Ismar

Septimus, Beryl

Tobin, Gary

Twersky, Itzhak -- Expert in Jewish Thought - Harvard University

Wiesel, Eli -- Nobel Laureate - Boston University

Weiss, Ruth -- Association of Professors of Jewish Education

3. Jewish Educators

Ariel, David -- College of Jewish Studies - Cleveland

Brooks, Michael -- Hillel

Dubin, David

Elkin, Josh

Garr, Burt

Gold, Ben-Zion (Rabbi)

Kleinman, David -- Jewish Community Center - Cleveland

Kosman, Barry

Lee, Sara -- Head of the Department of Education - Hebrew Union
College, Los Angeles

Levy, Harold

Lipstadt, Deborah

Ponet, Jim -- Yale

Ritterband, Paul

Rosenstein, Mark -- Principal

Schaffler, Sam

Schiff, Alvin -- Head of Jewish Education in New York City

PROPOSED LIST OF CANDIDATES FOR
COMMISSION MEMBERSHIP

Page 4

Schiff, Gary

Solomon, Bennett -- Principal

Steinmetz, Ira

(Thurz, Daniel)

11/6/87

SUGGESTED MI-NA AND MI-G

TIMETABLE

(after 11/11/87)

<u>Who</u>	<u>Elements</u>	<u>Due Date</u>
MLM, Woocher, Rotman	Firm up sponsorship of JESNA and JWB	12/1/87
SF, HS and possibly others	C.V.s on director and associates of MI-NA (insert names after 11/11)	12/1/87
Planning group	Revision of MI-NA draft and comments	12/15/87 (including budget and timetable)
VFL	New MI-NA draft	1/1/88 (including budget and timetable)
SF or VFL	Draft of MI-G	
Planning group	Selection of MI-NA director and associates	1/1/88
Director of MI-NA	First meeting of MI-NA Commission	3/1/88
SF and MLM	Conference to project MI-G idea	June 1988

MINUTES: PROPOSED MANDEL INITIATIVE -
JEWISH EDUCATION/JEWISH CONTINUITY

DATE OF MEETING: April 1, 1987

PRESENT: Seymour Fox, Barry Shrage, Henry L. Zucker,
Carol K. Willen (Sec'y)

KEY POINTS OF MEETING

1. The overarching issue is that of ensuring the meaningful continuity of the Jewish people. It was agreed that, at present, the best "tool" for ensuring Jewish continuity is Jewish education.

The question of Jewish education is multi-faceted; we do not yet know what the most effective and appropriate forms are. Jewish education does not refer to schools alone; the Community Center movement is an important educational force.

The social sciences offer many insights that can and should be applied in the field of education.

2. "Upon what authority do we undertake this task?" Discussion:

Professor Fox observed that there is a need for fundamental research in the field of Jewish education.

Henry Zucker noted that, without being immodest, the Mandel Associated Foundations strive to be a leader in the field. We will not be to Jewish education what Carnegie is to education in general; that is, Jewish education will not be our sole area of programmatic interest, although it will be a major area. The Mandel Associated Foundations are convening a Commission in order to investigate the problem on a national level in a systematic, organized, and thoughtful way.

Among the many problems in the field of Jewish education are the fact that an insufficient number of laymen are involved, and that there is no "profession" per se. Educators are generally beholden to Federations and have nothing to do with the budgeting process.

3. "Why is personnel the place to start?"

Professor Fox suggested that we build an argument as to why personnel is the place to start. He would then invite comment and criticism.

We discussed the issue of whether the Commission would focus on senior staff, or attempt to assess the whole field of Jewish educational personnel. Professor Fox asked: "Why look at the whole field of personnel when no one has yet come up with a good idea for meeting the shortage of teachers or upgrading the teaching profession?"

He noted that, typically, the phrase "senior personnel" is defined in terms of administrators. An approach fostered by Carnegie is the elimination of the term "administrators," in favor of "leading teachers" (for want of a better name). By concentrating on the development of "leading educators," rather than "senior personnel," we could look for ways to influence the field both intellectually and administratively.

It was noted that day-school teachers and administrators are more likely to see themselves as professionals than are "avocational" teachers in the supplemental schools, where there is a different sociology of both teacher and learner.

4. Among the questions that need to be answered by May 29 are: What is the function of the group that met on March 5th? What is the role of the Mandel Associated Foundations Trustees? What is the function of the Commission? Who is to be the lead scholar? What is the desired product? What should be the components of the product? What should we tell prospective Commission members?
5. Proposed plan for the design document:
 - a. We should make it clear that the Mandel Associated Foundations are interested in Jewish continuity, then spell out the link between Jewish continuity and Jewish education.
 - b. We should express "responsible optimism." We are not talking about shoring up a crumbling edifice, but rather, about capitalizing on some positive factors in the present environment in order to create a golden age of Jewry.

