



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	Folder
D-1	1880

CJENA reports, 1989-1990.

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

SUMMARY

1. Personnel

We are working with personnel assuming that personnel includes recruitment, training, profession building and retention. (We might put retention under profession building or we might keep it separate.)

This assumption leads to another question -- and that is: Must all 4 of these be dealt with simultaneously, or can they be dealt with independently (that question will be rephrased later)?

Then, if you talk about them all being done together, then there still are 2 basic approaches: one is all 4 together immediately in a controlled setting (demonstration center). We will have to make the distinction here between a demonstration center for the best of Jewish education, and a demonstration center for personnel and a community. And the connection between these 2 ideas. Then, we will have deal work with each of the 4 elements in several different ways. What I'm really talking about now is the second approach -- different than all being done together.

This is one in which the country, for example undertakes a declaration and decides to put teeth into the declaration. It says that we have to recruit, train, profession building and retention. What will take of each of these items, say recruitment, will depend on several other matters which we will come back to later. This policy -- this second policy -- may or may not be based on doing them all together; namely, some people could say that you could do all of them together even though they weren't in a demonstration center; some people could say you cannot. If you cannot, what are you left with? In other words, what happens if you start recruitment, and you don't get training for several years? In its own terms, how fatal is it? And two, how could you respond to that by virtue of patchwork or first aid?

Now we have 3 approaches: Approach number 1 is demonstration center; approach number 2 is a national policy where you do it with all -- you do all 4 simultaneously in whatever timetable you have; approach number 3, you don't do all 4 simultaneously, you do them in what order is logical or feasible.

Approach number 4, I will now call "all the various combinations." Between the demonstration center and approaches number 2 and 3. And approach number 5, I will call "anyone of the anticipated or unanticipated outcomes that come from the adoption of the combinations above."

Whatever we do, whatever one of the 4 we adopt, in addition to doing the checking the basic assumptions about the 4, each one

of the 4 has got to be elaborated: elaborated under 3 rubrics. Rubric #1 is our ideas; rubric #2 is the ideas that appear in the literature or in practice in Jewish education (CAJE is important here); rubric #3 ideas in theory that have appeared in general education. Those are the 3 areas we do them. So for example, if we talk about recruitment and we mention our idea about the supplementary school, Lisa Ahren's idea would be the one that exists in the field. What we were suggesting is that Joe Reimer take responsibility for the ideas in the Jewish field, and maybe for the general field as well.

ALTERNATIVES

I. DEMONSTRATION CENTERS

A demonstration center is attempting to discover what happens if you put all of the 4 elements (recruitment, training, profession building and retention) together with oversight, constant monitoring and evaluation, and with the community completely, the theory of the option completely integrated into it, particularly in relationship to governance and planning.

We will make a distinction now between the following categories: the demonstration center will have (each one of them will be able to be different in some of the elements) core institutions where the ideas of personnel will be tried out. Core institutions include the supplementary school, the day school, the JCC, etc. It will have optional institutions, such as family education, adult education, maybe even early childhood education. And then it will have creative institutions, by that I mean institutions that are suggested by the grassroots -- for example, a Lehr House, or institutions that are suggested to the community by virtue of convincing them to try out some idea that exists in the literature in Jewish education or in general education.

Now for each of these institutions, every one of the ideas that we have in recruitment that is appropriate will be tried out. So, for example, we are speaking here of the idea that we have talked about often for recruiting all the graduates, or as many graduates as we could rather, from what we called the potential pool, that is all the graduates that fit into the non-professional category -- these are graduates from Jewish schools -- they could be yeshiva bachorim who are now at the university, they are people who are in the field of general education who take this as an extra job, these are students at the universities, these are retired -- every one of the categories that we've put under "where from." And yordim as well. The point is that what makes this different is 2 things: 1) there's a new pool, e.g. graduates of Jewish schools that had no intention of going into Jewish education, and we are suggesting minimizing the weaknesses of non-professionals by virtue of having them regularly trained. Now, in dealing with this recruitment, we now have to put it together immediately with the issue of training and the lure of salaries, status, personal growth, professional growth and the business of mission which we put on blackboard number 3; namely, just to take 2 examples:

The people that would now be going into supplementary schools, essentially into community centers for particular assignments, and in to day schools for selected assignments -- would be people that would feel that though they don't want to be Jewish educators or rabbis, they are ready to devote several years of their lives to Jewish continuity and either as individuals or as part of "a peace corp." They would receive a salary that would make it desirable for them to do this (does this conflict with the mission idea?). Thus, the idea that we

talked about of somebody going to Western Reserve and getting as much of tuition and room and board as is necessary to lure him.

They would receive status and be recognized as such as people who were mitnadvim for Jewish life. They would learn a great deal, ranging from people who would learn Gemarah, to people who would learn something about inter-personal relationships and teaching. And these are all things that could lead to professional growth in their professions of choice. That is about the people who come from the non-professional and who are graduates, say, of Jewish schools.

When it comes to people of other professions, or the retired, a) other professions might actually consider retooling in stages, or see this as an additional job where their Jewish commitments could find expression. The retired could see this as giving them a meaning in life. Yordim could be made into professionals in stages. The same principle holds for the day school, and for other jobs where professionals seem to be conceivable goals. And here it would be choosing unique people in the field, and pirating them for the demonstration center -- again, because of all of the benefits that are to be found on blackboard #3 -- the benefits they would get from training, and the fact that they would be the first group of professionals in this new profession. And they would receive the recognition and all the items that are listed in the various blackboards.

In terms of the people in related fields that are professionals, for example rabbis, some of them might go into the field. Some of them as suggested by Ukeles, would move in a fast track -- that is Jewish studies programs people. So, I'm not so sure that in the professionals we have a way right now to increase numbers, but we do have I think a sufficient number (again to be researched) to undertake 4 or 5 demonstration centers.

Back to the issue of non-professionals, I'd like to make 2 more points: one is, I want to remind us of the conversation with Smiley about graduates of schools who are unable to go into Jewish education for the day school because they don't know enough, and therefore have gone off into public education. And what could be done to train them. And secondly, the fact that our use of non-professional keeps us away from Lisa Ahrens term of para-professional.

What we would be doing here, by virtue of the use of appropriate trainers, lead teachers, master teachers -- to work with these people in a systematic way. Not simply be bringing in a lower grade of teaching personnel, but be working with them through training and through whatever other ideas we have, or points like the mission, salary and status -- to have them develop.

Now, the same principle holds for the JCC, where we would have to decide -- where do we want to place our people, and how

do we want to place our people. On the other hand, the JCCs could identify the 150 professionals, who by virtue of their present position, are able to make the difference in maximizing. And they would have to be systematically worked at, as is already being started with the program that is being run at the Melton Centre for 3 months this year.

A similar job would have to be done for each one of the institutions that are at your core. For the institutions that are not at your core, a decision would have to be taken in each community as to how many of them would be included in our test of a demonstration center. (We have avoided the definitional issue here of what is a demonstration center and why it's a center that demonstrates personnel, and not the best of Jewish education as well as the relationship between them -- we have to do that in another version.)

Now, training in relationship to the demonstration center: Training would, as we say, either be through existing institutions, individually, through combinations of them -- or through new institutions. Thus, the example that we've given several times: we could either ask Yeshiva University to take over St. Louis by itself and bring in Hebrew Union College to handle the Reform parts of St. Louis; or we could build a consortium where Hebrew Union College is a seminary and Yeshiva and Brandeis work together and one of them undertook St. Louis and used the others, or some other combination. Similarly, we could use Israel in combination with existing institutions. We could use general universities and combine with present institutions. I doubt that we would want to give a major assignment, or the major assignment to a non-existent institution. However, non-existent institutions might be considered to be established after we have ascertained and maybe even tried out the maximum that the existing institutions can contribute.

Now in our early version of the demonstration center we described how personal and professional growth would be handled by the individual teacher, by virtue of him signing up to teach if it were in a supplementary school -- 6 hours a week; and participating in personal growth 1 day a week; vacations and visits to training programs in Israel from time to time. We described a similar role for senior educators and for teachers in day schools and JCCs. So the training institutions would have to undertake this role immediately. In other words, the biggest role for the training institutions would be what Twersky suggested, the on-the-job training.

The suggestions of Lamm, of pre-service training, and the suggestions of Gotshalk of producing centers of thinking and research -- would depend on what we learned about the institutions, and their potential -- and may or may not be created at the same institution. Another version is what the Germans do by creating Max Planck Institutes, that are not attached to the universities. They could be independent

institutions at general universities, independent institutions standing on their own, independent institutions connected to existing institutions of higher learning.

The idea of the demonstration center is based on the assumption that retention will be addressed to all the people that you are -- retention will be concentrated on all the people for whom you are recruiting -- that is, there will be retention considerations for the people that are coming 4 years, and retention considerations for the people who you want to stay "permanently." Similar with profession building: these people would be placed on our ladder of advancement, they would be given the necessary empowerment, we would build a collegiality, we would be giving them the body of knowledge, and thus they would be the first group of the pilot group of the profession building.

I think these are enough ideas about the demonstration center.

II. A POLICY DECISION BY THE NORTH AMERICAN JEWISH COMMUNITY TO ATTACK ALL 4 OF THESE TOGETHER NATIONALLY, AND TO DO THIS WITH WHATEVER GROUP OF CITIES WANT TO JOIN THE NATIONAL ENDEAVOR.

So you might have the 15 cities that are a part of the program for the improvement of Jewish education.

They would agree to pay different salaries, to offer different fringe benefits, to motivate and assist on training, to offer training (thus Yeshiva University would have to undertake this training as well, if it already was involved in a demonstration center; or, it would undertake this training if it were not involved in a demonstration center). (I'm not dealing with where they would get their faculty, because that's been picked up in examples in blackboard number 4, under resources.)

Thus these communities would be paying the new salary, insisting on the training, trying to recruit as many people as possible, and would never lower the standards for profession building, because they wouldn't be able to permit the entry into the profession -- that would be done nationally. Even if it's only a demonstration center, the decision to permit people to enter the profession would be done nationally.

Now under this arrangement -- whether it's with or without a demonstration center -- this option has the following advantages: it does not depend on the success of 1 community, it is incremental, and yet it insists on doing all 4 in as many places as possible. It's dirty and imperfect; but it creates a lot of tumult, encouragement and is another version of hope different than the demonstration center.

There certainly is no reason not to think of doing the demonstration center and this one as well.

III. The third approach is to take the decision nationally, but

either by design or by looking the other way, have communities throughout the United States undertake as many of the 4 elements as possible. Thus you might have a community that would increase salaries and introduce training, but not have their people enter the line of profession building yet. You might have a community that picks up one piece of the recruitment and does nothing else. So for example, they might only undertake the business of the recruitment of non-professionals for their community centers and supplementary schools, and get themselves a 20% input or infusion of energy for this system.

IV. A fourth approach, really brings us closer to the assumption that a demonstration center through personnel will bring out the very best of Jewish education.

Now back in that example of a demonstration center, we were speaking about Mona Ackerman being able to try out a laboratory for what personnel could do for early childhood. Where Hirschorn could see what is the maximum that evaluation could do. Where Bronfman could see what the JCC could do. Where some combination of Jesselson and others could see what the day school could do. In a sense, I want to go back to the wheel of XXXX and introduce the spokes for that wheel.

In this 4th example though, what you now have is a community saying -- we will work at trying to recruit, train, contribute to profession building and retain people -- only for early childhood. So, you have a 4th approach here. Now how we would put all 4 of these together, or a community might put all 4 of these together -- is something that I'm not going to be treating at this time.

THE COMMUNITY

What now happens is that all the vague terms that we used in community. We are now XXX see that all the vague terms that are used in community like climate, training, leadership, etc. is focused around the particular assignment of personnel.

In other words, you are now claiming that because personnel is the necessary condition, you say that you cannot do this without community. Therefore, you take all of the items in your community option and in your inventory, and ask yourself: what would it take on their part to make the personnel option work? And what would you have to do to educate them, motivate them, organize them? And what structures would they have to form in order to undertake that?

So certain things come about immediately. Because you are talking about personnel across the board in all settings, even in the concept of core setting, in the concept of the core you have a formal and informal settings -- some conception of commission comes to bear. In other words, the local form of organization will not work, be it the Bureau as a separate institution, and the JCC group as a separate institution. Is it the Federation, Jewish Education Committee, is it a commission? Those are issues that I think will have to be grappled with.

