



THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE
AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

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

Series E: Mandel Foundation Israel, 1984 – 1999.

Box
D-1

Folder
1987

CJENA meetings, 1989-1990.

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

THE COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA

FOURTH COMMISSION MEETING -- OCTOBER 23, 1989

10500
10500

Chairman Folks, I'd like to welcome all of you to the Fourth Meeting of the Commission, and if you look at your watches, it's exactly 10500 o'clock -- and I don't know if your watches are all accurate, but I do appreciate -- I guess we all do -- prompt attendance. There's no one around this table that hasn't chaired at least 100 meetings. And we'll think of a suitable prize for those of you who are here on time.

There are some people who are here for the first time. I'd like to recognize them and welcome them for being with us. And first we're very pleased to have Susan Crown here, who is a member of Lester's family -- Lester -- is that a suitable introduction for Susan, or do you have a little more?

L. CROWN ... introduce it the other way.

CHAIRMAN: Lester Crown is Susan's father. But I know that Susan has taken a leadership role in the philanthropic efforts of the family and we're very pleased to have you with us Susan.

I'd like to welcome Marty Kraar, who is the incoming Executive Director, Executive Director Elect I guess, of CJF. And Marty is a member of this group by ... I might say, but also volunteered and joined our Senior Policy Advisory Committee before he had to -- so Marty we appreciate that very much. And welcome.

I'd like to introduce two members of the staff who have joined us since the last time, joined the team you might say, since the last time we were here. First, Mark Survis, who is right there, who is on the -- actually on the staff of the

transcript of
Oct 23, 1989
meeting

Plenary Session -- 4th Commission Meeting

Cleveland Jewish Community Federation as Assistant Planning Director. He was heavily involved in a project, ongoing project -- now it's been 2-3, 4 years old perhaps in Cleveland -- the Cleveland Commission on Jewish Education. And he is on loan to this Commission on a part-time basis, and we welcome his contribution greatly.

Another part-time, you might say, staff member that we've just put on to work on what you might call public relations, getting our message out to our constituents and so on, Kent Meyers, who is a Cleveland free-lance writer of some experience and who will be helping us on that, in that area.

And lastly, I'd like to welcome Kathleen Hat in the far corner who works with Mona Ackerman on the Riklis Foundation Program. Mona is an interested commissioner, not able to be with us today, and asked us if it would be O.K. for Kathleen to sit in today, and we're very pleased to have you with us.

I think those are all the special guests. And I'd like at this time, if you would pull out your agenda which is at the very last page -- if you haven't had a chance to look at it already -- I want to go over the day, the logistics for today and give you some idea of what's in store for you.

Notice -- Plenary Session no. 1 -- we are in it; this is it. There will be an introduction which I will go through with some assistance in a few minutes. And then we're going to throw the floor you might say, open for discussion in terms of the subjects that are contained in this folder that we sent you. Then, item 3 -- we will break into separate discussion groups and the mechanics will be that there are 3 rooms on this floor. We will

be breaking into 3 groups. You see the chair and the co-chair of each of the groups and there will be a guide to help you find conference room "A" for Group "A". And Group B is conference room "C", which I hope is on your agenda. If not, be sure it says C. And then group C is in the Wiler Room -- we'll show you where that is; they're both within 50 feet of each other. And we've asked Charles Bronfman and Ben Yanowitz; Lester Crown and Lester Pollack; Esther Lea Ritz and John Coleman to kind of lead the discussions, which is sort of the way we did it last time also.

Notice it is in the church right next to Roman numeral III -- and the way that seems to work out the most efficiently here, is that we will all go into one room, which is right across the hall. Which is -- there will be a buffet and get our lunch and move to the appropriate room where there will be beverages. So you won't have to bring your beverages. And I guess that's the most efficient set-up.

Then at approximately 2:15, we'll reconvene here and get the reports of each member, each chair you might say of the 3 groups. And then we'll have an open discussion and presumably we will have covered the, thought through the items on our agenda for today. And that at the very end, as we have done now for each of our prior 3 meetings, we've asked someone to make concluding comments. At the last meeting it was Rabbi Gottschalk; and we've asked Arthur Green, Rabbi Arthur Green to conclude the meeting this time.

Those are the logistics. Are there any questions about any of that?

3

Plenary Session -- 4th Commission Meeting

Now I'd like to take you through the book; a lot of this was sent to you. The first divider is of course the listing of our

commissioners; the second divider is the senior policy advisors who have made major contributions really to our process; background material is our fourth report to you. We've had a background material at each of the prior meetings. And this essentially is where we need your reactions, your input, your changes. And hopefully I know most of you I am sure have had a chance to read it and there are some interesting questions here and some of it is controversial. And the process we've followed up till now, interviews, coupled with mailing this in advance, coupled with a very serious look at the logic and the points -- has brought us this far. We've made lots of progress. I believe many of you share that feeling. Since we started looking at this whole, somewhat confusing perhaps picture. How do you cut into it? And we're ready to talk today about how to cut into it.

And then behind that, what essentially will be the -- what we'll talk about today you see another tab, which is the minutes of the last meeting, which were sent out to all the commissioners just in case you want to refresh your memory about what we talked about and did last time.

The background information will be the basis for our meeting today, reviewing that, talking about it, digesting it and so on.

A couple of comments about what some of the things that have happened between now and the last meeting we had -- and let me say first that the participation by the commissioners, by many of you, perhaps not all of you, but by many of you -- and the senior policy advisors -- has been outstanding. I guess it's a nice

Plenary Session -- 4th Commission Meeting

thing to say, even if it weren't true -- it's true. And it's brought us to where we are today, ready to sort of cut into this, the pieces of the puzzle sort of seem to be coming together.

I will share with you that in my discussions with many of you, commissioners particularly -- there is a healthy impatience. I think it's healthy. There are so many of us that have been exposed to commissions before and maybe may be disappointed subsequently. I think so many of us have deep concerns about what's happening to the Jewish people, and it's a subject that's been on our agenda maybe for years. But there's some, maybe even frustration as to -- you know, is this thing doable, can you get anywhere with it, can we in fact change the trend line, can we do something about enhancing the likelihood that future generations of Jews will choose to be proactively Jewish, and feel good about working for the whole of the Jewish people? And so that impatience, which really is I think reflects an action orientation that so many of you have has helped us. And I remind you that we agreed at our very first meeting that this would just not be another report. That we -- even a beautiful, wonderful, distinguished report -- that we were going to somehow hang together until we moved from report to implementation, which is no small maneuver -- that's sort of the way we felt about it. And so I think that healthy impatience has been good.

I think today you have, and we have available for discussion, what an action plan could be. It's perhaps not the only formulation. I'm sure there are other formulations; no doubt there are other formulations equally as good. But this is a

/

5

Plenary Session -- 4th Commission Meeting

formulation by I believe a very hard-working and committed group of people -- us. And we've all had ... input at one way or another through our personal interviews and ... work that's been done. So, and today should be a very important day in the life of this Commission.

I remind you, as is stated in here, there are 2 major

outcomes that we see coming from the Commission work: one is of course a final report, not a report for the sake of a report, but a report that spells out what our findings have been, what our recommendations are for the future. A report that is based on the research reports you'll hear more about today that are underway; what their findings and conclusions and recommendations are. And in a sense, depending on how this works out, what -- and this may sound a little overblown -- and I don't mean to -- what our vision for Jewish education is for you know the next period -- the next 10 years or whatever. So that's one, the final report. And hopefully it will be what I said earlier -- a distinguished piece of work.