This is a moment of rare opportunity:

- (1.) Laity throughout the world has decided to make Jewish continuity its major concern. What we need is people to place our bets on.
- (2.) Financial means to implement good ideas are readily available. (It was noted that the Mandel Associated Foundations have the capacity to bring in other funders.)
- c. After spelling out the argument that Jewish continuity can best be assured through Jewish education, and after describing the opportunity at hand, we should then define the problem: What is the state of the field? What are the key issues?
- d. We must explain why we think the issue of personnel is at the heart of the problem.

- e. The design document will list the questions and concerns that need resolution: senior personnel versus the whole field, recruitment, profession-building, training, retraining, retention.
- f. We need to define what the Commission is and how it will function. Its work will entail commissioned papers, as well as consultation with experts. In order to keep the process moving, there will be conferences at which commissioned papers are presented.

The following was suggested as a possible list of papers that could be commissioned: Creating a Profession; Building Lay Leadership; An Alternative Concept of Training; The Economics of Jewish Education, etc. These could be published as "Mandel Occasional Papers."

- g. The design document should suggest what the future would be like if the stated problems were solved. (This scenario will be inspirational rather than operational.) Fox suggests that we think in terms of a ten-year program.
6. HLZ noted that he is in favor of process. One does not just create a Commission in order to validate a foregone conclusion. This Commission will not be a rubber stamp; its role is to criticize the report prepared by the study director.
 7. Seymour Fox estimates that this will be a year's work. (It is understood that the range could be from 10 months to 18 months.) The Commission may meet 4 to 6 times, probably 4. There will be a great deal of activity between meetings.
 8. The study director will have full responsibility for the final product, in terms of both administrative and intellectual control.
 9. The Mandel Associated Foundations are prepared to assume leadership and help leverage other support. We should make it clear that, after the report is completed and the pieces have been identified, the Mandel Associated Foundations are prepared to pick up a key piece and operationalize it.
 10. It was suggested that we try to get at least one other foundation involved at the very beginning; HLZ recommends the Revson Foundation (Eli Evans).
 11. A public relations program would be a good idea. Perhaps an article signed by MLM should appear in Commentary, the New York Times magazine section, etc.

Other PR questions: how to announce the appointment of a Commission, how to announce the final report of the Commission.
 12. We need to determine what the role of Israel should be.

13. To what extent should we inform or involve the international Jewish community? It was suggested that people in other countries be "corresponding members" of the Commission.
14. The Commission will be comprised of general scholars, Judaic scholars, representatives of the organized Jewish community, representatives of Jewish educational institutions and teacher training institutions, professional Jewish educators, etc. It was underscored that "every name should mean something."
15. When we propose potential Commission members, we will provide a long list, from which only a few will be picked. Seymour Fox will recommend scholars and Hank Zucker will recommend lay leaders. A one-line bio will identify each candidate. Further suggestions will be entertained at the May 29th meeting.
16. When we are ready to invite prospective Commission members, someone should "test the waters," either in a phone call or in a personal interview, so that when an official letter of invitation is sent out, it won't be turned down.
17. A proposed budget and a suggested list of candidates for the Commission are attached. (See exhibits.)
18. A draft of the design document will be sent to Zucker, Shrage, and Willen by Monday, May 4th. After their review, a revised draft will be sent to all persons who will be present on May 29th.
19. Henry Zucker will report to Mort Mandel on our April 1st meeting with Seymour Fox.

39
File
Mandel Initiative

1 of 6

Attention: Carol Willen

Please find material for meeting with Henry Zucker and Barry Shrage on Wednesday, April 1. Sorry for the delay.

Sincerely,

Seymour Fox

2076

MARCH 25, 1987

THE MANDEL INITIATIVE FOR THE FIELD OF JEWISH EDUCATION
DESIGN DOCUMENT - DRAFT #1

INTRODUCTION

The Mandel Associated Foundations decided to set up a Commission and to undertake a study that will establish the link between the meaningful continuity of Jewish life and Jewish education.

The study will suggest policies to guide the development, of a Jewish education that can respond to this challenge. It will begin to detail the steps and interventions necessary to bring about the environment that leads us to elect to remain Jewish.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

It is assumed that personnel is the key to any improvement in Jewish education. There is wide agreement, both in the field of general and Jewish education that the educator is the determining factor in the success or failure of any educational endeavor.

In Jewish education it is clear that there is a severe shortage of qualified, inspired and trained personnel.

Therefore the first target of an effort to improve Jewish education should be the recruitment, training and retention of the outstanding personnel required to respond to the challenge.

This target will only be realized if we can establish the problem of Jewish education as a priority in the minds of the people who set the agenda of the organized Jewish community and convince them that personnel is the key issue for the improvement of Jewish education.