So, it involves taking all of the people under the structures listed under the inventory, under existing -- both national and local -- and getting them to decide, act upon, on the issue of personnel. And then to create the governance and oversight structure that would do this. The funding needs become very different, because it is not the funding needs of all of Jewish education that you're talking about here, but in the first instances, the funding needs for personnel. And you give as the assignment for a climate, again personnel. So your question is how do you get the community to recognize the importance of personnel? How do you get them to pay for it? How do you get them to grant it status? And how do you get them to grant them empowerment? These are examples of the way you would now approach the community.

The concept of demonstration site is what we have chosen as the way to handle the two enabling options and their intersection with the programmatic option.

The assumption that we have to work with all four aspects: recruitment, training, profession-building and retention is the notion that we have to develop. We are answering Koshitsky and others that any one of these 4 elements, let alone any 1 category within these elements, (e.g., salary) is likely to achieve very little and even to discourage us from thinking that that element which on its own might have impact (e.g., salary -- fringe benefits) is misleading.

I therefore will begin with recruitment.

Recruitment

Though recruitment is probably the last of the elements to be dealt with, because we will be able to recruit if we have a profession and if the training institutions inspire and if the people in the field, by word of mouth and other ways, convey that this is an exciting area of profession to devote your life to -- we will still begin with it.

What are some of the ideas that could be considered?

1. The idea of beginning recruitment in the high school age, possibly even younger. In terms of best practice, camps like Ramah and youth movements were the resource for Jewish education and the rabbinate. A study of this could easily be done and there is enough experience and intuitive knowledge to justify this. Barry Shrage has mentioned earlier that the feeder systems that used to supply people are no longer operating. This is an area where the planning kind of study that you, Annette, talk about is so important. We would have to develop an approach like the ones that were used in the Israel Experience project, involving marketing etc. and ask ourselves -- at what age ought we to begin and why? Is it the end of high school; is it the beginning of college? Programs would have to be developed to nurture and work with these people, if we began in high school, and then continue throughout. This idea could then be combined with idea number 2, the use of college students while they are going to school. This is the idea that we talked about in terms of the supplementary school and the JCC, where we spoke about offering whatever package is necessary for someone to teach at Washington University in St. Louis for the 4 years involving on the job training, etc. We might have two groups here: one that is preparing itself for work in Jewish education and is committed to do this, together with the other group that we discussed and described up until now.

Path 3 -- there is recruitment on an ongoing basis that should be undertaken with college students itself, people in fields like education and the social sciences, the humanities and Judaic

departments. Bob Abramson describes several cases in his community of Detroit where people were finishing work in education and were not picked up, or positions were not available for them. The question of what kind of expectations you'd want to set, and how you could fulfill them (I refer to our conversation about what would happen if we graduated a large number of Jerusalem Fellows all at once, the other day) as what I mean by being able to fulfill expectations.

The next category, I don't know what its number is -- I think it's 4, would probably come close to what your colleague in New York who did the study for us on manpower for Senior Personnell, where he looked into the graduates of, or students in Judaic programs -- here as for this population as well as for other graduate populations, the question of a fast-track, of entering the field without having taught and making up for teaching later, should also be considered.

Another category, 5 or 6 or whatever it is, is the students in programs in Israel, such as the Rothberg School, etc. where they are likely to become inspired and consider a career in Jewish education.

Seven, the category would be for top positions coming from the rabbinate and other fields that are related to Jewish life, like the federation world, etc.

In this case of recruitment we have an excellent example of the importance that you have emphasized all along of beginning to develop the research agenda or questions that have to be considered before suggesting a given line. The problem for the meeting on the 14th, both in a progress report, as well as in the presentation, is how this should be presented so that it doesn't overwhelm, e.g., give the impression that unless we build a research institute we can't deal with these questions; and on the other hand, indicate that we need to gather information and we need to deliberate, we need to think, etc.

Another thought is that some of this stuff might be in Mandel's book for his own response, when the ii is discussed, and these would be examples of the kind of research that the ii would either undertake itself or farm out.

Training

I'm not going to say very much more about training -- it's in the first iteration. I will simply want to indicate that on-the-job training has to be thought of very carefully. Twersky has been emphasizing this, and it is commonly known that unless we change enough of the people in the field, the people that are trained (which are always small numbers) will be drowned by the people in the field. Various on-the-job training programs would obviously be related to the work of the demonstration site. Here, we could give examples of the kind of training that would be undertaken in a demonstration site for any one of the programmatic options. We could take the JCCs and indicate what it would mean to introduce

the Israel Experience properly, how they would prepare young people before they went to Israel, how they would follow-up after they came back from Israel, how they could give courses in the JCCs for the Israel Experience, and above all thus we are talking about what kind of training would you give staff at the JCCs, and what kind of staff, to undertake these assignments. You're therefore talking about deciding who in the JCCs you would want to train, what kind of on-the-job training you would do, and who would undertake it.

Similarly, whether it comes to the supplementary school, the day school or an area where training is practically non-existent like early childhood education, particularly in the JCC center. I think we could either offer an example of a program for on-the-job training or a module for on-the-job training. It could range from Mrs. Melton's mini-school for professional staff of JCCs, which is now taking place in several communities throughout the United States, or an intensive program at one of the existing training institutions during the summer or in Israel, or combinations thereof. Here, the ideas of Twersky that summer institutes at places like Harvard in subject matter, or the use of Judaic programs, for example the University of Seattle, the University of Washington in Seattle is now doing some of this work. It means the use of community resources like the Judaic programs for the sake of Jewish education.

This then could be combined with, again as we did with in our concept of building the training institutions with schools of education and Judaic departments. Thus, you could run at Harvard a program during the summer between the educators -- that is the school of education people and the Judaic program -- on the teaching of Bible. This is not off the walls, because there was such a program in moral education for Jewish education at Harvard over a few summers. (At some point we're going to have to take a decision between nuggets, teasing and a systematic approach.)

The whole area of training will require that we undertake "research" ranging from 1) visiting training institutions and seeing what they have to offer. 2) Encouraging the training institutions to build their visions (how much of this has already been encouraged by Wexner we ought to find out and we ought to bring Wexner into this picture). 3) Looking at the discussion and literature in general education. 4) Looking at best practice in general education and Jewish education. And here general education is not only in the United States. Some of the more interesting things have been done in England. 5) Creative new ideas which have to be systematically considered like the ones that we have suggested for building training institutions where we make combinations between the Wigodas, the roshei yeshivas, and the Beverly Gribitz - I refer to the first iteration.

I think that is enough for training at the present moment.

Profession Building

Here I think our earlier conversations are useful. We spoke about the demonstration site idea and suggested the following steps:

1. Go into a city like St. Louis and do a survey of what are the current positions in education, full and part-time.
2. Do another study of the optimal number of positions. This might involve creating positions that don't exist like the director of a pedagogic center, a director of in-service education, specialist in Bible education, adding additional positions for the day school in order to do the job more effectively.
3. We talked about then building a matrix, which would make it possible to think of advancement not being only linear -- that is, a teacher, a head teacher, assistant principal, principal -- but around specialties as well. This of course will involve us in the whole literature on lead teacher and the empowerment of teachers.
4. A whole section on the empowerment of teachers and different conceptions of administration is important here. People like Beiler and others should be encouraged to study this matter. The field of general education is strong on this, and there's almost nothing like this in Jewish education at all. This would be a real hidush for Jewish education.
5. Then we come to all the benefits like salary, vacations, sabbaticals, and pensions, health plans, etc. This matter should carefully be studied and here, Eli Evans' ideas about a national pension plan ought to be considered.

6. The issue of status cannot be glossed over so quickly. Neither Lipset's position, that status is almost impossible to develop, to the glib ones of giving prizes. It might be though that when you do enough things, quantity turns into quality. We ought to think about this carefully and systematically and ask ourselves in addition to salary and benefits and some externals that we came come up with quickly -- what happens when you put together money, visits to Israel, prizes, a new vision of a profession, lead teacher, etc. Is there a point where enough of these can make a difference in terms of status?

7. Both in terms of status and otherwise, the notion of collegality and building the profession by virtue of at least creating a strong in-group would become very important here. And the kind of culture that would be created here. We see what things like the Jerusalem Fellows and Senior Educators can mean. The mere development of professional seminars, journals, trips, conferences, etc. are not to be minimized. Again, the concept of when all of these are put together what takes place. Certainly, any of these done would be an advance on the existing.

This of course brings us to the planning issues of how much money is available, how much money might be available, what is the proper mix between vocational, avocational, older people that are brought into the field, part-time people, full-time people, lead teacher, etc.

In a demonstration center we could work out a model of how these

things might be combined and then begin to price it. This is the kind of thinking of course which is both likely to impress and frighten commissioners.

Another point I'd like to make under profession building is the whole question of content and its impact on the profession. Content has effected the yeshiva world and contact effected the rabbinate at a certain point in American Jewish life. They still may be attracting first-rate people. It ought to be investigated. It certainly has attracted people to the field of Judaic. What if the content here were raised to the level of innovative thinking and practice in the area of fields like character education, saving Jewish continuity, etc. And if the demonstration center offered real reason to be able to make such claims.

Retention

Though I agree with you that retention probably belongs within profession-building, it certainly deserves a special chapter in our work. By that I mean the question of burn-out, turnover, etc. ought to one first be investigated to see what the score is; 2) to do some more work like Ukeles has done about what are the reasons for the turnover and the burn-out; and 3) to see whether it is sabbaticals, seminars, loving-care, etc. that makes the difference. In any event, we don't have to eliminate this category of retention yet at this point, but rather indicate how elements of training and profession-building are likely to be most relevant toward the retention of people at this time.

The relationship of best practice to vision is something we will have to deal with this entire option of personnel -- that is, when are we talking about best practice (since very little of the stuff has really proved itself either in general education or Jewish education) and when are we talking about vision. And I think we ought to be upfront about this, but yet indicate why the ii could both force-manage and close the feedback loop to sufficiently, so that we could really learn how to do this.

We will need a section or an approach to the programmatic options as related to personnel. They can either be handled as a tease, or we can choose upfront several of them and indicate how we will show how the programmatic options will be served in the demonstration site through the option of personnel. Another possibility is a combination of both approaches.

We have to some way indicate how this is not going to be a smorgasbord, a whole string of good ideas, or elements of vision or competing visions or different visions but rather that part of the contribution of a demonstration site will be the overall game plan (curricular approach, philosophy) that will guide the entire experiment at the demonstration site. It is at this point that I think we're going to have to be sure that we include the importance of philosophy and goals as they will be re-introduced into the demonstration site, and the concept of research and evaluation that Hirschhorn and others are pushing for. In other words, the demonstration site will encourage or force us, or

whatever way you want to put it, to develop a philosophy of education, to carefully take the steps from philosophy to practice of evaluating practice in a sophisticated way, and thus beginning to come up with questions like -- what works -- and to begin the public debate in America about what are alternative, authentic conceptions of Jewish education, what are their justifications, and how likely are they to work, and how are they working.

In terms of the outcome of the meeting as well as the running of the meeting, questions such as taskforces as a result of the meeting is something that we're going to have to consider. And we'll also have to take a stand toward the issue of research and planning.

We owe Joe Ringler a response to his suggested papers, and this somehow relates to what we're talking about here -- I think we'd better get to him about this soon.

Relationship to the II

One of the things I think we might want to indicate is that in Jewish education and in general education there has been a separation between the development of ideas and theory (the university) -- those who implement (school systems, schools, etc.) -- and those who do evaluation which may be universities or research outfits or governmental agencies or something like that. This may be one of the reasons why education cannot advance as

much as it would like to.