And secondly an action plan. And this is what so many of us -- and I'll personalise -- what I have an anxiety for. To actually invest myself along with all of you or many of you in pieces of work that will be under the umbrella you might say of our coordinated effort that will move us closer to where we want to be. And the action plan is how we will go about implementing the recommendations. So when this is all over, next June, although there is some reference to a continuing mechanism and we'll have to talk about that; there's even some reference to some of your feeling that maybe the Commission ought to stay

6

Plenary Session -- 4th Commission Meeting

alive and meet once a year. And we'll have to think that through together. But when this is over, we will have a final report and presumably important programmatic options, important thrusts underway because of the interest that some of us have in doing that.

I remind you that again our plans call for 2 more meetings: February -- and that date is February 14th I believe, that's out

now and I hope it's on your calendar; and the June date has not been set. In February, our plan is for us to look together at the findings and recommendations. And it will be our first look at what you will call -- what we should call a "first draft" of our findings and recommendations. And after that meeting, presumably we will be wrapping up, moving toward the meeting on June.

So today when we are looking at an action plan, a possible action plan, and by 4:00 o'clock when we adjourn today that plan, as has been the case in 3 other meetings, will be enriched because of our deliberations and changed no doubt, we will have our -- I believe an action plan. And at the next meeting we will look at the final draft.

Two other things, and that concludes my introduction. I want to talk to you a little bit about outreach first. We've begun to reach out to various constituencies. Federations -- there are local commissions, as the Cleveland commission -- there's one just starting in Boston and L.A. and Philadelphia and I don't know where else. We've begun to reach out to educators and to the denominations. And just some of the little laundry list of what we've done. We've met twice with key federation planners, the

7

Plenary Session -- 4th Commission Meeting

professionals who are involved in federation planning. Last September I met at the CJF Quarterly with federation execs and presidents. On November 17th at the General Assembly, the CJF General Assembly, the President Bill Berman and the Exec Carmi Schwartz -- of course Marty Kraar will be in there. We've invited about 400 people at the G.A. which will include federation presidents and executives, chairs of endowment funds, budget and planning chairs, to hear the story. In September I went out to Seattle along with some of you to meet with CAJE. There were, at the CAJE group, there were several hundred educators there; we

SV
IV V 0^
0' V

Plenary Session Morning -- Fourth Commission Meeting

everybody. We've got so much room with people I think who are anxious for something better for themselves and their kids. Even if we never get to some people who resent it, or don't want any part of it -- there's -- it's a big playing field. So that's the point I wanted to make.

Yes that will sort itself out. I think that will sort itself out.

UNIDENTIFIEDs: If I may for just one moment --

CHAIRMAN: O.K. Norm.

NORM: ... very briefly -- I sometimes get the feeling that we're trying to reinvent the wheel. And we're not. There is a malaise in Jewish education -- obviously something is rotten in the State of Denmark. But it's not altogether rotten.

I mean American Jewry has really done some marvellous things in Jewish education, even if we failed in the '40s and we failed in this city, in this island of Manhattan -- we have done something. And I don't want to go into all kinds of statistics -- at the higher level there is probably more Jewish scholarship taking -- I'm sure Ismar will agree with me -- more Jewish scholarship of various kinds taking place on the highest level here than there was in the heyday of Podtz Jewry. I mean we're not exactly going to decide how to start Jewish education from scratch, it's not a zero sum game.

And I'd like to find out -- whereas it's terribly important to get local input and find out what the customer wants -- what has been done in American Jewry, some of the greatest things have been done by a few individuals who went out and sold the idea to everybody else. And without asking them their permission to do

got some very good feedback. I have met with the presidents of three of the seminaries -- Dr. Gottschalk, Dr. Lamm and Dr. Schorsen already -- and we want to engage in further dialogue with the denominations. It's this - the delivery of Jewish education, is heavily involved with congregations as we all know, and we need the marriage of all the powerful forces in Jewish life to make this work. So we're engaged in this continuing dialogue and sharing of ideas and experiences. I will say that the reaction from the denominations, and I guess we have 3 of the 4 here today, has been -- of the ones -- meetings we've had -- have been very very upbeat. I personally have felt very pleased. In this case it's Dr. Lamm and Dr. Schorsch that I have had a chance already to meet with, who are here today. Those were wonderful meetings. I told you that privately, I will tell you that again publicly. Very supportive, very much in tune with our larger objectives and so I feel very good about that.

The last thing I want to touch about is financing. Obviously, to all of us here -- there's nobody in this room who

8

Plenary Session -- 4th Commission Meeting

was quote "born yesterday" end quote -- to make the kind of impact we want to make that would satisfy us, to hopefully in the long run produce systemic change -- and make the whole process of Jewish education, formal and informal, as it leads to a better connection between the Jewish people and Jewish life, young people, maybe even in particular, it's going to take new dollars. This whole field I suspect it's fair to say has been undernourished for years. Maybe now is the time to change that. And there are two major sources that sort of pop up real quickly. I will say to you that in terms of federations, federation leaders -- my experience, probably yours -- increasingly

.

concerned with Jewish continuity and the right kind of process with federations to explore alternatives will be -- has really begun. And Bill Berman and Marty and Carmi, all three, have been very supportive. This is all ahead of us, but certainly we expect that to be in the long run very important.

Then, private foundations -- I have been in touch even before this began with some of you in this room and other substantial private foundations -- lead by families who care a lot about this subject. And we'll start to meet with them in a more official way, you might say, to really do two things: first determine what their areas of interest are; and to find out what their willingness to participate is. And we hope to be able to report that back. I personally will do this. And hope to be able to report back to you in February as to where we stand on that.

I will share with you my own gut feeling, backed up only by wisps and conversations and so on -- nothing official -- I'm

9

Plenary Session -- 4th Commission Meeting

really very optimistic about our ability to get very substantial sums of money moving into Jewish continuity, Jewish education from substantial private foundations. And I don't have enough hard data to quantify anything yet, except to tell you that I believe it's proper to use the word important sums, significant sums, and I believe that it's proper to say that there is interest, evidence already in those areas. So, very important assignment which I will take on with some of you in this room, and some not in this room, to really explore more fully this whole process.

That is the Chairman's introduction. There's one more thing that I'd like to do, and that's to have Annette Hochstein run 3 or 4 slides, which kind of will give us all a very quick overview of the points in the discussion guide. Before we do that, I ask

you to turn to the inside front cover. I believe there is a discussion guide tucked in there, if you haven't already pulled it out; there should be two sheets of paper. And that's the discussion guide that we will be using together in our 3 groups. And it picks up a lot, not everything, it picks up a lot of the background material. You'll need to take your books with you because the background material is really more complete and it has got the rationale, and a lot of the commentary and so on.

Before I do that however, I'd like Annette Rockstein to come up here and go through these slides. I think maybe some of us here are going to have to move.

Att: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, the focus of the background materials that you have received is a proposed plan for action. In the next 10 minutes or so, I will try to summarize

10

Plenary Session -- 4th Commission Meeting

the plan and highlight its main points.

I would like the first slide. We tried to illustrate on this slide two items. On the left-hand side, the work done by the Commission since its first meeting; and on the right-hand side, the anticipated products of the work. If you follow the left-hand side from the top going down, the process followed by the Commission led from the generation of ideas at the first meeting to the development of numerous options for intervention -- options were ^(submitted) under two categories: enabling options and programmatic options. A decision was taken to focus on ~~the~~ dealing with the shortage of qualified personnel for Jewish education and on the resources of the community -- leadership, structures, finance -- to bring about change in Jewish education.

At the same time, many commissioners urged that programmatic options also be dealt with. At the meeting of June 14th, the last

meeting of this Commission, the Commission ^{by implementation} ~~by~~ ^{imminent} discussed community action sites as a way to demonstrate with several local communities what Jewish education at its best can be, and at the same time to develop local solutions to the problem at hand. Commissioners pointed to the need for a number of simultaneous methods of intervention.

Following this discussion, and following interviews with commissioners, it became clear that the time has come to prepare an action plan that would respond to the goals of the Commission.