376

OUTCOME OF THE STUDY

The Commission will issue a report which will consist of suggested policies and interventions and indicate present opportunities. This report could have significant impact. The Mandel Associated Foundations could conceivably undertake to sponsor and fund one or more of these opportunities and interventions. No less important is the fact that it might serve as the leverage to involve other foundations to join in this enterprise. Through the active involvement of members of the Commission it could motivate institutions and organizations to initiate and implement the policies and interventions agreed upon by the Commission.

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

If this study is undertaken now, we can hope to significantly change the reality of Jewish education by the year 2000. We could develop plans for recruiting appropriate candidates for the profession of Jewish education. We could encourage the development and establishment of suitable training institutions, create an exciting profession of Jewish education and introduce a system of upgrading and retraining of practicing educators.

The Commission that will undertake this study will decide the appropriate point of entry for this assignment. Should they focus on the personnel for Jewish education, or on a strategic segment only - such as Senior Personnel.

4576

The shortage of Jewish educators is a global one and exists on all levels - from early childhood education through the university - and for all educational settings, formal and informal. It could be argued that a first effort should be undertaken in the area of Senior Personnel because:

1. Inspired and well-trained senior personnel will attract and retain appropriate candidates for the teaching profession and for the field of informal education.

2. Qualified senior personnel will introduce new ideas and programs which could change the nature of the profession and the image of the field of Jewish education.

① 3. The numbers involved, as compared to the need for teachers and youth leaders, make this assignment a feasible one.

A counter-argument could be developed and would claim :

1. The teacher and youth-leader are the front-line educators.

2. The improvement to date in status and salary have been made only in the area of senior personnel.

3. The impact of the work of this Commission might bring about major developments and changes in the whole field of Jewish Education that would include the teacher.

METHOD OF OPERATION

~ The Commission will meet either four or six times over a period of one year. The staff will prepare the appropriate papers and will conduct individual and small group meetings among members of

STAFFING

The staff of the Commission should include a coordinator, a limited administrative staff and consultants.

BUDGET

1. ~~Coordinator~~ Study Director
2. Administrative and research staff asst.
3. Secretary
4. ~~Consultants (part-time)~~ + commissioned papers
5. ~~Infrastructure (Office, mailing etc.)~~
6. ~~Consultations~~ Seminars
7. ~~Commissioned papers~~
8. Meetings of the Commission
9. Publications and communication
10. Travel, ~~rent~~, phone, postage, ~~etc.~~
11. Incidental Expenses

COMMUNICATIONS

The staff of the Commission should prepare a list of the appropriate publics in North America. These publics should be informed of the establishment of the commission and its progress. The list should include the appropriate organizations and institutions, the community of lay-leaders, scholars and Jewish educators, a selected list of Foundations and international constituencies in Israel and in other Jewish communities.

An appropriate program of communication will have to be undertaken for these various publics. A proper setting and framework will have to be decided upon for the release of the Commission's report.

PROPOSED COMPOSITION OF COMMISSION

We need representation from key organizations, but invitations are ad personam. This is a preliminary list; these are simply possibilities.

<u>Organizations</u>	<u>Number of Representatives</u>
	4
Council of Jewish Federations Jewish Education Service of North America Jewish Welfare Board Joint Distribution Committee (current President? future President? someone else?)	
<u>Educational Institutions</u>	3-5
Hebrew Union College - Alfred Gottschalk Jewish Theological Seminary - Ismar Schorsch Yeshiva University - Norman Lamm Brandeis ? Reconstructionist ?	
<u>Teacher Training Institution</u>	1
(e.g., Baltimore or Boston Hebrew Teachers College)	
<u>Practicing Educators</u>	2
- formal - informal	
<u>Outstanding Scholars</u>	3 - 5
(The number will be reduced if we can locate persons who are both outstanding scholars <u>and</u> experts in Judaica.)	
<u>Professionals</u>	
Lawrence Kremer Israel Scheffler Lee Shulman Eli Evans	
<u>Lay Leaders</u> - (consult Carmi Schwartz and Art Rotman for this list)	
Charles Bronfman Max Fisher Distinguished figures and charismatic personalities (e.g., Elie Wiesel) Esther Leah Ritz Senator Frank Lautenberg Senator Rudy Boschwitz Cynthia Ozick	

Lay Leaders (Cont'd)

Stuart Eisenstadt
Nobel Prize Winners
Bob Loup
Henry Taub
Heinz Eppler
Bennett Yanowitz
Bill Berman
Billie Tisch

Include Non Jews ? - (e.g., James Coleman)

Include any Israelis ? - (e.g., Abba Eban)

**APPENDIX B:
PAPERS COMMISSIONED FOR THE
CARNEGIE FORUM'S TASK FORCE ON TEACHING AS A PROFESSION**

Black Participation in the Teacher Pool

Joan C. Baratz, Director, Division of Education Policy Research and Services, Educational Testing Service

The Gains From Education Reform

Stephen M. Barro, President, SMB Economic Research

Current Approaches to Teacher Assessment

Tom Bird, Project Director, Far West Laboratory

School Resource Allocations: Potential for Change

Frederick Dembowski, Associate Professor, Frances Kemmerer, Research Associate, and Alan P. Wagner, Research Associate, Center for Educational Research and Policy Studies, School of Education, State University of New York at Albany

Teacher Choice: Does It Have a Future?