SECOND ITERATION

1. If we had the word "draft" listed across all our previous papers, then this one should have the notion of work in progress emphasized as compared to the idea of draft.
2. The entire approach should be one of Mandel saying -- this is what we have learned from you as we have interviewed you, and we have learned it from two sources -- either from commissioners or from experts. And the two can be interspersed.
3. We might reformulate the connection between community and personnel, not really in content, but in form. It could include ideas like this: The community is poised but needs hope; it needs encouragement or ideas that are convincing, that will be translated into programs or success. On the other hand, personnel needs to know that "daf hadash" "edan hadash", but that it really is so and not just rhetoric. And another formulation of the same thing is what is required to do anything, ideas that are worthy and able to inspire the community and personnel. They will have to respond to the community's concern for continuity. Stated another way, the community would respond if the ideas are likely to lead to a meaningful Jewish continuity.
4. Assuming that Hank is correct, that there is a different kind of situation out there now, then the community will be ready to undertake a reasonable gamble on things that might work. If XXXX. If they believe that the ideas could and would be implemented (this of course is the basis for the idea of an ii, which we should present later on in the document).
5. Similarly, people could be recruited, if Jewish education would lead (in their eyes) to a meaningful Jewish continuity. In other words, if they believe that there is a new Jewish education -- they might come on board.
6. Therefore ideas would have to be developed into programs demonstrated, improved, evaluated and policies developed. (One possibility is now to go ahead entirely with ideas and merely deal with those, and leave demonstration site -- that is the place where the ideas would be acted out on -- till after you have developed the ideas, and then go into the ii, which would include the way you would do it.) So in that set-up, we deal with all the ideas first, and whatever approach we undertake -- and I'll return to that in a moment -- first, and then we go on to demonstration site, where we deal with matters like the connection of local to national, and all the other points that have already been made in the material that Annette has written. And then go on to who would do it -- the ii. And there, the issue among others would be not where, but who and what functions would be carried out and a indication that this entire approach of force-mangement, fine-tuning, etc. anyway you want to put it --

is missing in education. (The approach could then be -- are there ideas? Or Mandel asked us to find out whether there are ideas. And the answer is a resounding yes -- and then we go on to give examples.) (Some -- we found them in conversations with commissioners, we found them in conversations with experts, we found them in the programmatic areas, we found them in the enabling areas).

Back to the numbers:

1. Some are ideas that are promising but need a great deal of work (under training, this could be the idea we have for yeshiva, it could be lead teacher, it could be on-the-job training).

2. Some ready to be tried, but only need a setting or an infrastructure (some of these could be Twersky, early childhood education, the media -- why they don't work, even though the idea is good).

3. Some are to be found in best practice (what's going on in Pasadena, what's going on in the day school).

4. All of them have to be put together differently (combinations, game plans, a logic, a principle to how they are put together).

5. Some are research questions (recruitment).

6. All need to be evaluated (Hirschhorn's argument).

7. All will have to be articulated as goals.

8. Indicate how in a demonstration site, you would recruit, train, build a profession and retain (use programmatic examples such as the supplementary school).

9. Then after you have developed the ideas in whatever form you have and by whatever principle, you then go on to say that this would be put together in a demonstration site. And then go on to why something must do it, e.g. the ii.

NOTES

1. We have to keep the macro, the systemic in mind. Hence, you'd move from demonstration site to diffusion; hence, the local-national connection; hence, the need for an ii.

2. All 4 (recruitment, training, profession-building, retention) have to be handled simultaneously -- the Koshinsky argument -- but how do you do it? That ought to be a formulation.

3. The enabling options will have to be acted out through and with the programmatic options.

4. How do you decide which programmatic to undertake?

a. In each demonstration center they will decide, at any given moment, as a result of impact and ease of doing. (This should be formulated as we were asked by the commissioners who will you decide which programmatic. But a demonstration site would indicate, or demonstrate the point of that putting all these things together in one place, even though they would be different in each place, in the light of the particular situation, the available money, their decision about impact and ease of doing -- what really was available in terms of staff, training institutions availability, etc. -- would, despite all this, a demonstration site would be a proof of the whole being greater than the sum of its parts, and this because of the notion of game planning).

5. What we're really saying here is that we're suggesting a different structure; namely, in response to Evans' challenge the question was -- is there anything that can be done; are there ideas? The answer is: we checked, and we found out there are. Then, the state of the ideas are -- and we create principles from promising to clear. And then we handle those ideas either through the enabling options only, or through enabling and programmatic and some combination. Then we go on to demonstration center where it would be put together; and then we go on to ii.

6. Relate the whole paper to the outcomes that we want, both the progress report and the presentations.

7. MLM's other ii goals that we list in our minutes have to somehow be interwoven.

8. We're going to have to check this whole approach to both the minutes and the letter we send him, to MLM.

9. MLM's introduction should be woven in, namely, he could say things like -- I sent staff to discover are there ideas; or, this is a time rich with ideas.

10. Call Barry Shrage and check his idea about the savings plan for Israel, and ask how much it would cost nationally or in a city. The reason for this is that then we might be able to say -- if Bronfman saturated a demonstration site with everything that could be done about Israel, including the fact that every child would go -- because of the saving plans -- how much would this cost for the United States? It also would mean that this is a place where you would try everything you knew about Israel, about the teaching of Israel, from the training of staff to the proper use of shlichim, to the proper use of the Israel Experience.

11. The issue of money -- that is, how much is available -- has to be investigated.

12. The question of money is a very different one after success, after a demonstration site has succeeded, after a given idea has succeeded, compared to before success.

13. Taskforces as outcomes.

14. We probably have to write Mort Mandel's book now, not after we get to the States, since it would be part of the script of the day.

15. We should choose our ideas on the basis of what commissioners have actually said, e.g. Bronfman -- saving plan, Israel; Evans -- media; Ackerman -- early childhood; Twersky -- on-the-job training and the use of Judaic departments for summer institutes; Hirschhorn -- evaluation and goal-setting, etc.

16. I want to emphasize again that this time the approach is one of work-in-progress and not that of draft.

18. Go over my notes on the sides of the other documents, such as the relationship of the Israel Experience to the family; such as the fact that we ought to look at institutions like Akiva Academy in relationship to the Israel Experience and see what works, how much it costs, etc.

17. We may have to put some point in about developing a method of choosing between ideas in terms of their acceptability, dependability, when they can be acted upon, who would decide how they would be acted upon, etc.

10X19
(on 4FAX-W)
May 17, 1990

Hello Dena,

We believe David and you will need the following materials with you over the week-end to be able to work on chapter four:

- * The background materials to all five commission meetings
- * Dena's re-write of chapter 4

Warm Regards,

p.s. We have just received Twersky's materials and are enclosing it. The second page appears to disagree with those concerned about continuity. We think it could and should be included in one of two ways: either as a way to explain that we are aiming for "meaningful continuity" and not merely "continuity" - or as another point of view, indicating that the Commission was responding to both those worried about continuity and to those who have a deep faith that we would never disappear.

This may fit in very well with what Scheffler and Fox are dealing with in the paper on the relationship between Jewish education and Jewish continuity. More on that later.

CHAPTER 4

Dear David and Dena,

We've been doing a good deal of thinking about what should happen after chapter 3. Here is what we would like to suggest:

We are no longer sure that there is a need for anyone to go through the history of the Commission. Why does what took place at any one particular meeting make any difference in this text? We are suggesting to consider dropping the history of the meetings.

On the other hand, after you have described the state of the field in chapter three, what is called for is to indicate how the Commission could "put its arms" around such an immense problem.

Before suggesting how to do this we would like to point out that although many topics appear both in chapter 4 and in chapter 5 there is a major difference in the way they are treated in both chapters.

In the present chapter -- chapter 4 -- we need to explain how the plan, how the ideas, represent a convincing response to the problem described in chapter 3 -- the state of the field. In chapter 5 we need to argue for how the ideas are realistic and can be implemented. Chapter 4 thus might be "the Commission's plan" or "the Commission's response" while chapter 5 would be "the implementation of the plan".

Our suggestion is the following:
CHAPTER 4: THE COMMISSION DEVELOPS A PLAN

In Chapter 3, we indicated that the Commission learned what the state of the field of Jewish education was. What was the Commission's response?

The Commission's response was to recognize that there were many different areas in which improvement could be made. In fact, the Commissioners suggested 26 such different areas (see background materials -- December 13, 1988 -- you may want to list the areas - see page 15 of February 14 document) . There was no way to choose amongst them, because almost every one of these areas, or all of these areas, were important. One could have devoted an entire commission to early childhood; one could have devoted an entire commission to the college-age; one could have devoted an entire commission to adult education. (many commissions in general education have devoted a full commission to a specific topic such as adolescence or early childhood.)

How could the Commission decide amongst them?

They recognized that there were some matters that were basic, that were pre-conditions, or as you are now going to call them "building blocks" upon which everything else -- any improvement in Jewish education -- depended. These are personnel and the community.

Why personnel? It was discovered that there was a shortage of talented, dedicated, trained personnel for every single area. It made no difference whether it was early childhood, the

supplementary school, the day school, the preparation of curriculum materials, the introduction of media for Jewish education. Each one of these suffered from a shortage of trained, qualified, dedicated personnel.

Secondly, it was clear that every program suffered from a lack of sufficient funds, and if you wanted to make a difference in Jewish education you were going to have to change the community's attitude toward Jewish education, the ambience, the environment, and this could only be done if outstanding community leaders were recruited for Jewish education, if they put Jewish education at the top of the priority list of the Jewish community, and raised the necessary funds.

Furthermore, it was discovered early on that these two building blocks, personnel and the community, were interrelated or inseparable -- namely, you could only recruit outstanding community leaders if they felt that they would work with talented dedicated personnel. On the other hand, you would not be able to attract the right kind of personnel unless they felt that the Jewish community was going to empower them and make it possible for them to make a difference. So, these two things are interrelated. (see the background materials for June 14 1989 - particularly p.6)

The question then arose: how are you going to address personnel and the community? These were not new issues. A strategy was

developed that included the following elements:

1. Both had to be addressed simultaneously
2. They are interrelated
3. The Commission wants to have across-the-board impact.
4. etc.. see June 14 document, executive summary page ii.

Furthermore we were going to do it in at least two ways. We are going to learn how to do it, and demonstrate it in lead communities (you have described Lead Communities effectively in chapter 5. It is also presented on pages 18 to 24 of the February 14 materials. The working assumptions -- pages 18/19 -- may also be important for this purpose) In the Lead Communities we are going to both learn and demonstrate how to affect change through working with the two building blocks of personnels and the community. You have covered this in chapter 5 effectively.

Next, we were going to do this on the national (always US and Canada) level and in all communities throughout the country by virtue of raising consciousness about Jewish education throughout the community by recruiting more top leaders, and that also is picked up in Chapter 5.

As to personnel: our approach differs from all previous approaches since we are suggesting to addressing the problem

through four elements simultaneously -- recruitment, training, profession building and retention. This means building the training institutions, this means a serious recruitment plan, this means a new conception of profession, this means higher salaries, etc. No longer is the issue to be dealt with in a piecemeal fashion. Some communities have only raised salaries and have been disappointed by not achieving significant results. Attempts at improving training failed to attract candidates for lack of attractive position or because no recruitment effort was undertaken. We believe a comprehensive approach has far more chances to succeed.

Following these steps the question became " granted that these are good ideas (e.g. dealing with the building blocks and demonstration through lead communities) who is going to do it? The answer to that is the center, or a Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education. (Remember the Commission committed itself to implement its ideas the day it completed its report (end of your chapter 2).

Now the Jewish community will not undertake this program on faith. Too little is known about the effectiveness of investments in Jewish education. The Commission's plan will have to be carefully monitored and evaluated. Moreover, as part of its plan the Commission will initiate the establishment of a research capability in North America -- one or more research facilities to produce the kind of research and data needed to begin to answer key questions about which we don't know enough, and to monitor

and evaluate the work done in the Lead Communities

Now the programmatic options, which were very important to commissioners, were going to be treated through lead communities and by virtue of the funding program that is being picked up by the various foundations. This you also have picked up in Chapter 5.

Therefore, the Commission developed the following plan and recommendations (February 14 materials pages 4 and 5).

1. How to come to grips with the problem
(Do we say anything about the richness of the Commission and the consequent difficulty -- e.g., scholars and lay people).
 2. Before first meeting, MO -- interviews; later -- plenum and small groups.
 3. Even at first meeting considered the realities of Jewish education -- its scope. It was clear that there were many areas that needed improvement, ranging from improving supplementary schools to early childhood, to fixing roofs. In fact, at the very first meeting -- 26 options.
 4. List ideas.
 5. How could Commission choose amongst them?
 6. In searching for the answer to this question, they were able to decide because it became clear that there were certain pre-conditions, certain fundamental issues -- we were later to call them building blocks.
- Another way, there was a way to cut into this complex problem.
7. Justify the building blocks and describe them -- I think quotes are important.