As Mort has just pointed out -- I'm moving to the right-hand side of the slide -- it appears that the work of this Commission will have two major products: a final Commission report and a method

11

Plenary Session -- 4th Commission Meeting

for implementation -- what we have called an action plan.

At our next meeting in February, we hope to reflect in detail the Commission report and the recommendations they make. Today's agenda is focused on the action plan.

The proposed plan calls for a variety of interventions and a method for their implementation. There are 7 points to this plan: the first point -- I will run them one by one -- mobilizing the community. Commissioners have told us that if we want significant change it will be necessary to mobilize the community for Jewish education. This would mean to recruit significantly more outstanding community leaders to take the lead in charge for Jewish education in their communities; it would mean to improve community structures that deal with Jewish education and ^(to develop) support systems; it would mean to generate significant additional funding to fund the recommended programs.

The second point: Building the profession. This is the category under which we have subsumed all those elements that pertain to the need to recruit, train and retain ^{qualified} ~~re-~~

professionals for the field. Some of the elements involved have been pointed out by Commissioners and are emerging already from the preliminary data that researchers are collecting for this Commission. And I would like to give a few examples:

Already at this stage of our work, it is clear that there is a need to increase significantly the capacity of training programs to produce graduates, and to enhance the quality of training. It is clear that more and ^{full-time} positions will have to be created for educators -- the level of the ... Salaries and benefits for teachers will have to be increased. There is a need

12

Plenary Session -- 4th Commission Meeting

for a massive recruitment program geared at bringing more talented young people to the field.

The third point calls for demonstration off, and relates to the ^{development} of community action sites. Community action sites will ^{serve} as a way to begin implementation. It will allow to demonstrate in one or more communities, what Jewish education can be when the shortage of personnel is addressed systematically and ^{and when the community is mobilized to the endeavor.} Some educators will be recruited from the site; training institutions will be engaged in the work of upgrading and developing adequate in-service training. What we've come to call "best practice", best programs, will be introduced in the community action site, and innovations will be encouraged there.

The fourth point: continental strategy. By this we mean that there will be a need to develop continental strategies to complement work at the local level. Training for example cannot be done solely on the local level but rather needs to be more centrally done in North America as well as in Israel. Policies to raise salaries and benefits will need to be set continentally;

The fifth point is the agenda for programmatic options. Commissioners have urged that ~~common~~ programmatic options - ^{what} we propose to do and offer for discussion is to identify those options that can be acted upon in the near future, provided

Plenary Session -- 4th Commission Meeting

The sixth point is to create a research capability for Jewish education in North America. As we began to put together the data for the work of the Commission, it became clear the extent to which very little is known today in a systematic way about Jewish education. Issues of effectiveness, of cost -- how much ~~are~~ ^{many teachers} there are, what their salaries are, who they are -- where their training has been -- have practically never been addressed in a systematic way. And there is no reliable data on which to build. Moreover, researchers are overworked -- those researchers that ... clear movement to significantly increase that capacity so that decisions can be taken in informed ways.

The seventh and last point is that the mechanism for implementation. In order to ensure that the plans become reality, that we do not end with recommendations alone, no matter how good the recommendations -- someone will have to do all of these.

✓ Commissioners have suggested to consider the kind of mechanisms that would be appropriate for the assignment. Such a mechanism could serve many functions.

This is the last slide. What could a mechanism ~~for~~ implementation, whatever its form be, do? ✓ The mechanism could assist with the establishment of several community action sites.

14

Plenary Session -- 4th Commission Meeting

✓ It could be a broker between continental and local expertise. ✓ It encourage foundations to support innovation. ^{rr^ C r \j35-} It could ^{guide} the implementation of continental strategies -- for example the preparation of a national recruitment plan. ✓ It could assist in ^{development} of programmatic options if asked to do so. ✓ It could help develop the research capability. ✓ And it could report annually on progress to this Commission or to any group that would receive accountability on the plans.

This then is a brief review of the suggested action plan. When considering them -- the seven points -- many questions arise. One of them is, are these the major elements that should be dealt with for significant change to occur? What should the emphasis be within each of the 7 categories? This is just what is being offered for discussion today. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you Annette.

O.K. now you have to sit in the seat that has your name on it. So please be sure to read it.

Well, welcome to those of you who have just come -- I know that some of our members will be a little late. What's your pleasure? We want to take this hour to give you a chance to react in a plenary session, and hear everybody else's reaction. I remind you we're going to break into smaller groups and then reconvene. So we'll have 3 really opportunities to think together

out loud-

1 - (over) And the floor is wide open, John.

JOHN: Has the staff looked at the question of "best practice" in terms of defining some issues for a community, or for the

15

Plenary Session -- 4th Commission Meeting

continental oversight group to consider what is "best practice" in the aggregate as opposed to "best practice" as to a specific project, adult education, kindergarten education, what have you?

When we started out earlier in the last Commission Meeting we had a lot of discussion about best practices in selected areas. Does the staff have some views on how one defines best practice as one takes a community oversight --?

CHAIRMAN: I'm going to give you a quick reaction to that, and then allow any member of the staff who wants to add to that to say something.

We have not moved into best practices per se. We have identified the notion that there are best practices out there that out to be replicated, that if it's done well in one location it could be done well in other locations. That's point one.

And the only other point I want to say before calling on any member of the staff who wants to add, is that in discussing priorities at our very first meeting -- I remind all of you that we decided not to try and set priorities, because priorities vary by group. They might vary within denominations; they might vary elsewhere. And commissioners have independent thoughts -- some of you that you've shared with me -- about what you feel is a high priority. And so we decided we would not try and set priorities. And then coming to best practices, that best practices also could be -- that there might not be a single best practice in any given specific; there could be several kinds of best practices, depending on the user group. So, we have stayed away at this

point from this subject.

Now is there any member of the staff -- Seymour would you

16

Plenary Session -- 4th Commission Meeting

I like to add something.

SE: We're in the midst John of undertaking that. And what we're going to be doing in the month of December is bringing together the best educators we can assemble to work with us on each of these programmatic options, as well as in the two enabling options. And point out to -- what are examples of best practice and why is this the case. We've already begun negotiations with CAJE so that they would bring their enormous power to bear on this.

Now the problem is that if we had enough time, and when we have enough time, we will want to have developed criteria that can be shared by everyone, and have people look at these institutions -- or if it's an afternoon school that's doing an usual job -- and there's a reason that we can indicate why parts of it or all of it exemplify best practice -- that we could share those criteria with all that would want to see them.

So what we hope to do for this Commission report, is at least in as many of the programmatic options as possible, bring to bear what the people who are most talented say is best practices; and offer that as step number one in developing a more systematic approach.

CHAIRMAN: ~~Mr. A. S.~~ *A. S.*

A. S. ~~Chairman:~~ I may have an atypical view of that. First best practices might refer to the structures that have proven to be best. We have to qualify what the word "best" means. It may not be best to everybody. But in many many ways the day schools ..., the supplementary schools -- you call that best practice? I think

Plenary Session -- 4th Commission Meeting

that each of those institutions, or those mechanisms -- each of those instrumentalities has to be seen one in perspective of the other. That's one point.

The other is, I think that we have to be open to what the potential best practice is about. Our study in Greater New York of the supplementary schools shows that it cannot have best practices unless certain things happen. And we believe that one of those things has to be the introduction of family education into the supplementary school, where the synagogue has to change significantly in order that the schools for children be changed, transformed into an educational enterprise for the total family, including the children. The focus has to be much different. So the second point I want to make is that there has to be a view of what can potentially be the best practice, because we believe that there are very very few best practices without such an enterprise, without such an arrangement.

The third is that there has to be in a potential best practice -- is developing the kind of confluence between formal and informal that doesn't exist in either the formal or the informal enterprises. We've learned that you just can't divide them -- whether it's in a synagogue setting, or whether it's in the JCC. You've had experience with your taskforce and commission in the JWB. And so that that also has to be considered within its potentiality rather its current application now.