Denis P. Doyle, Director, Education Policy Studies, American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research

Students as Teachers: A Tool for Improving School Climate and Productivity

Diane Hedin, Associate Professor and Assistant Director, Center for Youth Development and Research, University of Minnesota

Teacher Mobility and Pension Portability

Bernard Jump Jr., Professor and Chairman, Department of Public Administration, and Associate Dean, Maxwell School, Syracuse University

Financing Education Reform

James A. Kelly, President, Center for Creative Studies

Increasing the Number and Quality of Minority Science and Mathematics Teachers

Shirley M. McBay, Dean for Student Affairs, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

A National Board for Teaching? In Search of a Bold Standard

Lee S. Shulman, Professor of Education, and Gary Sykes, Research Associate, Stanford University

The Knowledge Base for Teaching

Lee S. Shulman, Professor of Education, Stanford University

Professional Examinations: A Cross Occupational Analysis

Gary Sykes, Research Associate, Stanford University

*APPENDIX C:
WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS*

*Education Finance Workshop
December 18-19, 1985*

Charles Benson
School of Education
University of California
Berkeley, California

Lewis M. Branscomb
Vice President and Chief Scientist
IBM Corporation
Armonk, New York

Anthony P. Carnevale
Vice President,
Governmental Affairs
American Society for Training and
Development
Alexandria, Virginia

E. Alden Dunham
Program Chair
Carnegie Corporation of New York
New York, New York

Margaret Goertz
Senior Research Scientist
Education Policy Research and Services
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, New Jersey

Steven D. Gold
Program Director, Fiscal Affairs
National Conference of State Legislators
Denver, Colorado

James A. Kelly
President
Center for Creative Studies
Detroit, Michigan

Helen Ladd
Department of City and Regional Planning
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Will Myers
Manager, School Finance
National Education Association
Washington, D.C.

Allan Odden
Department of Education Policy
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California

William Spring
Vice President
District Community Affairs
Federal Reserve Bank of Boston
Boston, Massachusetts

Robert Reischauer
Vice President
The Urban Institute
Washington, D.C.

MEMO TO: Seymour Fox
FROM: Henry L. Zucker and Carol K. Willen *CHW*
SUBJECT: HIGHLIGHTS OF OUR CONVERSATION ON MAY 6, 1987

The following summarizes our discussion of Wednesday, May 6, 1987, and our initial reactions to your draft of May 5:

1. The content of the draft is good. You provide an overview of the problem, suggest the motivation of the Mandel family in pursuing this initiative, and identify the areas that will require investigation. Moreover, you tentatively suggest avenues to explore and possible conclusions that could result. Finally, you begin to address some of the practical issues, e.g., the composition of the Commission, its leadership, the role of staff, etc.

We feel that, while the draft does in fact include most of what needs to be said, its focus could be sharper. We need to indicate that this is the first proposal; once it has been reviewed by our small working group, it will be sent to the larger circle of participants in advance of our May 29th meeting. (Date of distribution: May 15.)

2. The draft that results from our May 29 meeting should be written with the following audiences in mind:
 - a. Persons who will be invited to serve on the Commission.
 - b. The prospective Study Director, Consultants, and others who will be asked to participate in the initiative.
 - c. The general Jewish public, particularly community leaders, educators, and persons in the laity who are interested in, and concerned with, problems of Jewish education and Jewish continuity.
3. The document will be written to provide the kinds of information that these people will want to know. We propose the following format:

SECTION ONE:

Reasons for the Study

In the first section, we should define the problem and explain why it merits attention. This is an opportunity to make a case for conducting a study, and to express our hopes for the eventual outcome. We do not intend for this study to gather dust on a shelf; rather, we hope that it will be a blueprint for activity.

SECTION TWO:Explanation of the Mandels' Interest

This section affords an opportunity to explain why the Mandel family and the Trustees of the Mandel Associated Foundations have selected this particular initiative. What is the natural connection between the personal interests of the Mandel family and the philanthropic objectives of the Mandel Associated Foundations, on one hand, and the proposed initiative, on the other? Once the results of the study are known, what actions are the Mandels prepared to take, in terms of leadership support and financial involvement? At what point would they seek the participation of other funders and other institutions? How might others become involved?