8. Furthermore, the Commissioners recognized that these building blocks were inter-related.

9. However, they would not give up on the programmatic -- Eli Evans, how could you enter the 21st century; how could you ignore the college-age?

10. They also asked what could we do about these building blocks that would make a difference (conferences, many papers, etc.).

11. Answer:

a. By doing it, by doing it with sufficient scope (so many experiments and innovations in education have failed because the scope was not sufficient, there wasn't enough money, there wasn't enough energy for the implementation).

b. By being sufficiently comprehensive.

c. By doing it -- lead community.

12. Define lead community -- from best practice to diffusion.

13. Understood that lead community involved programmatic.

14. Research -- accompanied us from the beginning, but became the central issue at the 4th meeting.

15. Programmatic.

16. Who would do it, because the Commission was determined to act.

17. Entity -- mechanism -- IJE -- Council.

18. The functions of the Council.

19. At the fifth meeting the Commission summarized its work, agreed on an action plan and the following recommendations.

20. Should we go by meetings:

- a. How to decide on an agenda -- 26 options
- b. Building blocks
- c. Lead community
- d. Research and action plan and council (funding)
- e. Action plan and recommendations (funding)

Demonstration is required in Jewish education today for several different reasons:

1. This is a moment where people have to see that significant, great, impressive things can be done in Jewish education. Many people do not believe it -- both lay people and professionals -- for different reasons -- number 1.

2. We have now discovered that there are institutions that people have either given up about, or don't see the great potential of. The demonstration would make all the difference. They range from the supplementary school, where people were ready to close the show down, and now we see that there are successful supplementary schools, and if you add the vision ideas and best practice to it -- who knows what can be.

3. There are great opportunities, which if you did with demonstration, just waiting to be developed; e.g., the early childhood program or the Israel Experience program, where the minute you scratch the surface, you see enormous possibilities.

4. The field of Jewish education needs demonstration. They are burnt out, they are depressed, etc. You have to fire them up. They have to be shown that something can be done.

5. The world of scholarship is ready to make its contribution to demonstration.

Those are all the reasons why you need demonstration today, besides everything else that we talked about.

How would you say that? You'd say it by the following way:

We have learned in our conversations with commissioners and other experts that what is truly need, what is needed at this time, is the demonstration of what can be in Jewish education. This period or the year of the work of the Commission has been a source of great encouragement, one might almost say excitement in discovering places, instances, programs that themselves are very promising and sources of encouragement. Educators like that who are sources of encouragement, etc. Ideas that are like that. There is every reason to believe that this a moment, if we carefully plan, where these things could be put together and you could show a kind of Jewish education that only the very few believe can be. Now this is still very clumsy, but give me --

One of the ways that you could possibly pick up the concept prototype without mentioning it -- because prototype is really a major article that I have to write -- is to say the following: The kind of community action site that will be built, the kind of demonstration that will be created, will require the very careful development of what of what exists are you introducing, what is

experimentation that you're introducing, how do you plan it, and how do you test it out. And we'll have to make a clear distinction to the learned between this and demonstration without using big words.

Research Capacity:

The most shocking thing for us in this entire work with the Commission was to discover that we know nothing. Examples: we don't know what parents want, we don't know if there's a market. Commissioners told us that -- we don't know if there is; we don't know what salaries are, we don't know what is being spent, we don't know whether it works. Commissioners are furious, whether they be Arnow or Hirschhorn or Lipset, about this situation. There is no way that a serious effort can be undertaken now. It will fail without research. 2) The commissioners won't let you do it without research. Therefore, let us pick the areas that we are using as examples and indicate from the quality to the quantity to various strategies to impact to market, and indicate why a continuing database has to be built, plus the evaluation business.

Number 2, there is no training in Jewish education anywhere in the world. There is no scholarship; there is no academic field without research. They will not be training institutions; you will not attract people to the field unless you make it into a profession. Profession means research.

A NOTE FOR THE DISCUSSION GUIDE & GAME PLAN

1. I think Mort Mandel has to begin by describing how it all came together and what the final product will be. That means, how we moved -- it's really an elaboration of what we wrote in the letter and in the report -- which is that we went from options to community action site to conception of final report, which will have an agenda for programmatic options; it will have community action sites and all the elements of the final report. Indicating vision -- Hank is right about this -- and best practice, but indicating why we're ready for an action plan today.

In other words, he's really got to give Annette's story of two sides to a chart, or an outline. One is final report; the other is action plan. He's got to say -- and make it clear to them -- that there is going to be plenty of time to discuss the final report -- that's why we're having two more meetings -- in one of which will be fully devoted to the recommendation of the final report and the other is to the adopting the final report. (I don't know if he should say there's going to be 2 more meetings.) Just that there will be plenty of time to review it.

Now, then he comes to tell them that this document that you had, had a logic to it. I'd like to review the logic that guides this document; and then he should take then the logic, which really is the logic that's been developed 15 times here -- that you have the question of who is going to do it all after you decide on community action site, and dealing with the programmatic options

as well as the others. So he has to review a little bit about how you're going to deal with them in a community action site, and then he goes on to what community action site is.

Then he should take them through each of the points on the first page -- the 7 points -- and say a few words about each one of them. Mobilizing the community -- he should say something about the 3-pronged approach and Hank's assumption which is that you have to have something to speed up the process. Developing strategies for building the profession -- there he should say, as our researchers begin to work it looks like some of the following his very clear -- and he should begin to tip his hands on recommendations, however he can he should. One, two, three, four and five are full of recommendations and he should say so. It looks like -- both from our interviews with you and the research -- I don't think I have to give you any examples on this. But just for the sake of the tape, when it comes to developing programmatic options, that's where we put in the one on early childhood -- and he might even put it up on the board, on the slide. When it comes to developing strategies on a continental level, that's where he should answer Evans all the way --- by virtue of indicating how the training institutions have got to be built, how seminars have got to be built at Harvard, how all kinds of different programs of beefing up the continental has got to take place.

When it comes to developing community action sites, we should

have to beef that one up a little bit too. But of the profession there, we've got the recruitment, training and profession-building -- all as examples, and we should refer to Isa's research.

Now we come to the discussion guide. Then he should finish up by saying: all of this seems to raise the following issues -- and then he should list the issues, and that is -- this is just my first time around -- in mobilizing the community, we think that the following three; it is our opinion that the following 3 areas (3-pronged approach) are the issues. This assumes, 1, 2, 3. We need input on this. 2. When it comes to building the profession, it already appears that A, B, C, and that therefore we would have to do, D, E and F. We would have to invest in the training institutions; we'd have to start working with them now. Is this really the direction that we're going.

Community action sites -- it is true that we are going to have to have a group that's going to have to sit down and figure out what a community action site is. And when we get the IJE folks, I'll tell you more about that; I'll say more about that. No condescending talk.

But right now, it looks like one institution is too small; a whole community is very exciting -- we have to find out whether we can do it, and what are the criteria for a community. But, these are the kinds of issues that somebody is going to have to figure out.

Now when it comes to the continental level and Israel -- again, that we need your input on that. He's got to see to it that the key factor is (7) -- the mechanism for implementation -- so all the other stuff has got to be preliminary; even in the formulation of the questions, it can't be a set-up -- so it can't be 50% of the questions, but it could be 30-40% of the questions should be based on that.

I think that's the thing. So we're really talking about a 4-page set of notes for Mandel; and a one and a half page maximum -- discussion guide.

FOR PART ON THE MECHANISM FOR IMPLEMENTATION

We ought to concentrate on the functions -- what needs to be done, rather than on the mechanism. In other words, we should begin by saying -- these are the things that need to be done; and let the commissioners say -- well somebody has to do this. So let's set up a mechanism. That does not mean that we don't put it under the heading "mechanism" but it means that the discussion concentrates on for example, research, data collection, planning, policy analysis has to be done; for example: we need to set criteria for the selection of community action sites. Somebody has to determine what is the best process for selecting the community action sites. There is a very heavy community interface, community facilitation function, that somebody will have to deal with. Eli Evans, for example, illustrates some of the difficulties of going into communities. Well, who is going to smooth things over, deal with them? Who is going to offer carrots and sticks to make cooperation fruitful? One has to deal with funding facilitation, etc.

The key to the issue of personnel is building the profession. The profession will be built if dedicated people believe that through Jewish education they can effect the future of the Jewish people. There are some dedicated people today -- very few of them -- and those will have to be enlarged and some of those who are dedicated and not trained -- will have to be trained.

What will it take to get more good people, more appropriate people, more talented people to decide to go into the profession of Jewish education? The first is, the understanding that a new era is beginning for Jewish education; that ideas, creativity will be given a chance; that they will be able to make a difference. So in a sense one could almost say that the success on the community level is the key to recruitment. The key to building the profession.

The elements of status for educators are not only being respected in the conventional sense of being respected, but rather being recognized as the people who are going to save the Jews. So it means that the Jewish community when it says that Jewish education is the top priority, and sets in motion things like community action sites and makes it possible for programmatic options to be acted upon in a creative and new way; when it makes it possible for experimental schools to be established -- it is changing dramatically the status of the field. It is in a sense giving to them, what in a place like Israel, the status you gave to halutzim or to Tzahal. So the first question is -- what is the image that the Jewish community is projecting for the future? This is translated into action by virtue of being able to point that the talk is being acted upon. So, to give you an example: you can talk about recruiting people to be Ramah directors, when Ramah is a very exciting place. And then in addition to it, you create the position called "full-time director."

So if you say there are -- the new Jewish education has 30 different positions that never existed before -- for example, it has educational planners. That has a double message, educational planners: it says 1) this field is big enough and needs planning. It also says that someone who is a person who wants to be a planner and cares about the Jewish people can make his contribution through planning. So the very notion of creating a position of educational planner responds to 3 issues at once: it's a new position, it brings into the field, it opens it up for new kinds of people, it also means that planning will characterize the new Jewish education, and the impact of planning will be felt.

I could do that obviously more easily than planning by talking about the fact that you would make managers professionalized. If you said that principals either studied administration or got something in a serious way -- or we created a combination with business schools, or business schools produced your top managers -- you're taking administration very seriously.

Then the more obvious examples of all the positions that don't exist if Jewish education was to be serious. So, the positions you're talking about are: special education -- the fact that 12% of the population falls into special education and there are no special educators, people in special education; or that the early childhood people are people who are not only underpaid, but the specialization is not considered serious; or that informal educators who are experts in Judaica are just beginning to emerge; or that camping has regressed as a full-time position instead of increased; or that the arts or museums hardly exist; or that specialists in adolescent education or by age groups don't exist -- all this is what is counter-productive.

Now turn it on its head and say: supposing you said you're going to build all these professions, that the Jewish community is going to break this whole thing wide open and there's 37 different kinds of jobs, and you did it in a community action site -- it's not merely that you announce that you did it -- and then you began to produce in the training institutions places that specialized and did it. So for example, you could simultaneously say there is going to be -- the community cares -- proof? There's money, there are new positions, these new positions you can see in a real-life situation in community action sites, and you can be trained for them at Yeshiva or at Harvard or at the Hebrew University. All those put together -- and they are, I hate to sound trite -- are organically connected -- is what makes a profession different than what it is today.

The extent to which the attack on a profession requires a macro view or an attack all across all of the fronts can be demonstrated by virtue of even the para-professionals. If para-professionals were trained and you had some kind of standards for them -- and they could move from para-professional to professional, you not only meet the problem of numbers of people, but you also do something for the profession. Because you say: if you go to school for 3 weeks before you come in to be a para-professional, and then you go once a week -- then you're a para-professional. You want to move from para-professional to category number 1 of professional -- you go to Israel for 6 summers. You want to become professional -- you go to a teacher training college. The salary for a para-professional is this; and the status that he gets, because he is contributing like a nurse is to saving people's lives. You want to become a head nurse, or you want to go to medical school -- these are the things you have to do.

So the point has to be that your funding and your privileges and your training have to be viewed across the board. And one of the things -- another one of the things that a community action site is going to do is figure out how you do this, and together with the training institutions and the other experts, we'll be able to figure out what will it take to carry out such a program.

What I'm saying is that the show-stopper of status is not such a

show-stopper. Status can be broken down into very specific things that are not trite. For example: what power would you have at a given category in Jewish education; what opportunity would you have for experimentation; how will your experimentation be monitored by the community so that you can get recognition for it; what funds will be available for that; what collegiality will be offered to all the people that are trying to revolutionize family education; how many times will you go to Israel; what kind of conferences will there exist; what kind of publications will there be; what kind of pure recognition will there be; will it be clear that not everybody can talk about Israel Experience programs, that only people that have been trained and who have done something.