And finally, the point I want to make -- and I think Seymour touched upon that -- is the whole question of transferability. I don't believe that we should spend so much time on developing best practices if those best practices aren't transferable. You

Plenary Session -- 4th Commission Meeting

can generalize about that. But community "x" may not be ... I think that that caveat has to be consistently viewed in terms of what best practices are. And we came ... in the enthusiasm of many persons, or people, or institutions who say -- look how good that is -- you can be swayed, and researchers can be swayed in terms of one institution's practice being so good. And I just make that as a third comment.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Florence.

F. MELTON: I think there's also ... this particular issue -- with best practices as one -- that is so broad, that I would like to see our discussions start with short-term goals and develop long-term goals at a different time. Because there are some areas which I think all of you, American Jewish communities would agree are pressing. And one is the center for training and the quality of the trainers, and the way that the training takes place. The second is the recruitment of young students who, with a professional finding them, would be able to bring them into the training system. And to me this is the bulwark and the infrastructure of everything that this Commission is going to try to do in the future.

So I would say that short-term goals, investment and energy, investment of money, should be -- in my view -- to be invested in those who think.

7
CHAIRMAN: David.

2-15
DAVID: A question for clarification. A while back, it seemed in ... we ... that the priorities here are going to be enabling options, as community leadership and personnel. And this action

Plenary Session -- 4th Commission Meeting

plan is very comprehensive and very ambitious and it seems to be very inclusive. For example it includes these programmatic options»

But Annette did not mention, and it's not mentioned here, whether these programmatic options -- because we all have pet programmatic options -- I formally submitted one to Seymour -- whether they must relate to these two other options. Because otherwise we're really all over the place here. Or are we saying that any programmatic option, if we stretch a little bit, is going to have to relate to personnel, or community? Or are we really ... to these ... Because otherwise, I think we're making a very democratic effort to be inclusive of all those people who still are into programs, and not sticking to this initial focus -- the mobilization of community and personnel.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, well, let me react to that because that question has come up before. And again, I welcome any additions that anyone wants to add.

When we first started, we listed 26 options I believe, which probably will be shrunk if we sort them out a little more carefully to a small number -- maybe 17, 16, 18, whatever. We decided that to make things happen, there were two things we had to deal with: one is personnel, which you've just heard the last speaker talk about; and the other was community ambience -- community support, federation leadership, community leadership, congregational leadership -- all the environmental factors that would need to be in place to give the proper amount of -- you might say nutrients -- in the local community to Jewish education«

we picked those two as the big categories, which if we dealt with those, we would make a difference, we could produce systemic change.

We further said that in translating these broad categories into specific action, it would be true -- it could be through or would be through -- various kinds of programmatic options, like early childhood. We could have a very substantial investment in early childhood or family education as part of a community action site. As part of a way a community deals with a community action site. Service is local, people are reached locally. It could be supplementary school, day school, whatever the programmatic option is. So what I'm saying to you -- without speaking too long on this -- is that these are mutually interdependent -- not mutually exclusive. It is not confusing the issue; it is the way we will attack it. If that's not 100% clear, I wouldn't be surprised.

But does anybody want to add anything to that? Does that satisfy you David?

DAVID: Well it says you have a very flexible determination --

CHAIRMAN: Yes, yes, yes. O.K. good. Jack.

J. B. 200
JACK: I'd like to react to Florence and Al's ... best practices. I think that they're concerned that best practice could be a limiting process as opposed to an opening process. And I think that issue of best practice -- the way I view it is that it's a means by which you can raise the morale of the professionals and you can raise the expectations of the community.

If we are going to say -- well, there are no best practices currently -- I think that's very demoralizing. As someone who has

Plenary Session -- 4th Commission Meeting

been in that situation, where people say -- well, where is your model? And I say I really can't point to one right now. That



Plenary Session, 4th Commission Meeting

TAPE 1, SIDE 2

UNIDENTIFIED: ».» real and concrete happens that really points the way in that kind of dramatic fashion, for an example of what can be done. I care a great deal about training institutions. I work in one and that's what most of my effort goes into. But I would like to see us not focus exclusively on training institutions or centers that are remote from the general population. I think we need a couple of shining examples out

there in the community which really show. if we infuse the right personnel and the right money and the right effort into a particular school -- or a particular class -- look what can be done! I wouldn't want us to skip that.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you ... Josh.

JOSH: I'd like to underscore what Sara Lee just said and maybe sharpen the point a little bit further. I like your terminology of challenging assumptions and increase the consciousness-raising. But I think that we have to go back to when the Commission started -- there was a very careful decision made, as I understand it, to stay away from getting into anything that was going to be divisive to a wall-to-wall coalition like what we have in this room.

CHAIRMAN: Absolutely.

JOSH: I think that's been one of the keys to ... the Commission thus far. However, as you listen to Sara Lee's point and hearing what Alvin has to say about you know there may be that there are certain institutions that we find from the research or from the data that really just work better than others -- and where is that going to come out in the report -- that really what we're

Plenary Session, 4th Commission Meeting

talking about moves a little bit beyond challenging assumptions and consciousness-raising and may even start inclining us into something that could look very much like being prescriptive. And my sense is that there's going to be a challenge to all of us, but certainly to the drafters of the report and certainly to our discussion of the action plan -- of finding the middle road between wanting to maintain a coalition of everyone assembled here, wanting to do something that's going to in fact be able to be received by the American Jewish community in the broadest context -- but also having to read what comes out of the data and

out of the research where there are going to be conceivably some conclusions. And possibly even some "dss" and "don'ts" -- maybe not a lot of them, but I think maybe more than we think. And I think there's going to be a challenge of how to enable these community action sites to get underway with the research, but also to make sure that people are not going to be in a position where they're going to be doomed to repeat mistakes, or not be able to capitalize on a certain knowledge and use that is beginning to emerge from even the limited research that we have.

So I applaud the idea of challenging assumptions and consciousness raising. I think we're going to have to do at least that. I'm raising the question that maybe as we look at what's going to come out of the research, there may in fact be stronger statements that may be justified for the Commission to take in terms of trying to provide some guidance to communities that get involved.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, very good. Thanks Josh. Bennett?

2

Plenary Session, 4th Commission Meeting

View of
BENNETT: Josh at the conclusion of his remarks referred to research as a key element there. In looking at that end as a slide, I was troubled by the fact that research came at the very end of the list of programmatic actions. It seemed to me sort of the reverse of the process that one would expect normally as part of a design process.

In looking at --

CHAIRMAN: This is not a priority order. It's an accident.

BENNETT: But it struck me as strange -- looking at it, it seems to me you know ... in Appendix I on page 9, we're talking about a Research Design and the work in process -- looking at the framework for a report of this Commission. And I thought that was

a crucial element of the work as we look ahead toward the next meeting, and a very ambitious undertaking to describe what you've called "vision" of what education should be; and also the current state, holding together a host of information on some fairly fundamental research in a short time frame.

I personally would tend to think of the other, where we have used the term research as more analysis or evaluation of results, rather than fundamental research. Because we're looking at specific projects and how they have worked. And I look at that as evaluation, as a better description of that phase of it. Whereas research would be going into our report. I think that terminology may be significant for us.

CHAIRMAN: Good thank you Bennett. We're going to have some comments on research this morning.

Harriet.