SECTION THREE:Practical Considerations

In this section one might address such matters as: the timetable for the initiative, the function of the Commission; the responsibilities of Commission members--and our expectations with regard to their participation; the job description of the "Study Director"; who the Director might be; the relationship of the Study Director to the Commission members; the relationship of the Study Director to the key consultants, functionaries, and other persons attached to the project, including outside consultants; the "publics" that need to be apprised of our work (concentric circles--"corresponding members"), etc. (As for the budget, we will need to discuss further at what point it will be introduced, and to whom we will show it.)

4. Henry Zucker mentioned that Barry Shrage's plans to take a position in Boston are now firm. He will definitely stay with the project in some capacity. Mark Gurvis will represent the Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland in the small working group.
5. As for the potential list of candidates to be considered for membership, we reiterated that Hank Zucker will take responsibility for suggesting lay persons, while Seymour Fox will generate a list of scholars, educators, and other professionals. We agreed that we would not "stand on ceremony," and that each could suggest names in the other domain. We may have to come up with 60 names, in order to settle on 30. Our objective is to suggest realistic possibilities--people who are likely to accept the invitation.
6. Some names that have come up in recent discussions: Eli Evans of the Revson Foundation; Dr. Rosalyn Yalow, Nobel Laureate and Senior Medical Investigator at the Veterans Administration Medical Center in New York; Florence Melton. Hank Zucker and Carol Willen have also discussed the possibility of including a Hillel director, perhaps Rabbi Ben-Zion Gold, Director of the Harvard-Radcliffe Hillel, or his counterpart at Yale University.

10/2/87

MINUTES: SUMMARY OF MEETING ON JEWISH EDUCATION/JEWISH CONTINUITY (Amended)

DATE: September 17, 1987

PRESENT: Seymour Fox, Annette Hochstein, Morton L. Mandel, Herman D. Stein,
Henry L. Zucker, Virginia F. Levi (Sec'y)

Morton Mandel opened the meeting with a statement in which he indicated that one of the deepest concerns of the enlightened, outstanding Jewish leadership is Jewish continuity. The World Leadership Conference of June 1984 and the subsequent work of the Jewish Education Committee of the Jewish Agency have substantiated this assumption. The work of the Jewish Education Committee has offered hope, cultivated outstanding leaders, and has demonstrated some of the methods that must be introduced into Jewish Education if it is to fulfill its function as a means for dealing effectively with Jewish continuity. Careful planning, experimentation and a process of involvement of outstanding community leaders as well as the central institutions have resulted in significant strides in the realms of personnel and the use of Israel as an educational resource. The impact of this work must not be lost and the momentum created must be built upon. MLM pointed out that Jewish education worldwide is in great need of leadership. For all these reasons the Mandel Associated Foundations are considering undertaking a major initiative in the realm of Jewish Education.

In the discussion that followed it became evident that there are two complementary components to this "Mandel Initiative." In order to be able to approach the strengthening of Jewish education systematically, two commissions will be established to conduct studies and make recommendations for systemic change in personnel and institutions in their respective areas. One will focus on issues in Jewish education and Jewish continuity in North America and the other, worldwide.

Each commission will have its own director in order that the two might function simultaneously. The first is to be known as the Mandel Initiative-North America (MI-NA) and the second as the Mandel Initiative-Global (MI-G).

MI-NA has been in the planning stages for about one year. In earlier plans, a commission was to be established in time for a first meeting in October 1987. While running behind schedule, it is conceivable that a first commission meeting could occur shortly after January 1988.

At the same time, activities of the Jewish Education Committee have built a momentum for action in the near future. It was suggested that MLM convene a worldwide meeting entitled "Jewish Education as a Force for Jewish Continuity" for June 1988. At that time, the concept for MI-G would be presented and input solicited. MI-NA would have been functioning for approximately six months and might serve as a prototype for the activities to be developed at the MI-G meeting. The Jewish Education Committee project which has been undertaken in France might also serve as an example.

It was pointed out that, for the two Initiatives to function more or less simultaneously, there would have to be two separate sets of staff with a small overlap group. The overlap group would be responsible for planning and coordination of the activities. It was agreed that planning for MI-G should involve the incoming presidents of JESNA, JWB, and possibly others at some point in the future.

It is hoped that a global conference could involve both strategic planning and implementation planning. The resultant body would offer consultative services, research, an information service, a planning operation and demonstration projects. It would develop criteria for selecting problems to approach and identify people or organizations to assist.

MLM advised the group to "think big; start small." The planning group should conceive the ultimate goal and then develop an achievable project to build from. The nature of the demand should determine how the committee begins. This should optimize the chances for success.