Then the issues of salary should accompany that, not the other way around. And so status becomes what you've done, plus the way your colleagues respond to you, plus the money available, plus your role which your peers and a networking, plus the fact that the community recognizes that your network is important and makes money available, plus the fact that you have therefore received the following salary for it. It even includes things like the fact that you are trainer of para-professionals.

Here's what I'm saying to Lipsett who says you'll never the lick the status problem is: first of all, we're looking at it the wrong way. If the competition is Wall Street or a lawyer versus a Jewish educator -- then we've got the wrong terms. The answer is a salary she ho mechubad to the people that deserve it; but a lot of other things that lawyers don't get. Such as, the fact that you are working not with "x" but you're working with those things that are going to save the Jewish people, that you feel that, that you say that, that your peers feel that, and that the Jewish community recognizes that.

The motivation for Wall Street is money and power. The motivation for medicine, ala Arrowsmith, is saving people's lives. The motivation for people in this field is going to be -- are you going to save the Jewish people. That's the motivation. Now those people who get turned-on and moved by that, are your pool. In that pool there are many people who are among the best people in the world. They don't come to us because a) they don't believe this; b) they don't know it; c) they have to have evidence for it; and d) they can't starve.

The real issue before the Jewish people is: to what extent are we determined to massively deal with the question of Jewish survival, of a meaningful Jewish survival. When that becomes the major issue, then those people who care about that deeply are going to be attracted. There are two kinds of people who are going to be attracted -- three kinds of people who are going to be attracted: those lay-leaders whom this drives them nuts, like Jesselson on one side and like Crown on the other -- for different reasons; those academics who are Jewish academics, but are deeply Jewish and are different than those people who are experts in Shakespeare, but they care about the future of the

Jewish people and the transmission of their stuff; and those educators who want to be the front-line soldiers to save the Jews. That is the issue.

So the question is: whether it be at the beginning of the report, in the issue of personnel -- the key question is -- not how do we raise this to the top of the list of our priorities -- but how do we make happen that in Mort's terms, a total war on this topic is undertaken. And we're going to have to find more elegant, more refined terms for that. Something along the line that the -- I don't know what to say.

2ND TAPE

The question becomes what has to be done if we mean it? Now we have to translate "we mean it" into terms that people will understand. And I think we're talking about what is required to intervene to change the trend lines? What is required to intervene so that you can build a Judaism when you don't have to be Jewish? What is necessary in order to compete? What is necessary in order to win the war? I don't know what the formulation is.

And the answer to that is new kinds of people in all the areas that we talked about. Now those new kinds of people are not going to come unless this really is the issue. If the issue is something like learning a language, or transmitting a culture, or teaching the Jewish religion or Halacha -- all those people who believe in that are there. That is not enough to do the job. Even for those -- you're going to have to create all the conditions we've talked about before.

To handle Hoffman's desire for vision, I think the issue has to be couched in the following terms: there are people, a significant number of people, who deeply care about the future of the Jewish people. They have to be convinced; it has to be demonstrated to them that Jewish education is today where medicine was in 1900. And that is, that Jewish education -- this is Jewish education's problem. The whole frontier is open, from an early childhood education teacher who is going to develop a way to give a child deep emotional experiences that will make up for what he can't get in his family; to a planner that's going to be able to convince the federation that if they properly spend their money, a new educational plan can be established.

In other words, people have got to understand that this is not being a melamed, and that what was previously considered to be a melamed is somebody who saves souls like a psychiatrist.

Starting another way -- you really want to change the trend lines? Then you've got to attack this problem 50 different ways. When the Jewish community decides to attack it 50 different ways, then you have a right to say you're intervening; otherwise it's a joke. Now it cannot be that you're going to fight this war with the boy scouts. So you need 50 different methods of intervention. It means that community centers are a different institution; it means that schools are a different institution; it means that congregations are a different institution. All those places have got to be geared up for it, and the people have got to be invited in to undertake those assignments.

Then, to handle Lamm when he's tired, and to bring him back to his best, you have to show him that there are 10 ideas that Yeshiva University could undertake and that the money will be available. 1) He has to be responsible for an association of 10 new Orthodox dayschools, either in community action sites and certainly beyond community actions sites. What will these Orthodox dayschools be like? First of all, their teachers are

going to get paid higher salaries. Or some of their teachers will get paid higher salaries. Two, all of their teachers are going to study at Yeshiva University every summer and in Israel every other summer. Three, all of their teachers are going to study by teachers from Yeshiva University every Monday afternoon. Four, all of their teachers together with Yeshiva University are going to try out new methods of teaching Bible. Six, there's going to be monitoring of that so they're going to learn from it. Seven, they're going to meet in conferences. Eight, there are going to be journals. Nine, there's going to be ongoing research. Ten, there's going to be a contact between rosh yeshivas who are going to be asked questions on how do you solve these problems as they come up with them. And then they're going to be -- at the end of 3 year's say to the Jewish community -- we just got 20% more kids and 15% more our ... Then they're going to say: how do you move from 15% to 20%?

It means that Yeshiva University is going to get a Jerusalem Fellows program. It means that they're going to have a Morim Beharim program. It means that they're going to have a program to train their faculty. Now that's the way you speak to Yeshiva University. So you unlock their tiredness and depression.

Up until now I've been speaking about how you speak to the people in the field -- to the Arnie Zar-Kesslers out there; and there's so many of them. You say to them: where do you want to be? You want to be in that terrible Hartford, Connecticut where you can't move a god-damn thing in education because of politics? Or do you want to move into a wide-open system that lets you try any crazy idea in the world, including the building of new institutions?

I could go on to the same message to the academic community. I am saying to a psychologist or a sociologist: do you want to try new methods of character education -- that's what the Jews care about. I am saying to the professors of Bible -- do you want your ideas talked to large numbers of people? That's what Jewish education is going to make possible. So, if you're teaching at Yale University, there is one thing -- developing your ideas; there is the other thing, of your getting someone who is going to make those ideas popular to, or known to, lots of people.

Let's go into recruitment now.

XXX this image versus the present image. Grating this P.R. story, versus the present P.R. story. Granting role models in the field. Now you come to high school kids and you get them at USY, at NIFTY, in America, in their schools, in their community centers, in their visits to Israel -- and you hand pick one out of 50, and you say: you have been invited to join the Mandel Fellows; you have been invited to join the people who are going to save the Jews, the boy-scouts of the Jewish people -- I don't know what. And you begin to bring them to seminars. This is a group of people who are being identified for service to the Jewish people. As LTF was thought of. They are picked out at whatever age your market study and your academics tell you is smart. Is it 16? Is it 14? I don't know what.

If you start out with 50, out of those 50 by the time you get to college you're still, with your computer, working with 6. Those 6 that you're working with are dealt with anywhere from correspondence to --

Another population are the Judaic study students. We have to assume every single one of them as being somehow interested. They can either end up in Jewish education or as important leaders of the community later.

Similar to the people who are studying education or the social sciences that are Jews. Those we have every right to compete for them, just like the businesses compete for people. There are Jewish organizations which have -- the National Council of Jewish Women has 100 women, 100,000 women. Those women want to work. Is 1% of them candidates for being trained for Jewish education? These are all college graduates. Hadassah has got 400,000 women. The community center has got 1 million members. How many of those adults are candidates. The congregations have got adults. Why isn't a major recruitment effort made for all of those people?

Now, we can then go on to all the question of geometry -- changers and people who will be re-tooled. The important factor is that nobody has thought of it this way and all of this has got to be guided by two things: thinking -- market studies, which will inform us as to how to go about this. And that becomes one of the top priorities.

Now for you and me -- just to say thinking in market study and planning is enough. For them, we will need all those other things to inspire them to think that there's a chance that the thinking and market study will come out with something.

The task here then is, if we take an example like the National Council of Jewish Women: 1) to do a survey and find out, or I don't know what the hell it's called -- a market study -- and find out is there a population; hard-nosed as can be; then there's a hard-nosed decision that there is a population -- then you begin to take 50 of them and you begin to do in-depth work with them. It may be in-depth work of further discussion with them. Then you begin to train them; then you begin to unleash them in a community action site, or some other such place. All of a sudden you've got a program -- the National Council of Jewish Women in XXXX -- which says: we are going to begin to produce leadership for Jewish education, or people for Jewish education. Similarly with Hadassah etc.

By the way -- dealing with the National Council of Jewish Women -- has a lot of different reasons, a lot of different purposes. First of all you're going to save them; number 2, what you are now doing -- is that's what it means to get the whole community involved. You are saying: how can I get any organization that's relevant -- which never thought of its mission as doing something like this -- into the act? And what you're now saying is that

Hadassah and the National Council of Jewish Women -- whose only thought of Jewish education might have been how are we going to teach our women a little bit of Jewish history -- all of sudden see as one of their purposes the war on Jewish survival, for Jewish survival.

(This whole issue of identifying new pools and researching, the market research and the survey -- belongs on the research agenda too.)

3RD TAPE

I want to say another word about the context.

I think that we've got to find some way for the message to be that whatever your position is about the state of the Jewish people, whether you think it's terrible, or you think it's optimistic -- you have got to produce a massive intervention now. And a massive intervention can't be words. And the kind of massive intervention we're talking about is for the new Jewish education to involve all of the elements that we're talking about.

Now, how we say that -- I'm not sure yet.

Now to move on to training. Training has a lot of elements to it that we want to project in this report.

First is we have to develop models for training and they don't exist. So what we will have to do in this report is indicate in sketchy form, what such a model would have to include. We'd have to indicate the depth of people and assignments that a training institution would have to undertake, of which none of them come close to it.

Just to give you an example: you just can't -- Bible, Jewish history, Hebrew, etc. -- none of the training institutions have any of those positions today. You have to have people in the area of Jewish sociology, psychology, philosophy, Jewish thought etc. Those people practically don't exist -- they don't even exist in numbers; they don't even exist in specialities. So the first question is merely, like a medical school has got to have professors of clinical medicine -- you have to have "x" number of faculty people and "x" number of specialities. That's number 1.

Number 2: There are areas which have to be covered for the Jewish education. Now, not every institution has to have all of them. But America, the United States, North America has got to have all of them. So, therefore, someone has got to specialize in early childhood; somebody has got to specialize in informal education; somebody has got to specialize in education; somebody has got to specialize in administration; somebody has got to specialize in curriculum. So all of these things are special ... core.

Then there is the question of who is going to do the research. And who is going to do ... education. And it's to have to go into training institutions. IN order to do this, a massive investment of money has to be made first of all for faculty. Without the faculty -- now there are ways that we know how to do that. First of all, the pool of people to be chosen for faculty are first of all, the professors of the faculty of Judaic -- of the programs of Judaic studies. Then there are school people who could be moved up. Then there are people in general education. Then there are roshei yeshivot. Then there are people in the federation movement. There are people in the JCC movement. These are all people who could be lured into the field of -- for the faculty of

the training institutions.

(It's important to remember that when you do that, you are doing a tremendous job of building the profession, because you're building the top of the profession. And you're indicating that a new kind of person is in this field too. He may be a professor at a training institution.)

So the point is, the training institution has got to be done -- and Israel has got to help with that. And that's a five-year program. And the training institutions have got to be chosen, and the recommendation might even say that over the next 5 years, the following assignments have to be undertaken for the training institutions.

The training institutions, on the other hand, are going to have to make a contribution to the field for many different reasons. A) the only way they can do their job is by being in the field. They will not learn their job except by being in the field. Hence, community action sites and other activities. Finally, they will not get their money if they're -- and support -- if they're not going to be described as institutions that are serving the community.

Now in the short-run, the training institutions will have to be given great sex appeal such as announcing outstanding scholars that are teaching in order for them to attract students in the first, in the short-term before they really get going. I did not include setting norms and standards, because that is a very important thing for us -- but is not going to speak to them very much. So we'll have to put it in -- I don't know how we say it.

By the way, about the training institutions, Aryeh's data will of course make the case so powerful that it will be easy to sell the story.