HARRIET: I have been thinking about what Sara Lee said and what

-

Plenary Session, 4th Commission Meeting

Josh said and Alvin and the others. And what I am beginning to hear is a need to first set standards and to develop the curriculum -- or a series of curricula -- I'm not sure about my Latin plural to be correct -- so anybody wishes to. But I remember that as part of the discussion in our work group last time when Isadore Twersky was bringing up the subject of curriculum. It seems to me that what we are now beginning to do is to describe a beginning set of standards, by which we wish to measure programs; that best practices becomes not the first ... last part of standards; that the possibility as David was saying at the beginning, that the need for the improvement in personnel and the backing of the community leaders for the implementation of that standard set. But somewhere along the line we may have to come to grips with what we ... the standards by which you measure

what we consider to be good Jewish education, indicating the means to educate the family, the need to -- whatever it is that we decide.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you Harriet. Esther Lea.

ELR: The question of best practice relates to a problem I've been now calling for some time -- the question is what kinds of Jewish education will help development and guarantee Jewish continuity? And step one in Jewish continuity means to enhance the Jewish identity of individuals and families, before we get to the community. And I recall back in the early days -- if I can use a parochial reference -- of the JWB Research Center -- we attempted to develop a scale of Jewish identification against which to measure the Jewish educational effectiveness of a variety of

Plenary Session, 4th Commission Meeting
programs that were being undertaken by center..

And we read the literature; and there were many documents that dealt with identity. Many scales of identification. We couldn't find or devise -- and I don't mean that the whole research center did it -- we had a number of researchers working on it -- we could not find or devise a single scale, one scale, for saying this guarantees Jewish identification.

Which has led me over the years to the conclusion that Jewish identification, and therefore Jewish continuity, is pluralistic. There are many definitions.

When we look at the question of best practice therefore, it seems to me that we cannot look to a single standard. There are those who are so remote from Jewish life, that join them two steps or one step closer in a process that is best practice for that population. For those who have had an intensive day school experience, let's say through high school, and continue and

demonstrate their commitment and involvement by college activity, and they ... families and so on -- that's another level.

What I'm saying is that I would be very leary, worried about any single standard for testing the effectiveness of programs in terms of Jewish continuity and identification. Because I think we need to have a variety, and multiple levels if we're going to deal with the world as it is. Otherwise, we're going to have only yeshivot and leave the rest of the Jewish world to go down the drain.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you Esther Lea. Charles.

CHARLES: I want to ^{Vocational} subject Mort and I think Florence wants to --

CHAIRMAN: Florence you want to pick up on that?

Plenary Session, 4th Commission Meeting

FLORENCE: I just want to ... they said. Because it's so important. I don't know how many people in this room are familiar with ... Milner ... about ... There is in this country such a diversity of acculturation in American Judaism. The Southwest is different from the West; and Middle America is different from the East; and ... is totally different as well.

And I want to say that from the standpoint of using the terminologies that generalize about the American Jewish community -- they generalize about best practices per se -- would not lead to any kind of ... results in terms of how you work with individual communities.

And ... say is that this Commission, in my view, instead of using the word "intervention" which I fully take out of my vocabulary when it comes to Jewish education -- that word does not belong in my view. What I mean to say is that we are going to research professionalism in Jewish education. We are going to research good Jewish educational programs in the various categories that we understand and know. And that we will have

professionals in developing. We will publish this material. We will make ourselves available to your community, if you want us, and we'll give you whatever help you need so that we can work together to meet the needs and goals of your special community. Because every community is special. And even as Alvin says -- that those kids who go to day school have the greatest, and those kids who go to ... afternoon schools don't have the greatest -- I can tell you that I know day schools that went broke because they had lousy teachers.

6

Plenary Session, 4th Commission Meeting

So you cannot generalise about day schools; you cannot generalise about afternoon schools; and you can generalise best practices -- what I'm trying to tell you. What I'd like us ... for us to think about is what we can do in terms of helping that particular community to reach its goals and to try and help that community to teach them how to reach goals.

CHAIRMAN: Very good Florence. Charles.

BRONFMAN: Yes Mort, I'd like to get off on another subject.

Maybe this is almost going back to reishit. But if we read the outside -- the briefing paper -- it says convened by the Mandel Associated Foundations, JWB and JESNA in collaboration with CJF. Now we hear a lot about CJF and about Federation involvement. We haven't heard very much in the meetings I have attended about where JWB or the JCC -- think that they're going through this commission, or what JESNA's role is.

Can we have a little bit of elaboration on that?

Or is it necessary -- maybe I wasn't --

CHAIRMAN: Well yes that's necessary, if you asked the question -- it's necessary,

I would say that we have here a number of JWB leaders and

and on.

CHAIRMAN: Is that the kind of information you want?

BRONFMAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Yes Lester.

L. CROWN: I could too add that just briefly relevant to our

§

Plenary Session, 4th Commission Meeting

deliberations on community action sites -- it seems to me the experience of the JWB in the Commission on Maximizing as well as the implementation created really in a specific form -- community action sites, which became a very significant means and a catalyst for locally elevating the issue and the topic and of community action. So the centers engaged the community in the issue of Jewish education and the same for Jewish community centers in that role.

BRONFMAN: Perhaps one of the things I'm trying to find out -- definition of community. Because I think in the last Commission there was partly "how do you define a community?" Are you talking about a physical location; or are you talking about the various communities be it the seminaries, or be it the day schools or the federations and JCCS. And trying to figure out in my own head -- and getting back to the original question, we've heard about federation involvement -- we haven't heard very much about the possibility of JCC involvement in the possible programming.

CHAIRMAN: At these meetings -- yes. It might be a good idea to schedule that presentation. A number of us, including me, know that there is a very very ambitious program. And it might be worthwhile to have it on the agenda. Of course JESNA and CJF -- that's their whole life. JESNA -- that's its whole life really -- Jewish continuity; and CJF, I don't know Marty whether it's appropriate to make any comment or not at this point.

some past presidents. And we also have JESNA here -- you know -- well represented. Maybe I'll just throw that open to Art -- you want to start -- would that be -- where JWB is with regard to this Commission and its own involvement -- is that a good place to start?

ART: Well, without going back to too far history -- certainly there has been an increase in the amount of ... involvement in JCCs over the past several decades. But it really came to a head

7

Plenary Session, 4th Commission Meeting

in the early 1980s, when a commission on this very subject was set up in the Jewish Community Center movement. And as a result of the work of that commission on Jewish education in the JCCs, the JCCs ... confident - have had a great number now of Jewish programs, a great amount of their staff have been involved in equipping themselves better ... For example, there have been 42 different centers have sent a total of 550 staff members over the last couple of years to Israel for a 3-week program. And doing just that -- identifying their learning needs, learning what they had to learn Jewishly, at the Hartmann Institute -- with the various centers in Israel.

Lay boards have been doing that increasingly lately so that they can be in a better position when making decisions as they have ... in the context of what is needed Jewishly. We've had a - a study was done 6 years ago at the start of the commission, by Bernie ... of the Brandeis University, where Prof. ... conducted a study of all the centers; and then just completed 6 months ago a similar study and an increase in Jewish identity ... programming and increased dramatically. There were at one point no staff people identified as Jewish education specialists; there are now such specialists already competent in 13 of these centers and the number is growing. I don't want to keep it -- to go on

MARTY: Yes it is.

CHAIRMAN: O.K.

MARTY: I think it's clear that federations around the country have put Jewish continuity as a high priority on their agenda. I

9

Plenary Session, 4th Commission Meeting

don't think there is any question in our minds that the Commission is probably 3 steps ahead of what the communities are going to be in the coming 5-10 years ahead of us; but right now, there's some 13 commissions on continuity -- called by different names, but they're operating, throughout North America --

CHAIRMAN: 13 local city commissions.

MARTY: 13 local communities are beginning to study Jewish continuity -- they're calling it identity, they're calling it affiliation -- but that's basically what they're studying. And communities are making more and more dollars available for innovation in that area.

The instruments for implementation is some system that is usually funded by the local community. Whether it be a bureau, or whether it be a commission, or whether it be a committee. So I think it's relatively clear that the agenda of the communities and the agenda of this Commission are beginning to coincide on parallel tracks. And that the challenge ahead of us is to figure out how to network it together so that we can move down that road together.