LOGISTICS

It was agreed that there should be a single chairman of the entire effort (MLM), two executives (one for MI-NA and one for MI-G) and a steering committee to consist of MLM, SF, AH, HDS, HLZ, and VFL. (It might also include Hoffman, Ratner, Rotman, and Woocher.) There was also discussion of a possible planning committee to include an expanded group, but current thinking is not to involve a planning committee at this point.

The question of when and how to go public was raised. While there is some knowledge of plans for MI-NA, it might be inappropriate to begin discussing MI-G at this time. For the moment it was agreed to remain general and indicate that the Mandel Foundation is putting together a team to explore the position it should take with respect to Jewish education and Jewish continuity. In order to avoid leaks, the next planning meeting will involve the steering committee of six people.

Plans for MI-NA are on hold until HDS is in a position to respond to an invitation to become director. It was suggested that an associate director be engaged as soon as possible to set up meetings and do preparation work. SF will serve as director of MI-G.

Following is a timetable of next steps:

<u>Who</u>	<u>Elements</u>	<u>Due Date</u>
VFL	Minutes	9/22
MLM	Firm up sponsorship of JESNA and JWB	10/1
SF	Get CVs of five possible associates (Gail Dorph, Barry Holtz, Vicki Kelman, Joseph Riemer, Susan Shevitz)	10/5
HLZ	Firm up director of MI-NA	10/15
GROUP	Revised, condensed draft of MI-NA	10/16 (Comments to VFL on draft 3)
VFL	New MI-NA draft	11/1 (To include initial budget and and timetable)
SF	Draft #1 - MI-G	11/6 (Including initial budget and timetable as well as staff suggestions for Associate Director)
HDS	Get CV on Abe Tanenbaum	
	Next meeting of small group	11/18 - 8:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

On the agenda for the meeting of November 18 will be discussion of public relations and a review of the two drafts. In the meanwhile efforts will be made to involve JESNA and JWB early in order that they might help with the selection of a director. MLM will seek a statement of intent to participate from the two organizations.

Discussion concluded with a reiteration that a primary goal of these activities is to work to increase the pool of top leaders in Jewish education and to develop strong institutions through which they can work.

*Sue Shevitz - now @ Boston
BJE - she knows all*

Gail Dorph + Vicki Kelman are real educators

Barry Holtz - lovely, bright but an editor.

Joe Riemer - adolescent psych, challenges

MINUTES: SUMMARY OF MEETING ON JEWISH EDUCATION/JEWISH
CONTINUITY

DATE OF MEETING: November 17, 1987

DATE MINUTES ISSUED: December 9, 1987

PRESENT: Morton L. Mandel, Chair, Seymour Fox, Annette
Hochstein, Arthur Naparstek, Herman Stein, Henry L.
Zucker, Virginia F. Levi, (Sec'y)

I. MINUTES

- A. The minutes of the meeting of September 17, 1987 were reviewed and approved.
- B. The minutes of the meeting of November 11, 1987 were reviewed and approved. They formed the basis for the discussion of the design document which followed.

II. DISCUSSION OF MI-NA DESIGN DOCUMENT

The design document of 11/9/87 was reviewed and a number of changes in style and wording were suggested which would give the proposed commission more leeway in developing its mission. These will be incorporated in the next draft. The document should be reviewed as an introduction to our concerns, should inspire its readers--especially potential commission members and consultants--and encourage their thinking about Jewish education in broad terms rather than narrowly as religious education.

Discussion focused primarily on the goals of MI-NA and the means to reaching those goals. The following paragraphs summarize that discussion.

A. Jewish Continuity

The basic concern to be addressed is how to enhance the identity of future generations with their religious and cultural heritage as Jews. This is what we mean by Jewish continuity. Jewish identity can be developed in a variety of ways, one major factor being Jewish education. The document should make clear that the issue of Jewish continuity is broader than Jewish education and that our focus on Jewish education is an important means to the desired end. The document should clarify what we mean by Jewish continuity and should clearly define Jewish education as including both the formal structures of education and the informal structures such as community centers and camps.

B. Big issues that make this study timely:

1. An open society tends to offer choices that can pull people away from a commitment to their Jewishness. Compensatory action must be taken.
2. Jewish continuity and specifically Jewish education is front and center on the Jewish communal agenda today.
3. Substantial communal-foundation resources for the support of education and culture are a growing phenomenon in Jewish life. Good ideas and programs are more likely to be funded now than in the past.

C. The relationship of Mandel Associated Foundations to JWB and JESNA

We want to make clear the role of the MAF as the initiators and funders of MI-NA. It is equally important that JWB and JESNA feel that their role is important. MI-NA is intended as a cooperative effort.

MAF hopes to demonstrate through MI-NA that a foundation can be innovative and yet work through the establishment.