The training section has got to play a very subtle game between encouraging and reducing the anxiety of the existing institutions -- while at the same time we open up the possibility of new and different approaches. They should range from the Judaica departments in the universities offering seminars like the ones that are given for English teachers at Yale during the summer; to the education departments, like what Stanford is already doing for -- and we probably should describe it the first time around as enrichment -- plus the fact of are consortia necessary, or new institutions that would undertake specific assignments for Jewish education. And I don't think that they will let you put in new institutions in the report.

The use of Israel is crucial in the training. First of all, the present contribution of Israel should be emphasized. Next, the role that Israel can play with existing institutions, such as a year spent in Israel -- the Reform Movement and the Conservative Movement in a certain sense are doing this already. Then the expanded role of Israel, ranging from in-service education, the

CAJE story of teachers complaining -- to the specializations that Israel has to offer. For example: in early childhood.

WE need a five-year development program and we'll have to talk about realistic numbers; it might be tripling the numbers in five years.

The issue of in-service education is no less important than the issue of pre-service or training programs.

All of the various ideas that we have in our papers like fast-tracks for special populations such as the Judaic students; the stipends as financial support -- all of that obviously has to be included in this.

The elite programs like the Jerusalem Fellows will have to be -- several of them will have to be created; they might be created around specific areas, where you decide to invest heavily in early childhood -- and you want to build the top of the field -- they might be created for the professors of academic institutions, they might be created for -- in a more general term, for anybody who is going to take a top. There probably will have to be several of them. And they could or could not be linked with what's going on in Israel.

Retention: Retention in one sense is created by virtue of all the things you did before. Once you deal with the profession in the way that we talked about earlier, and once you begin to give status, and once you introduce in-service education and trips to Israel and sabbaticals -- you've done a lot for retention. I think then we come on to the issue of retention like burn-out, sabbaticals which I've already mentioned, and advancement as well -- that is both vertical and linear. Of course that area has to be studied as well. But I think the retention issue would be dramatically changed once you pick that topic up -- pick the topic up the way I've suggested.

A question is whether yordim deserve a special treatment anywhere in this paper? I don't know. ... come about somehow through Isa's work.

Another section on the community. One of the recommendations for personnel is building a national recruitment, a systematic recruitment plan. It will be based both on thinking and market study, but it will be argued for by virtue of, and encouraged by virtue of the various elements that we have mentioned in the previous tapes.

In-service education is probably as important, if not important, than pre-service and training. There are several reasons for it: the first is that the numbers are greater and it will probably take you 20 years to reach the numbers that you will reach in in-service education with a systematic massive attack in a period of a few years.

Number 2, what goes on in the field shapes enormously your attractiveness to people to join the field. Three, they will make a difference in the existing institutions. Four, it's the morale of the professional etc.

Now there's almost no in-service going on. There's more in-service education and a deeper level going on in people coming from the Golah coming to Israel than there is in the United States. I don't know how many programs there are of -- where people spend more than 2 nights away from home in in-service education. So the role of the bureaus and the role of the training institutions in this, and the role of Israel in this, have to be carefully considered.

In-service training can take place, or should take place, in many different content areas. First of all, there are subject matters: Bible, history, Hebrew, which are critical. Then there are more general things like didactics, parent relationships, family education, the special child, gifted or handicapped; community relations etc. There is no program for principals; nobody trains principals anywhere in America. And the principal is a key person. That's one of the things under personnel that's got to be emphasized -- is the role of a principal and there is no training program in America for principals. Pardon me, I'm wrong, the Seminary has a little one.

The whole question of when we go back to the profession, we have to devote a special section to the supplementary school, which has been completely demoralized. And there full-time positions are not the creating of new ones; it means taking ones that used to be full-time once and re-introducing them. Now if every single supplementary school does not have a full-time professional principal then you have no right to hope that anything will take place in that institution. The question is not how many -- the question is how many additional positions do you need that are full-time. Now therefore, in-service education for principals is crucial -- a) to make those that are not full-time, make those that are not professional, professional; and then the ongoing training of those people. They will -- the principals will kill everything unless they are involved in the innovation. And therefore in-service education of principals is crucial.

You will decide how to formulate your recommendations after you've weeded out the content and put it into its order of importance, but take your stab now anyway.

(We should not forget a specific item in the recommendation -- to provide financial assistance to existing training programs for their expansion and improvement. It could include the endowment of professorships of Jewish education; the teaming up of Israeli and Diaspora institutions; etc.)

In terms of style, it might be that your funding section under community would give all the examples of why you need money -- that that would be the place you would do it, and there you would indicate that you need money for a five-year expansion of

training institutions, for in-service education, etc.

As far as norms and standards I can say: you can do one of 3 things -- they're all bullshit. You can either state that we're going to need to develop norms and standards, which I think is the only thing you can say -- and you can write that in a paragraph instead of 3 words. But the actual norms and standards are going to have to be figured out in some kind of dialectic between what the field can take, versus what is desirable. And there's no sense in saying that you require a Master's degree and the knowledge of Hebrew language of every nursery school teachers -- unless you start doing it on some small scale, maybe you can say that in 5 years.

I have no objection to using ideas like lead-teachers. I think we've got too many promising ideas already. And we gain nothing from that. The ideas of general education, I think we're richer than theirs -- but I have no objection to any idea from general education that could be useful. Instead of talking about empowerment, we've given examples of empowerment.

Entry levels are even worse than norms and standards because the entry level today is anybody who has got two arms and two legs. Therefore, you can talk about entry level in relationship to the way the IJE begins to work. First in a community action site; then to the money available; then to the way you've built the profession.

Under profession building -- ladder of advancement and map of positions are important. I think in the appendix that should be developed as carefully as we can. We might even actually draw an example of a ladder and put the positions in. That it would include and show what that might mean in a mid-sized community.

The Community

Look, the real issue with the community is that the reason why Max Fisher and Mort Mandel and all those guys dealt with Israel is because they saw Israel as the thing that was going to save the Jewish people at that point. They now have to declare themselves and internalize the fact that what the Jewish people and Israel needs today is an informed, committed, Jewish community.

An informed, committed Jewish community should only be one that is -- that understands what Judaism is all about, in whatever conviction a person has. And that is engaged by Judaism, as deeply as we possibly can achieve. Now the way the other great things that the organized Jewish community did or the Jews did was by virtue of top people -- whether it be Albert Einstein, or it be Morgenthau or it be Rosenwald -- it meant rich, powerful, learned, attractive role models who took the leadership roles. Now that is what now has to happen, that the very top of the Jewish community has to say: because the Jewish community today -- our children have not experienced the past, be it the Shoah or the establishment of Israel, and they now live as if everything is halack -- we can lose them all; therefore, the very top have got to make this the concern of the Jewish people.

What does that mean? That means first of all that they devote their time; two, that we get money; three, that every single Jewish organization has got to be viewed as a possible target in several ways. What contribution will it make to this war? So it's not only -- and that's the example that we gave before about the National Council of Jewish Women, seeing its women as potential educators. They have got to be -- we've got to ask ourselves what every single organization -- what role will they play.

Now this starts with the denominations. The way to make Joe's paper meaningful is to ask ourselves: how can we help good shuls become good shuls -- if there is such a concept. And how can we help education be their major assignment, and how can we have every single aspect of their work be influenced by it? Of effected by it?

So this is a general atmosphere that has to be created. If Israel was the word that raised the adrenaline of all Jews, then somehow saving the Jewish people has got to be the slogan, the word, the thing that does it. And we've got to understand that there will not be commitment to Israel unless there are committed Jews. Whether you're talking about aliya or contributions -- this certainly is going to be the factor.

Now the ... that Jewish education has got to build wall-to-wall coalitions or wall-to-wall coalitions have to be built for Jewish education just like -- just like they were built for all emergency efforts in Jewish life -- and just like they were built

in Cleveland for the commission. So, everybody has got to be involved on the attack in Jewish education. And the federation is the ideal convener as they were previously. The central player is the denominations. So those two have -- start out with central concern or central responsibility. But everybody else has got to be involved in the act as well. Besides wall-to-wall coalition we need the Bronfmans and the Mandels. Namely, we need the top leadership to add the spice to the wall-to-wall coalition. We need the Lipsetts who have stayed away from the community because they saw the issue being fundraising and things like that, and get them involved because the issue now is what is going to save the Jewish people. Educators and rabbis have got to have a say in this, because this is not management, this is a content that is going to make a difference. So your coalition now, may make federations convenor, but it involves additional players and those being academics, rabbis and scholars -- and not there by virtue of tolerance. It isn't only the people with money and influence that have to -- that are part of the equation, but the people who know what should be done -- and that's rabbis and educators too.

So that's in terms of the players.

Now, the very fact that you talk this way means that this becomes a central issue in federation, it means that the structure issues are now wide open; all we know about structure that we can say at this point is wall-to-wall -- Cleveland and what we can learn from it. And we have to ask ourselves I think in order to stay political, what is the appropriate role and how can we maximize the impact of bureaus of Jewish education; what would their relationship be to the other players. And that should be left as a question, and not answered.

Then come the issue of funding. I think there, there are 3 kinds of funding that are required. One is the funding of foundations, which we know about -- which Hank has handled so well as being the catalyst, the short-term, the initial push, the challenge grant. Then there is federations making this, figuring out how over the next few years they're both going to raise more money and change their priorities. And then comes the thing which we're adding this morning, which is that every single Jewish organization has got to be helped to change its own priorities. So the National Council of Jewish Women has got to change part of its own priorities away from merely dealing with civil rights and with women's rights and with urban renewal -- to the issue of the saving of the Jewish people and how do they spend their money that way too. And so you're now talking about a very different pool of money, beyond -- I think we've added a third factor this morning -- that we didn't have before.

The way to handle Mort's point about the North American system I think now becomes how can the commission and its successor see to it that every organization is constantly at work in the area of Jewish education, and that those that are responsible for the actual delivery of services, the training institutions, the

JESNA, JWB etc. -- are being given constantly opportunities and challenges? In other words it becomes a major shadchan, and supports, and financial support system for everything that exists -- the indication of new assignments, which might require new structures, or giving new assignments to existing structures. And this notion of getting as many players into the act as possible.

The IJE might create a series of coalitions or associations or affiliates. On the most obvious level, it could create an association of commissions. In other words, the 13 commissions that exist might all be invited to join as the association of commissions, like you have the association of effective schools. They might -- I will come back later to the question of criteria for joining -- similarly, you might get 60 organizations in America, like the National Council of Jewish Women and Hadassah to join, as supporters of the war on Jewish assimilation. Like there were supporters on the war on poverty. And they also could join. They might range from Hadassah to the Association of Jewish University Professors. I am leaving out the role of JESNA, JWB because I don't know how to handle it right now. I'm not dealing with content; the way we put this together is later to be handled.

To finish up ... we talked about 1) a respect for and commitment to pluralism; 2) the fact that they are ready to work together; 3) the fact that they are ready to act, and not just talk; and 4) that they're ready to put up money for the action.

For Community, we are saying 1) climate; 2) leadership; 3) structure; 4) every organization is a potential target to be infused with an educational mission. For the moment, we've left out funding.

The Programmatic Options

I think we could say: the Commission identified 12 areas that required hard work, but could be acted upon; that it was important to recruit allies, funders, thinkers and doers in each of those areas. And then to list them with a small paragraph description of each one and in the appendix pick them up.

... programmatic options are really called great opportunities for Jewish education or opportunities for making an impact -- something like that.

November 16, 1989

IDEAS ABOUT COMMUNITY ACTION SITES

I think in the section that we write about community action site, we have to be able to give several scenarios as to what a community action site can be, but still maintaining the fact that it's the IJE that's going to figure it out -- learning by doing. However, we'll have to show them that we're not just bullshitting and deferring it to the next stage by saying IJE.

Therefore here are three scenarios:

Scenario number 1 is what we are closest to -- a full community that does as much as you can with the greatest of best practice/vision put together. And in this one, you also may decide on how many you can handle; you may not be able to handle more than one with some pale imitations with the other 2.

Two: This is a very different conception which we've been flirting with for some time and that is incomplete versions, but an arguable set of things put together in several different places, with the purpose being this is the most you can do or want to do or any other reasons in the second version.

The third version that I'm now suggesting is an association of commissions or communities, each that would pick something that would be controlled almost by virtue of a general plan. So you're hitting early childhood in four communities. The point is, it's

not merely early childhood -- the community as a whole takes early childhood as an issue. And that would be a third version.