BRONFMAN: Could I ask just one more question?

CHAIRMAN: Please.

BRONFMAN: That is the relationship in either those cities that you're talking about or in other communities and the collaboration between the federations and the JCCs?

UNIDENTIFIED: I think -- I come by the way to this issue with a mixed bag, because I come out of the center field -- I'd love

to tell you that it's perfect all over the world. Unfortunately

10

Plenary Session, 4th Commission Meeting

it's a mixed bag. As frequently the function of dual leadership and the nature of the relationship between the leadership of the communities. But there has been enormous respect in the federation field for the work of JWB in the area of Jewish continuity over the last several years -- ... since 1980. And the uniqueness of that process was that it was a collaborative process.

It wasn't the center studying themselves in a vacuum -- the centers studying themselves and carving out a new direction in concert with the community leaders. So as federation executive at the time ... started I was involved in the process from the local community perspectives.

I suggest that the nature of the relationship between the centers and federations and between the bureaus of Jewish education and the federations are a function of the local community setting priorities with the agencies, and delivering those together. And that seems to be the model that seems to be working in most communities throughout the country.

CHAIRMAN'S David.

Highline
AVU
Amor? DAVID: Yes referring to Charles Bronfman's question -- I think there are other national organizations that have been rather in the area of Jewish education and not identified specifically in our material to date; particularly organizations that have done research. I would identify those among them: there's the American Jewish Committee, there's the American Jewish Congress, and ADL -- they have all done some rather important substantive work. And I think they need to be also brought into this, for this to be truly a national community endeavor.

Plenary Session, 4th Commission Meeting

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, John -- you're the last of the trouka. JESNA. Would you want to make any comments relating back to Charles' questions.

Wojahn JOHN: I think there's a fundamental congruence between what the Commission is about and what JESNA tries to do on a day-to-day basis. Essentially our role is to serve as the education arm of the organized Jewish community -- meaning the federations and the agencies and institutions which federations have created, and/or support locally to implement their community education agendas.

And that means that we're involved, both in one-to-one relationships with federations and the central agencies of Jewish education, communally-sponsored schools, many of those communities that have undertaken planning ... in recent years -- we've worked directly with a federation in a variety of ways. And also means that we are kind of the bridge for the federations collectively and a whole staff of other actors on the Jewish education scene, both continentally and in Israel, to try to facilitate the communication between and among communities -- and one of our major roles probably a third to a half of our time is involved in helping communities and their instruments get the information they want and need about what is happening elsewhere and about how to apply that to their own local situation.

The other area that JESNA is very much involved with is the whole domain of community awareness, the development of consciousness around critical issues. For example, some of you are aware of the fact that we are in the midst of a series of leadership conferences on Jewish education that began last Spring

Plenary Session, 4th Commission Meeting

in Chicago and the most recent one was in September in Metro-West New Jersey. Which are collaborative efforts of JESNA, the federations in the regions and the central agencies of Jewish education in the region. And they are all pointing towards a continental leadership conference that will take place, coincidentally, in Cleveland in June of 1991. So that I think in terms of the work of the Commission, we see ourselves as being right there as a partner in whatever enterprises are emanating from the Commission -- because this is our bread and butter, this is the kind of work that we do on a day-to-day basis with as many communities as we can effectively serve.

Yamitz
UNIDENTIFIED: You know, just institutionally JESNA has very much felt the part of the Commission on Jewish Education in North America. We report on it regularly at our Board meetings; we discuss it in terms of where it's at, and what the progress is. We've had members of the Commission come and discuss it with us. We are very much interested in the work, and looking forward ultimately to the implementation and involvement as the planning and coordinating body for Jewish education in North America -- in the appropriate role in the implementation process.

CHAIRMAN: Folks, this might be a good time to call on David Hirschhorn. David for some months really has indicated a particular interest in making sure that we get enough facts about what's going on in general, and specifically about how effective what we're doing is. In other words -- who says that a +*x+ e -- which we think sounds good -- really means anything, really works. And this whole business of accountability, evaluation, measurement, getting the facts, etc. is an area in which he has

Plenary Session, 4th Commission Meeting

been interested for some time.

it's an impractical concept -- I mean I don't think we can work on the premise that everyone is going to be able to -- is going to go to day school. So therefore we have to assume that a large percentage of the population is going to be interested in using the vehicle of supplementary education. And obviously there are limits to what can be accomplished in supplementary education, given the time that's available. Therefore, isn't it important that we establish goals for what are practical objectives, what can be practically achieved. There are some things that may be more or less important to devote ourselves to in a period of time, 3 hours a week or whatever, for supplementary education.,.

30 I -- the reasons -- these reasons I had intended to make a plea that we give -- ... ideas and Bennett Yanowitz has already said -- I too would have hoped -- I realize it's not prioritized -- but maybe it is -- but that carry over --

CHAIRMAN: I guarantee it will be at the top of the list next time.

HIRSCHHORN: Because I think that we are all saying here -- and we have I think presented a convincing picture -- that there is a need for more funding. I recognize that there's a need for ... enhancing faculty salaries, there's a need for training, there's a need for making Jewish education a respected profession and so on -- all that's going to take money. But money, by itself, we'll never have enough money, if we don't use our money responsibility, and I do think we need to -- I feel that this Commission probably

Plenary Session, 4th Commission Meeting

among other things, has one service it can perform -- and it's a difficult thing, I recognize and it's a sensitive subject -- but one thing it can do is to help establish the methodology. And I recognize it's already been commented -- standards are not the same. I would be oversimplifying to say -- there's one standard

that's going to be established for everything around the country. That's one of the purposes of establishing proper objectives that are properly related to that local community, to the local situation, the local picture -- that's part of it. And this is not a national standard that I am proposing. But the fact remains that we can inspire, be helpful in -- helpful in working with local communities so those stairs can be set.

Let's say I have prepared to read a statement -- but I don't think it's necessary. I think what I'm expressing and what others have already expressed as well gives me confidence that we are going to give it priority.

CHAIRMAN: You should never read a statement. You should talk without notes. You did beautifully.

David?

Arnold DAVID: I'm very delighted by the general direction ... your conversation so far. Mort, if you will remember, I wrote you a letter a couple --

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DAVID: -- of months ago that dealt with my concern about the need for evaluation. It seems to me that in spirit of all of the comments, most of the comments that have been made this morning -- that we might want to consider adding another paper to the list

16

Plenary Session, 4th Commission Meeting

of papers to be commissioned. And I would suggest it could be called something like The Pluralistic Evaluation Programs in Jewish Education.

CHAIRMAN: Bob Hiller,

HILLER: I was rather interested in David's comments, since I remember the first time that Seymour came to Baltimore and he sat and talked with David and myself in your office. And you're

consistent David. It was the same exact speech you made to him then, and I agree with it, and I think you probably have a fairly rapid consensus on that.

I'd like to shift this just a little bit in terms of taking the same approach but to another piece of this. And that has to do with the whole area of programming. I think this Commission has done an outstanding job in avoiding the difficult task of dealing with the programmatic recommendations, because it's taught and it would be very difficult to get consensus. There -- earlier, I'm trying to remember who made the comments -- but I'm going to pick it up in just one moment -- that if we are really serious about community action sites, this gives the concept gives a free hand to any community to do what you want; and everyone has that right. However, I think that this Commission probably should put some guidelines down, particularly in the area of programming.