In contrast to other initiatives, this project could serve as a model for a successful partnership between the public and the private sector.

D. "Not Another Study"

We should clarify the fact that this is a commission charged with finding realistic ways to address a major concern. It is the means to arrive at informed recommendations for action. This is intended to lead to practical results, and not to produce another "paper" which will wind up on the shelf.

E. The Place of Institutional Structure

Each generation of American Jews has dealt with issues of assimilation differently. We are working with a set of institutions which were created two or three generations ago, some of which may no longer address Jewish continuity issues as effectively as is needed. The structure of Jewish agencies and educational institutions must be examined to ensure that they meet the needs of current and future generations. While not the primary focus of the commission, issues of institutional structure should be addressed.

II. DISCUSSION OF MI-NA DRAFT

Following Blum's departure, attention was focused on the current MI-NA draft. The weakness of Jewish education personnel was put in numerical terms. Of the approximately 4,000 "leaders" worldwide, only 100 have had formal training. There are fewer trained personnel today than there were in 1955. There are only 10-20 people teaching Jewish education in this country. While the personnel issue need not be the only one addressed by the commission, it is critical to improving Jewish education.

It was agreed that the concept paper should point out more clearly our understanding that there are aspects of Jewish continuity which do not relate directly to Jewish education. These should be enumerated as significant, but outside the scope of this commission.

One of the first tasks of the commission will be to define the problem. The task force on personnel in Cleveland has determined the central problem in raising the level of Jewish personnel.

There is a problem of organizational structure. Trained personnel are not served effectively by the Bureau of Jewish Education. Perhaps the Jewish Community Federation should be encouraged to establish a department of Jewish continuity/Jewish education that would absorb the Bureau of Jewish Education and related activities and would take responsibility for placement of trained personnel. Political issues become significant when we begin talking about changing organizational structure.

AJN suggested the following format for the concept paper: It would propose the creation of the commission and would set forth:

- A. the mission
- B. preliminary problem statement
- C. commission tasks (review of Jewish education as primary task)
- D. organization
- E. timetable
- F. outcomes
- G. budget
- H. commission membership

A key question to be decided at our meeting of November 17 is a focus for the commission. We want to look at Jewish continuity in broad terms, but to be able to come to practical conclusions. The final draft of the design document must serve as an introduction to potential participants and must interest them in joining our efforts.

III. AGENDA FOR MEETING OF NOVEMBER 17, 1987

A. Review Drafts of MI-NA and MI-C

We will not revise the drafts in light of the 11/11/87 meeting, but will consider points made at this meeting in discussion.

Foundations would play a major role in funding MI-G, but that approximately ten other, smaller supporters would be found to participate. Eventually, MI-G might be divided into branches by discipline, each funded by foundations sharing an interest in that field.

It was suggested that the proposal be divided into two sections: one on the vision and a second on practical first steps. One goal which was identified is to develop a healthy Israel-Diaspora relationship, a partnership of value to both parties.

10/5/87

MEMO TO: Seymour Fox, Annette Hochstein, Morton L. Mandel, Herman D. Stein,
Henry L. Zucker

FROM: Virginia F. Levi *VFL*

SUBJECT: Amended Minutes of our Meeting of September 17, 1987

Attached is an amended version of the minutes of our meeting of September 17, 1987 on Jewish education/Jewish continuity. The first three paragraphs have been amended upon the advice of Seymour Fox.

Please note that our next meeting has been rescheduled and will now take place on Tuesday, November 17, 8:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. at Premier. I look forward to seeing you then.

(To Seymour Fox: Herman Stein will not be available to serve as director for MI-NA, but is deeply interested in continuing to work with us.)

SUBJECT: Summary of Mandel Initiative Meeting of December 11, 1987

DATE: December 14, 1987

PRESENT: David Ariel, Seymour Fox, Morton L. Mandel (Chair),
Arthur J. Naparstek, Arthur Rotman, Carmi Schwartz,
Herman Stein, Jonathan Woocher, Bennett Yanowitz,
Henry L. Zucker, Virginia F. Levi (Sec'y)

COPY TO: Stephen Hoffman, Charles Ratner

I. INTRODUCTION

The meeting was opened by Morton L. Mandel, Chairman, who indicated that discussion would focus first on the design document; then on the process for selection of a director, followed by discussion of potential Commission membership and a timetable. This was to be a general discussion, with no expectation that final conclusions would be reached. Participants will have an opportunity to review the draft resulting from this meeting and to provide further input at that time.

II. REVIEW OF DESIGN DOCUMENT

The design document was reviewed page by page. It was agreed that the outcome of the discussion should be a document sufficiently clear and precise to encourage potential members to join the Commission.