The final point I want to make is that a combination of all 3 is certainly in the cards. So we have three conceptions that I can easily spell out right now -- we give them that -- and then we tell them that none of them equal the score, because the IJE will do it. I am ready to describe each one of these fully in 4 pages.

VISION

We will have to take a decision on vision as to how it is picked up. Is it a scenario for the 21st century? Is it incorporated in each chapter like best practice? Or is it the -- or is some special section at the end called, part of what Mike calls the "moral?:"

THE COMMUNITY

The new point that we are making about the community is that it is really a pre-condition to the whole story. The reason it's a pre-condition is nothing is going to happen with the profession unless people feel that a new era has begun. And that's the first new thing we're saying.

The second new thing we're saying is that the federation and the rest of the organized Jewish community -- and we don't know how to call that, because what is Haddash? Not part of the organized Jewish community? We'll have to figure a terminology. So the answer is that the central actors or the leaders of the organized Jewish community, which is now CJF, the denominations, JWB and JESNA are - have got to be the driving force to get everybody else in the community in. That's the next new point we're making. Namely if everybody, if Hadassah has to worry about its future number of its members and the quality of its commitment -- then education is going to be the answer. And then the other very interesting thought which is a sub-point for this purpose and that is that they are resources for professionals and lay people for the field of Jewish education.

We'll also have to put in, even though it's boring, the notion that their institutions themselves should be involved in Jewish education. But that's a silly idea because they are probably not good forums, unless for some version of adult education.

Now to go to the thing itself. The first point is the Jewish

community has got to decide that this is a war for its survival. And we don't want to use the term war, but that's what it is. And the war for its survival means that you mobilize everybody like you did for the emergency of Israel, the JDC to save the Jews of Ethiopia or of Iran and the way the National Council of Jewish said that women's rights or discrimination were key issues.

Now, you do that by virtue of the top guys taking leadership. So it's no longer we're asking the top guys to come in and deal with Jewish education -- we're asking the top guys to come in to save the Jews. We're calling like Israel Nehemia; we're saying we're at a terrible situation; and you Charles have got to save the Jews. Now you believe the way to save the Jews is through the Israel Experience -- but you've got to save. So the top leaders are coming together to save the Jews.

Now there are 3 kinds of top leaders for the Jewish community now: one is these guys who are never involved, that is the top leadership which cared about the JDC and the UJA; the second is the top academics, and the academics have to be involved now because they saw the previous issue as being fundraising -- so they were pushed aside, or they pushed themselves aside. However, if the issue is what is going to do it -- they are full partners. They're full partners in several ways. First of all, they're smart; two, the care; three, they have specialization which is equal to the money. If you're a Judaica scholar your specialization is one kind of content; if you're Mike Inbar, it's

another kind of context. So just keep Mike Inbar in front of your head all the time as to what role he would play in the strategy in the IJE, in a community action site, etc.

And finally, it is the educators and rabbis who are the people that do the work that have to become full partners in this thing; and not by sufferance, but because they are equal in a large sense to what the halutzim were or what the kibbutznikim are in terms of doing something with klita in this country.

So that's point number 1. And again, this whole report, the spirit has to be no longer the commission should; the commission will, the commission must. And let them tone it down.

Now, so therefore that's why we're going to get the leaders; we're going to get the leaders because this is the cause.

So it's no longer recruiting leaders. It's, because this is the cause, therefore we must get the leaders. And words like recruitment are out, or they're mentioned once.

The next point is that -- and of course leaders are defined, as I said, 3 different ways.

The next point is funding. Funding can be picked up here, although I'm suggesting it gets a separate category -- because I think it's beyond merely the community -- but what has to be made here is that if they mean it, they're going to have to translate

it into funding because that's what the community knows, into new priorities, and here keep Cleveland in mind. And it's not so much Cleveland -- that we mention Cleveland -- but that's the story of Cleveland. The story of Cleveland is top leadership took over; that never happened before in Jewish education; wall-to-wall coalition although they didn't bring Hadassah in. Thirdly, they then produced a "wish list" and the wish list was acted upon. So the point is -- if we do not know that the community means that the academics are going to help monitor and guarantee quality, that the educators are going to look at this afresh and anew and that the funders are going to give the money -- so it's bullshit.

Now then comes -- so that's the issue of funding. Now structure obviously is a new ballgame, because there's no way in the world for Charles Bronfman to join the local board of Jewish education. So now you have 2 things: first of all you have what we learned from commissions -- namely commissions built wall-to-wall; but now you're talking about it in a different way. You're saying that there's no way that you're -- just like the IJE is not going to work without -- no IJE -- no funder is going to give big money and not be on the board of the IJE. The board for the survival of the Jewish people is going to be Charles Bronfman and Crown too. As it is going to be Twersky and Lipset.

The next -- I mean let's keep in mind here -- here the war on poverty, the environment -- these are all analogies, mental

health, etc. -- this is to save the world. So you get the top people; you don't get second rate people here.

Now in terms of structures -- so first of all we have to keep commission in mind. We leave open the question what kind of structure. And here we pay -- we treat the existing structures with kindness, and we say -- under the -- with the help or leadership of boards of -- I don't know what we do; but we have to figure out a way to handle that.

Finally the last point, another hidush here -- how can we use the power of existing commissions? And I already would level the suggestion -- let them knock it down of an association of commissions with criteria. And we mentioned that in yesterday's paper when I talked about what the criteria would be. Wall-to-wall, pluralism, money, action, standards. So there should be a bureau of standards that lets commissions come in. And maybe the answer is that the Commission will now create an association of those communities that want to join in this attack on poverty. And any commission who can join, can join under the following conditions. Just like you have criteria for profession, you have criteria for community.

I think that we should -- ... avoid that question. And let us fight it out there. If anybody who wants to take that decision today will knock-out col helka tova. Bronfman will quit. And just like you're saying an IJE is not going to accept the present; you'd better not answer the structure question now. The structure

question will be figured out as you begin to. You ask him: what's the structure in Cleveland? They don't know -- they're avoiding it.

SOME NOTES ON A COMMUNITY ACTION SITE

The full blown version of a community action site would involve us in doing a study of all of the deliverers of service in Jewish education in a community. The needs that they service and the state of their work would be studied together with the deliverers of services.

Thus, for example, the supplementary school would be looked at in the Reform, Orthodox and Conservative congregations in the community, and we would discover what the numbers, the nature of the staff, etc. are. We then would work out with the supplementary schools (if they were ready to play) what it is that they see as the kind of improvement that is necessary and feasible. They would be hopefully engaged through the IJE with the examples of best practice (Pasadena or the results of Joe Reimer's research) and with the best minds in the field, both from Jewish education, Jewish scholarship and general education. Together the IJE and they would work out a taskforce on how to improve the supplementary school. This taskforce would also have to involve the national institutions that will later be involved in training in this -- it might be Hebrew Union College, Jewish Theological Seminary, Yeshiva and/or a local teacher training college. Together they would work out both a mission statement and a series of short-range, middle-range and long-range goals. And begin to look at what it would take to finance such an activity and what personnel would be involved.

But just to give some notion of a flavor of that activity, I could imagine that several steps might be undertaken. First, it might be decided that every school needs a full-time principal and as Alvin Schiff has suggested, one other full-time teacher who could be some version of a master teacher or a lead teacher. Every one of the avocational teachers would be undergoing on-the-job training or if it is before they were entering the job, some kind of pre-service training. This could take place in summers and other vacations, and every Monday afternoon.

Each of the denominations and their training institutions would work with the local institutions to figure out what changes in content, in teaching methodology are likely to lead to the values and goals that they would have been hammering out together, which would serve as a statement of the philosophy of the institution. Yeshiva University would send its people out every Monday afternoon to teach these people in the Orthodox supplementary schools; would bring them to Yeshiva University during the summer and vacations, or come to the community action site in the summer vacations and maybe bring them to Israel every second or third year, as a group. That is the teachers in the supplementary schools.

A similar story would take place in the day schools, and early childhood education where there heavy emphasis would be on the work of the JCC and again, it would have to be decided, who could undertake what assignments.

So that is the way you would be upgrading education by a combination of local initiative, plus best practice, plus best ... who together would build a vision and undertake experimentation and innovation.

I probably should have begun the whole thing by indicating that the IJE in addition to, or after, or parallel to undertaking a study of a community in order to see whether it met its criteria for being accepted as a candidate for a community action site, would together with the local community and maybe a local IJE is necessary -- for it could be the professional arm of the local commission -- would undertake a study of the total community ranging from all of its institutions to all of its educational personnel to its funding, etc. And begin to develop a program, as was done in Cleveland, as to what is needed, what is desired and what is needed to reach what is desired.

The difference between Cleveland and what we are talking about is that the injection of the IJE would guarantee that the national institutions, the training institutions would be involved, and that best practice and that vision would be introduced into the program. So that you would have quality control. Furthermore, the initial mapping of needs would begin to be a first step toward mapping the positions from the standpoint of a profession. Here we would discover that there are no special education people; we would discover that there are few early childhood specialists; no family educators; etc. And we would build a map of what is needed in this community action site. We also would build appropriate

salary scales and norms and standards for advancing from one position to another position. So you would be dealing with the issue of profession-building from that standpoint.

Now if this was done across-the-board in every one of the institutions, then I think we're on the way to dealing with the question of salaries and maybe status and certainly mapping positions in relationship to profession.

Now, somewhere in the IJE related to community action site, the other approach that we talked about -- which is one which is entirely client-centered, which says there are "x" number of families in this community action site -- 75% of them are served during early childhood, 50% after early childhood, and the question is -- what happens to the rest of them, and begin to take an approach on how to engage every one of these different groups at different times.

COMMUNITY ACTION SITES

A Community Action Site is a place - a whole community or a network of institutions - where excellence in Jewish education will be demonstrated for others to see, learn from and, where appropriate, to replicate. The Community Action Site will engage in the process of redesigning and improving the delivery of Jewish education according to state-of-the-art knowledge. The focus will be on personnel and the community, with the goal of effecting and inspiring change in the various programmatic areas in the field of Jewish education.

I. Assumptions

The concept of the Community Action Site is based on several assumptions.

A. Learning by Doing

The notion of a Community Action Site assumes that it is possible to demonstrate effective approaches to problems in a specific community which can then be replicated elsewhere. Significant questions concerning innovation and implementation, such as what elements should be included and how they should be combined, can only be resolved in real-life situations, through the dynamics of thinking about implementation, and in the process of implementing.

B. Local Initiatives

The initiative for establishing a Community Action Site must come from the local community and the key stakeholders must be fully committed to the endeavour. The community must be willing to set for itself the highest possible standards and guarantee the necessary funding for the project. The community selected will have to develop a local mechanism that will play a major role in the initiation of ideas, the design of programs and their implementation.

C. Best Practice

Best practice will be an important resource for the work of the Community Action Site. Examples of best practice in Jewish education, suggested by the national denominational bodies, their training institutions, educational organizations and other relevant groups, together with the staff of the mechanism for implementation, will be brought to the site, integrated in a complementary way, and adequately funded, thus significantly increasing their impact.

D. Environment

The Community Action Site will be characterized by innovation and experimentation. Programs will not be limited to existing ideas, but rather creativity will be encouraged. As ideas are tested they will be carefully monitored and will be subject to critical analysis. The combination of openness and creativity with monitoring and accountability is not easily accomplished, but is vital to the concept of the Community Action Site.

E. Content

The philosophy, values and content of the education offered in a Community Action Site will be a central issue. The denominations, working with the local institutions, JWB, JESNA, the national mechanism for implementation and others invited to participate, will produce background papers on the philosophy that should guide the work being done. These papers should address the problem of translating the particular philosophy into curriculum, as well as describe the texts to be studied and the methods to be used. They will also help guide the evaluation of the program.

F. Evaluation

The work of the Community Action Site will have to be monitored and evaluated in order to discover what can be achieved when there is a massive and systematic investment of thought, energy and funding in Jewish education. The results of the evaluation will serve as the basis for diffusion.

G. Diffusion

The results of work in a Community Action Site, and lessons learned from projects demonstrated there, will be diffused throughout the North American Jewish community and to other interested Jewish communities in the world. This will require thorough documentation of all aspects of the work.

II. The Scope of a Community Action Site

The scope of a Community Action Site has not yet been decided. Below are two possible models.