When we talk about transferability, replication and so forth -- it's great to transfer something from Sioux City Iowa to Des Moines. I don't know what that's going to mean. And I think that we have an obligation, certainly if there is an instrument for implementation, to begin to talk about programs as it relates to

17

Plenary Session, 4th Commission Meeting

a series of other things. Particularly program -- community action sites, programs that may be dealing with best practice and their relationship to it, and certainly in terms of what we believe, not necessarily spelling out the program, but it is the preliminary to ultimate evaluation. And I think that we can do some of these things and I was going to bring this up in our later discussion, but since it seems so appropriate now -- that the Commission should not try to side-step the aspect of programs by saying -- you know, this is something we can't get unanimity

or consensus on -- but we ought to begin to think about how to deal with programs, which ultimately if you're going to talk about community action sites is going to be coming back constantly to this.

CHAIRMAN: Very good, Alvin and then David.

ALVIN: I'd like to suggest that community action sites indeed -- the whole concept as approached by staff -- relates to research. I refrained in my earlier remarks from using the dirty word "experimentation" and when one does research, you can do it on a variety of levels ... you can collect data and analyze it; that analysis will provide us findings of how we should build that which we might want.

On the other hand, you can develop a methodology to evaluate what exists. And based on that evaluation, the criteria you use, the findings you get -- you can continue and build what you want based on that. But there's another way to do it, and since we're going ... it doesn't require a facility.

When we're thinking of community action sites, we're

13

Plenary Session, 4th Commission Meeting

thinking of developing from something that does exist, something better. That requires experimentation. So the two examples that I gave can be used within the community action site. The community action site using synagogues can try to involve family.

CHAIRMAN: Sure.

ALVIN: In such a way that it will change the whole nature of supplementary education. And make it more viable, make it potentially more effective. That will require some experimentation that is not being done in the Jewish community; it is ... research and certainly action researchers not done in the Jewish community. And there's hardly any experimentation in

Seymour's options that mention that. So I'm suggesting that we're not far off when we talk about community action sites, from the implementation of the concept of research -- if we can become pragmatic about it. And see how, based on the knowledge that we have, and direction we want to go -- develop some experimental models based on experience that we have, in different types of communities.

Now whether or not they can be demonstration from one community to another, and dissemination thereafter -- in general education ... success. That's another question. And you can't always do that.

So I think we're on the right track if we consider the potential of using research methodology in a variety of our ... community action sites.

CHAIRMAN: David.

DAVID: Mort, I'd like to make a very non-scientific suggestion that perhaps could be considered for our next meeting. If it's

Plenary Session, 4th Commission Meeting

totally rejected, I find that ... I want --

You know I teach a course to graduate school and I was ... training with my staff and I always try to get them to think conceptually first, diagnose me to them -- determine what are some of the ideas, the pragmatic models that ... from these ideas. And I like to sort of betray myself and suggest something else here.

Because I think we have a lot of great conceptualizers around the table and evaluators and researchers and so on. I think what would make this process even more helpful is if we could come up with, next time we meet, with perhaps a half a dozen live illustrations of some of the ideas of models that are created, dazzling, meet the criteria we talk about, that would

represent ideas that we may be able to suggest to communities -- not to suggest that ideas can't come forward from communities as well in the process -- and to see whether these illustrations that we can flesh out meet some of these wonderful conceptual thoughts, that they're evaluable -- if they're replicable, if they're implementable, if they meet the two criteria of personnel and community. To really take a look at what we could envision down the road if we had some very pragmatic concepts to make some real changes in terms of the structure in a given community, the programmatic idea, lay leadership -- a new form of lay leadership training. While I agree with Marty that lay leadership are more involved in Jewish education now -- I also find that they're more involved in Jewish education in relation to specific agencies, not in the terms of the community problem of Jewish education.

20

Plenary Session, 4th Commission Meeting

50 I wonder if we could sort of flesh out this process a little bit, with some very non-scientific ideas of the kinds of things that would be live-action when this process is over. I think that's doable and I think it will help us get down to some of the practical realities. It will help me understand some of these deeper ideas that have been submitted.

CHAIRMAN: Right. We accept that and we'll see what we can do with it. I understand where you are coming from. Yes, please Lester.

L. CROWNS This is an old topic that I think -- it may be an old topic, but I think it requires some update. And I thought it's the opposite part of the question that Charles asked in terms of the engagement of community and community organizations and the process.

And if we're about to discuss a mechanism for implementation and the briefing materials talk about the creation of an

organisation, or melting this into an existing organization, I was wondering if you reported on outreach to other institutions -- whether the possibility of another organization, or this committee having an ongoing life and dealing with implementation in an ongoing way. And that that issue has surfaced in your outreach, and whether you can comment on that?

CHAIRMAN: Yes, I can comment on it. It has -- the outreach events were all different in nature. Some of them were more consultative than others. But, yes there seems to be an acceptance of the notion that either the Commission could stay alive, because of its unique -- if that's the right word -- acceptance by everybody, as being -- as having the great possibility of doing something important. Or, some mechanism that is not at this stage

21

Plenary Session, 4th Commission Meeting

of the game linked to any existing institution, so that the existing institutions in a sense -- say national institutions, JESNA, JWB maybe even CJF -- although I'm not sure about CJF -- certainly the seminaries -- all would be the kind of institutions that would receive input, financial, ideas and so on. So some either commission or substitute of the commission might be indicated to keep this thing, this process -- not JWB's job, not CJF's job, not JESNA's job -- but this process moving forward by someone who has impeccable, you might say, credentials acceptable to all.

Yes. We -- I personally have spent a large part of my life fighting new organizations. And with good cause I believe. So, but every once in a while you find a situation where maybe that's not true -- and this may be one such situation. Whatever is envisioned would be very very small. It would have a board made up of the kind of people sitting around this room who could genuinely be open to all streams, open to all acceptable

If you turn to page 7 of the background materials behind the divider headed "background materials," you'll see that item 7 itself, the heading says "one of the major objectives at this point" -- and this is for you to dissect -- any comments now will be welcome in this plenary session -- for you to dissect as carefully as you choose to, in the individual sessions. And then

24

Plenary Session, 4th Commission Meeting

we'll come back again, as you know, at the conclusion for our third session -- our second plenary. Designing a mechanism for implementation has been something that we have struggled with almost from the beginning, but certainly as we got into this. Because we all wanted -- I would guess everybody in this room -- and I don't mean to speak for you -- but I would guess everybody in this room wants the Commission life to --

END OF SIDE OF TAPE

Plenary Session Morning -- Fourth Coefficient 501:14:27:1mg

TAPE 2, SIDE 1

CHAIRMAN: ... through local initiatives and planning. key statements were made today -- I think Maurice Co key statement about the unaffiliated -- how are we go with that. It's in my head, it's the local community reach the people; not us. It's the local community and improve Jewish education, with maybe national, organisations. But people are reached in local community the community action sites, which theoretically would effort of all sorts of national continental bodies something that would be facilitated by the mechanism, implementation,

if you go to the next page -- I'm not going to those, but it does list some of the functions of the could include community action sites, criteria for selection; serving as a broker between expertise at the level -- are inventory of national continental organizations local needs. To encourage foundations and philanthropy would be a proactive organization after me to invest money in Jewish education and others of you are present. Helping me do my thing. You know, what is it interested in?

D. To facilitate implementation of national and continental level and in Israel. We see that as a very Israel is a very important piece of Jewish education continuity. This may mean encouraging institutions to and carry out the development efforts and so on.

Plenary Session Morning -- Fourth Commission Meeting

E. This mechanism might be available to work with and for private foundations, private families, as required or with other institutions for the planning and development of programmatic options.

F. This is where research, evaluation and so on might be housed.

And G. Progress report.

Now if you add to this small hopefully if we ever do it, high-grade staff governed by maybe a lot of the people or some of the people in this room and others -- it might fill a vacuum that is not instead of anybody else, but will help other players now in existence, including our partners to be the best they can be.