A. Pages 1-3 - Introduction

The executive directors of JWB and JESNA will each rewrite the paragraph describing his organization, will discuss it with the other director and with Carmi Schwartz.

The concept of "survival" of the Jewish people was discussed. It was felt that a focus on "revival," "renaissance," or "ongoing vitality" might offer a more positive framework for the goals of the Commission.

The definition of the Jewish community (found on page 2, paragraph 2) should be broadened. The purpose of this section is to create a context. We have been successful in providing systems of support in other aspects of Jewish communal life. The Commission will focus on an aspect of Jewish life that has not had sufficient attention or success--Jewish

education. Jewish education has become an issue of critical interest to this generation, but we do not have the organizational structure nor the personnel to tackle the problems of Jewish education successfully.

A primary issue to be addressed is the need to ensure strong, sustained lay and professional leadership in the field. This requires effective recruitment of top leadership as well as a climate to attract good people.

One function of this study should be to stretch the concept of Jewish education beyond current boundaries to reach people not now within the system of organized Jewish life.

A discussion of how to attract the attention of potential Commission members from the very beginning resulted in the recommendation that a one to two page executive summary be added at the beginning of the document to focus on the problem.

It was agreed that Jonathan Woocher will redraft pages two and three of the design document up to the Statement of the Problem. Art Naparstek will work on revision of the remainder of the document with help from David Ariel.

8. Pages 3-5 - Statement of the Problem

The concept "to review Jewish education" was discussed. It was suggested that the document state explicitly that the Commission will review the current state of Jewish education in order to understand how one produces change. Recognizing that the issue of Jewish personnel demands attention in this context, the Commission will review the environment/institutions that comprise the Jewish education framework. (It was noted that Jewish education is a "field," not a separate profession.) In order to reinvigorate the field, the structure must be reviewed for needed changes and the status of the field must be raised.

A concern was raised that any reference to changing institutions could be intimidating to existing institutions. However, any review of Jewish education must include the context, or structure, in which it exists.

In discussing development of a new thrust for Jewish education, it was suggested that the focus be on formulating a policy which, when implemented throughout North America, will bring about a renaissance in Jewish education. Others felt that we must be cautious not to overstate the case and that we might better leave the paragraph at the bottom of page 4 as is.

C. Pages 5-6 - Jewish Education for the 21st Century

Minor changes were recommended to soften the language somewhat. Technology is to be added to the list of areas whose advances might apply to the field of Jewish education.

D. Pages 6-10 - The Purpose of the Commission

On page 7, paragraph 2, the point should be made that the key to change is held by communal lay leadership.

On page 9, item 5 should be reentitled "creating the conditions for change" and should become item 1 in the list of illustrative topics to be considered.

E. Pages 10-11 - The Scope of the Commission Study

The first paragraph of this section is to be rewritten. It will indicate that the design document points the Commission toward an appropriate point of entry. The Commission itself will determine its direction based upon its reactions to the document. Commission members should recognize that the document is only an invitation to deliberate.

The remainder of the section was considered too specific and will be eliminated.

F. Pages 11-14 - Work of the Commission

On page 12, the paragraph on the function of the Commission should be enlarged to incorporate the notion of this being an interactive process.

III. COMMISSION STAFF

A. Qualities of the Ideal Director

The following list of qualities of the ideal director was developed:

1. Commitment to Jewish life.
2. Ability to work with the highest quality people.
3. An effective manager, able to drive a major effort.
4. Understanding of education, in general, and Jewish education, in particular.

3. The four seminaries (MLM will talk with seminary heads before 1/21 with the assistance of JW)
 4. The Association of Institutions of Higher Learning for Jewish Education (Jonathan Woocher will provide us with the names; MLM will write to the appropriate persons)
 5. CAJE (Jonathan Woocher will provide us with the names; MLM will write to the appropriate persons)
 6. The Bureau Directors Fellowship (Jonathan Woocher will provide us with the names; MLM will write to the appropriate persons)
- C. Hold a meeting with the public relations people at CJF, JWB and JESNA and take advantage of their expertise.
- D. We will "go public" at the time that we are ready to announce the formation and membership of the Commission.
- E. Further suggestions made were:
1. An article in the New York Times describing the background and thinking behind the establishment of a Commission, but with no reference to the Commission. The purpose is to establish MLM as a spokesman on the subject.

While there was some doubt as to the likelihood of our getting the New York Times to accept such an article, it was believed that the Jewish press would be receptive.

2. It was suggested that a public relations lay person be added to the Commission and that a two-year public relations calendar be established.
3. It is also important that we communicate with the Israeli public.

VII. NEXT MEETING

A meeting of the planning group has been scheduled for Thursday, February 4, 1988, 11 o'clock a.m. to 3 o'clock p.m. at Cleveland Hopkins airport.