A. The Community Action Site could be an entire community where all the institutions involved in Jewish education are invited to join. One to three such comprehensive sites could be established. Each site would have to guarantee the participation of a minimum number of its institutions. It might be determined that 80% of all the Jewish educational institutions in the

community (e.g. the early childhood programs, the supplementary schools, the day schools, JCCs, Judaic studies programs in the local university, adult education programs, etc.) would be needed to build this version of a Community Action Site.

B. Several Community Action Sites could be established with each of them taking different cuts into Jewish education. This could be a cut by ages (e.g. elementary school age), by institutions (e.g. all the day schools), or some combination of these approaches. If, for example, three Community Action Sites decided to concentrate on early childhood and the supplementary school, three others on the high school and college age groups, and three more on JCCs, summer camps and Israel Experience programs, a good deal of the map of Jewish education would be covered.

III. A Community Action Site at Work

After establishing criteria for the selection of a Community Action Site, the board of the national mechanism will consider several possibilities and choose from among them. The community that is selected will create a structure to work in partnership with the national mechanism for implementation. If a local commission already exists, it might serve as that structure. Together they will conduct a study of the community to learn about the market for Jewish education (e.g. how many people are involved); the nature and status of the personnel; the lay leadership of Jewish education, the current level of funding for Jewish education; etc. A preliminary plan would then be developed. Below are some of the elements of the plan which serve as examples of the work that will be undertaken in a Community Action Site.

A. Personnel

The study might show that there are currently 1,000 filled positions (formal and informal, full-time and part-time) in all areas of Jewish education in the community. The study would also identify the gaps that exist -- the positions that need to be created and filled. The denominations (organizations and their training institutions) and others will be invited to join in developing a plan for recruiting, training and retaining personnel.

1. Recruitment

All of the recommendations related to recruitment in the Commission's report, and the results of the national recruitment study that will have been undertaken, will be reviewed and the Community Action Site would act on those recommendations. Some examples:

- a. Recruiting appropriate college students (good Jewish background, commitment to Judaism) from the local universities, and hiring them for several years of work in the supplementary schools, day schools and JCCs in the community.
- b. Recruiting people interested in changing their careers.
- c. Encouraging general educators in the community to retool themselves for positions in Jewish education.
- d. Bringing a number of outstanding educators from outside the community to assume key positions (e.g. three Jerusalem Fellows, four Senior Educators, etc.). Five supplementary schools could offer full-time positions for principals, to be filled by local part-time principals or by people recruited from other communities.
- e. Recruiting personnel from among the membership of organizations like Hadassah, the National Council of Jewish Women, ORT, etc. and building a program to prepare them to work in the field.
- f. Canvassing the retired population in the community to recruit appropriate candidates for work in Jewish education.

2. Training

In addition to preparing people who are new to the field, training would involve some of the following elements.

- a. In-service training for every person in the educational endeavour. All avocational teachers would be assessed in terms of their current knowledge and their potential and a program to advance them would be designed.
- b. All professional teachers, principals, and informal educators would be involved in some form of ongoing training planned jointly by the national and local mechanisms.
- c. Special fast-track programs would be developed for retraining general educators or career-changers who are moving into the field of Jewish education.
- d. The Community Action Site might be adopted by a consortium of training institutions, with each institution undertaking a specific assignment. The national training institutions, the local universities, institutions in Israel, and any other relevant players would be invited to participate.

3. Profession Building

As a result of the community study, a new map of the Jewish educational needs in the community would be developed. This map might include three full-time positions for special education; several positions for experts in early childhood education; two teacher-trainers; specialists in the teaching of Bible, Hebrew, History; an expert on the use of Israel Experience programs; consultants on Jewish programming for the JCCs; several adult educators; several family educators; etc. To respond to these needs, it might be determined that a 10% increase in the number of positions in the community is required. This could include introducing more full-time positions for people currently working part-time. This map would be the beginning of a new conception of the profession and would grow with time.

Accompanying the map would be a description of the training, salary, benefits and status appropriate to each position. Thus, a Bible expert might earn the same salary and be granted the same status as a principal. This would expand the possibilities of advancement in Jewish education beyond the conventional linear pattern of teacher, assistant principal, principal.

4. Retention

The issue of retention would be addressed in light of the results of the community study. The study might have pointed to the need for improving the relationship between lay boards and educators; the need for sabbaticals, trips to Israel and more on-the-job training for teachers. The local mechanism will have to determine the elements that are necessary to retain good people in the field and deal with them accordingly.

B. Community -- Its Leadership, Funding, and Structures

From the onset of the Community Action Site, the appropriate community leadership will have to be engaged. These leaders, either the board of a local commission and its staff or newly recruited leaders, will have to be constantly involved in developing the plans of the Community Action Site, overseeing them, monitoring them and responding to feed-back. The community would have to either create its own evaluation program or subscribe to the national mechanism's evaluation program so that success could be measured and appropriate decisions could be made.

Unless the community leadership is informed and committed, the necessary funding will not be obtained for the work of the Community Action Site.

C. An Institution Within a Community Action Site

The supplementary school is offered below as an example of how the national and local mechanisms would work together to implement appropriate recommendations for a specific community. Over time, such an approach could be introduced for all of the institutions in a Community Action Site.

A taskforce, composed of the top experts of the Conservative, Orthodox, Reform and Reconstructionist groups, would be created to examine the supplementary school. It would search for examples of best practice and invite those who have developed them, as well as thinkers or theoreticians in the area, to join in deliberations on the supplementary school. Together, they would begin to plan an approach to improving the supplementary school which could include the following:

- * the elaboration of the educational philosophy of the supplementary school;
- * the supplementary school's relationship to the synagogue, to informal education, to summer camping, to trips to Israel, to family education and to adult education;
- * legitimate educational outcomes of the supplementary school;
- * the curriculum, the content that should be offered in the supplementary school;
- * the methods and materials currently available that should be introduced;
- * the crucial problematic areas for which materials must be prepared e.g., methods for the teaching of Hebrew. In such a case, one of the national institutions or research centers might be asked to undertake the assignment immediately.

Each of the denominations would be given the opportunity and appropriate support (e.g. funding, expert personnel) to develop a plan including all of the elements listed above. The local and national mechanisms would review, modify and adopt the plan. Funding and criteria for evaluation would be agreed upon. The appropriate training institutions would be asked to undertake responsibility for training the personnel and would accompany the experiment as a whole. For example, for the Conservative supplementary schools, the faculty of the Jewish Theological Seminary and its Melton Research Center might work with the staff of the mechanisms, helping them decide what materials should be taught and developing a training program for the teaching of this material. JTS and Melton faculty would be involved with the local supplementary schools on a regular basis, to monitor progress and to serve as trouble-shooters.

Although they would have to work individually with their Conservative, Orthodox, Reform and Reconstructionist schools, there are some areas where all of the denominations could work together. On issues such as the integration of formal and informal education, the use of the Israel Experience, family education, and possibly even in certain content areas such as the teaching of Hebrew, combined effort would yield significant results.

Within a few years, we could learn what can be achieved when proper thinking, funding and training are invested in a supplementary school. We could also see how informal education, the Israel Experience, family education and other elements could be combined to increase the impact of the supplementary school. The extent of the success and the rate of introduction of new ideas will only become apparent when the Community Action Site is functioning.

The national mechanism, in addition to its role in planning, evaluating and overseeing the entire project, would, as quickly as possible, extrapolate principles from the experience of a Community Action Site to feed the public debate, leading to the development of policies on issues such as salaries, benefits, the elements of professional status, sabbaticals, etc. These policies, as well as specific lessons learned, would be diffused to other communities in North America.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Commission recommends the establishment of several Community Action Sites, where excellence in Jewish education will be demonstrated for others to see, learn from and, where appropriate, to replicate. Community Action Sites will be initiated by local communities which will work in partnership with the mechanism for implementation. The mechanism will help distill the lessons learned from the Community Action Sites and diffuse the results.

D. Another Approach

The Community Action Site as described asks what can be done to the existing institutions to raise them to the highest possible stature. It makes room for new institutions and new positions.

Another approach might be to start with the clients. If the market study revealed, say, that there are 5,000 young children between the ages of two and six in Pittsburgh, the question of how many of them are involved in any form of Jewish education (early childhood programs, day care, etc.) might be raised. From this would flow a series of related questions: What, if anything, could be done for the percentage of young people who are not at all involved? What is being done for the families of those who are enrolled in programs? What might be done to motivate or make contact with the families of those that are not enrolled, so that ultimately their children would get involved in some kind of a Jewish educational program?

The same types of questions could be asked about the elementary school group: What happened to the children who were enrolled in Jewish early childhood programs and went on to public schools? How many went on to day school? What should be done with the many who do not go to day school? Is this the time to reintroduce the concept of the foundation school (a supplementary school from the end of kindergarten to age 8) or should some other institution be developed? What should be done with the parents of children who have stopped attending or have never attended?

Such an approach could be applied to all of the clients for Jewish education, from young children to the elderly. Responses could be developed which might range from a newsletter to inviting them to community activities, to trying to involve them in the federation, to giving the JCC an intensive role with them, to the use of Israel Experiences, or possibly even the creation of new institutions. This client-centered approach could either be the basis of a Community Action Site, or might accompany the work of some community action sites.

November 26, 1989

The Commission discovered at least 12 areas which could be significantly improved upon through appropriate intervention. In some of these areas a good deal of work has been done; in others we are just beginning (examples?).

In community action sites it will be possible and necessary to learn how to act upon many of these programmatic areas. The examples of best practice will have to be assembled, carefully studied and the next steps decided upon. Taskforces will have to be established to decide upon what research, what programs for the preparation of personnel and materials must be undertaken, so that education in a programmatic area will have its greatest effect.

The work that has been initiated by institutions, organizations and foundations will be carefully studied and built upon. Mechanism for implementation must see this as one of its top responsibilities (priorities). Both in terms of the community action sites, as well as in its role of assisting in the planning and development of programmatic agendas and encouraging foundations and philanthropists to support innovation and experimentation.

XXX was reminded that though the programmatic areas are at the very heart of the educational endeavour, the history of general

education and Jewish education offer many examples of important ideas that were acted upon prematurely. Bandwagons around programs and projects developed which raised expectations that later proved unattainable.

The mechanism for implementation established by the Commission will carefully study each of the programmatic areas and help introduce the very best ideas and programs in the community action sites. It will learn through its work with institutions and foundations who decide to concentrate on a programmatic area, how to best bring the results of their work to the attention of the North American Jewish community.

conception of public relations.

1. I think your idea that the approach should be that we should describe the various projects in their own terms, as though they had no relationship to public relations is excellent. This I take it would mean that we would begin discrete campaigns or approaches on matters like the Israel Experience, the Personnel Project, or it could be cut the Jerusalem Fellows, Senior Educators, the Melton Center, etc. -- simply describing its activities. You made some good suggestions: the approach might be based on the testimony of people like Wigoda and Danny Feinstein, etc.

2. The approach should not be seen as P.R. but as conceptual. If we are dealing with senior personnel, then the approach ought to be why we got into it, how we got into it, what are particular cut into the situation is.

3. This is an idea which is much more than P.R., but not unrelated to it. I think the time has come for us to launch a major project on the issue of Zionist education. This should have its historical perspectives, going back to what Zionist education was like in various parts of Europe (people like Anita Shapiro or others like her) what the youth movements were like in this country, and how they worked in hutz la'aretz. And then we might go on continuing through Dulzin's period, and describe the present situation. That would be the theoretical side of it, or historical side of it, or philosophical side of it. The other

side would be to galvanize the forces of "light" in this country and in hutz la'aretz that are doing the work of Zionist education and it might focus around the kibbutz movement, around Infeld, around Ellul, etc. to describe both their dreams, their frustrations and their possibilities. This kind of project should have theoretical and maybe even practical implications. It's the kind of project that Jaime Constantiner, Bronfman or others might be the sources of finance for, and should probably be carried out within the Institute.

4. This last matter should be followed up fairly soon, it should be the basis of my conversations both with Constantiner and Bronfman.

5. This activity of the study of Zionism, having both a theoretic and practical component, is both an example of what a department in the Institute might be (and I mean this as an actual example), as well as demonstrating the way the Institute would work because it could end up in demonstration projects having begun with research.

6. I think that we should decide how much of this we want to talk about in our Thursday meeting. We also need an agenda for the Thursday meeting with Alan and Zeev.