So that sort of --

MELTOM: ... question. Maybe I'm not reading this ... but I don't see anything in here that indicates there will be initial research. That the local communities be involved as partners in research. And to try to get their cooperative input from the beginning in some terms of research help. In any case it's what their particular set of problems, do they feel that they need ... from the Commission. Give them exactly you know the kind of an outline about what this Commission was established to do. And what we have done so far. And give them some background and structural on what we are and what we're hoping to do and will they need our help, and would they like our input, etc.

CHAIRMAN: Very good point - I think it's very --

UNIDENTIFIED: You say in number D -- to facilitate implementation of strategies on a continental level and in Israel -- what does that mean "and in Israel"? The Israeli experience and help the

Plenary Session Morning -- Fourth Commission Meeting

Jewish education or to transfer our strategy is to help the Israelis get their ■-

CHAIRMAN: No, no, we're not going to help -- yes, let me just give you some case history -- Art Ratman has walked out of the room, but there are lot of JWB leaders here.

Last summer, I think 13 or 17 center executives went to Israel for 4 months for deep immersion really in Jewish ... This is not to educate the Israeli kids.

Yes, I think that writing could be tightened up.

Any other comments on this. Yes, please Jack.

JACK: I'd like to take Florence's comment and perhaps play the devil's advocate and be cynical or raise different point of views. Namely, that we're presuming that the communities are dissatisfied with the services they're providing right now. And that the communities will welcome some sort of your know suggestions -- and maybe they could be better' etc.

Let's even assume that they are dissatisfied -- are they ready to pay the price of energy effort, work standards, all of the others? And therefore, you know, you're going to come up against the problem that whatever you know vision or suggestions etc. we can come up with -- or even taking what Maurice said before -- there are all these people who are not reached -- let's say that they don't want to be reached. To what extent does -- again, from a theological point of view, like ... view ... that they are you know -- I have to go and help them. But if we want to preserve the pluralistic idea -- is someone entitled -- is a Jew in America today entitled to say -- I'm really not interested in

Plenary Session Morning -- Fourth Commission Meeting

these kinds of services?

So in that sense I'm saying that we are presuming that there are many people out there who want what we have to offer in terms of the consumer in terms of the community, in terms of the institutions -- and they're just waiting for someone to come and give them the key to how to do this.

I think there's a much more fundamental problem. That we are dealing now with very philosophical points of view. Namely, that every -- you know everyone is just waiting for this kind of opportunity. And what point do you cross over the line between P.R. and taking on a certain pluralistic attitude, who are all of these different players that you know we're talking about?

CHAUFRAN: Yes, sure, that -- you're going to keep us from being too arrogant.

P. MELTUM: I'd like to respond to that Mort. I can openly say that in generalizing we err and it's not the right way to think. If there are people out there that have not been reached, I don't ... affiliated and unaffiliated -- I like the word "unreached" because we have proven and I can show you numbers to prove it, that if you deal with a particularized problems of a particular ... Jewish community -- the intermarried, etc., or the inter-faith couples or ..., or those people who are scared to death to come near a synagogue because they don't know how to read the prayers and they feel alienated and estranged -- if you take each one of the segments of a community that stays away -- and you talk with them and find out what it is that they would accept -- you will be able to develop programs, not only ... starving for ... They're hungry for them; but they won't study in the

Plenary Session Morning -- Fourth Commission Meeting

synagogue -- they may come to Jewish center -- the Jewish center is the natural meeting place for people who are scared to death to come near a synagogue -- and they are learning.

I can tell you that we have proven that there are people who even are not Jewish, who have come to the synagogue -- where they would never come to a synagogue education program. And we had one convert last year who just came to learn about Judaism and became a ... and we have many people who are inter-married who came to this Jewish center to learn and they're so thrilled. We have others who never went near a synagogue, who have studied a two-year program and asked for a third and a fourth. So don't tell me that they don't want it; I know they do.

CHAIRMAN: O.K., David.

DAVID: I know that it's not the intent that this group or this body be concerned or might be viewed as a big brother, telling the community ... must be done. But I think it's rather important that we verbalize in all our material very specifically that it is our intent to utilize the maximum existing resources.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, O.K.

DAVID: I mean I would rather like to see that very specifically stated so that --

CHAIRMAN: Where feasible, we would definitely -- yes.

UNIDENTIFIED: No one doesn't like a big brother whose also a rich uncle.

CHAIRMAN: ... be both a big brother and a rich uncle.

UNIDENTIFIED: You can be both -- that's -- is what this is all about.

Plenary Session Morning -- Fourth Commission Meeting

about what's actually happening. We're not in a vacuum; this is not an ivory tower. A couple of months ago I received a call from I guess the immediate past president of the Philadelphia Federation. He says, I heard about the Commission -- how come we're not part of it; how do we get in on it? How do we join up? Recently the city of Boston started a commission on Jewish continuity, Jewish education. I know about the one in Cleveland the best, but there are different models out there. And not only did we get that phone call, but I got another phone call last week -- I know you're meeting next Monday; can you possibly see that we are appointed a community action site, from Boston.

Now, we're not appointing any community action sites and that's not the way our system works. But it's not like nobody has talked to us; it's not like we know nobody cares.

UNIDENTIFIED: Was that a community talking to you?

CHAURHAN: It's a person in the community. Well, O.K. Jack -- it starts there -- you know. I mean dayenu -- for now. I'd rather that than the other.

The point is that I think you should be aware that federation leaders and you know federation leaders don't own their communities, the federation leaders are merely representatives of their communities -- but it's clear they're talking about it. It's not like we know every city and every person in that city Jack wants this. But we're not deaf either. There is something new. And so if you figure that there's a large universe, and we can take the small slice we impact and double it -- we still may be it's a big percentage increase, but it's not

Plenary Session Morning -- Fourth Commission Meeting

it. I mean one group has educational summer camps -- they didn't go around asking people -- do you think it's a good idea; they thought it was a good idea, they went ahead and did it, and people bought it. The day school movement was not something that grew up by a kind of common consensus around the country that the time has come to have day schools. A small group of people decided we've got to do something; they went ahead and sent emissaries to community after community; they generally built against the will of the local community; and in fact I would say in all cases against the will of the local establishment; until they won out -- you have day schools.

The reason I'm saying this is let's not worry too much about consensus out there -- as much as possible yes -- if this group is going to succeed in implementing its vision, its vision has got to have more self-confidence. We don't have to have everyone agreeing every place in the country with what we want to do.

And I think this is a historic chance we have and we shouldn't blow it by worrying too much about others.

CHAIRMAN: Very good statement. I've got 3 more speakers lined up and I'll tell you who they are and then probably we'll be hitting the break hour.

Harriet Rosenthal, Jack Shelkin and Steve Hoffman.

Harriet Rosenthal -- you're hungry right. Well listen you can't get up until the food is ready. So you can't -- Jack

JACK: I'll be real brief -- I just want to build on Norman's point. I think that I would encapsulate where we're at right now as needing to generate significantly greater momentum going in

Plenary Session Morning -- Fourth Commission Meeting

the direction of these -- I'm not worried about the people in the community accepting what's going to come out of it. My sense is picking several community action sites -- whatever those action sites are going to be -- they are going to have to be people in those communities who are going to be in tune with what this Commission -- what it's going to be all about -- we've got to have a running headstart.

What I do want to put on the table is something for us to begin being concerned about, is what I would call -- and I use this term advisably in quotes "the unauthorised and unexamined use of this report." Unauthorised and unexamined -- meaning people who are going to, in other communities that are not initially designated as action sites -- picking up the report and saying: um, this looks good, take something from this chapter, something from that chapter. Experience and failure create a kind of a wave of feeling going in the opposite direction. And I think that that's something to begin thinking about. There's certainly plenty of examples in general education of when that happened. I think that being able to document what's going on in the action sites that are picked to have the momentum propel us forward, and to have it be ... and contagious and to document why it's working, so that other communities will go into it with an informed knowledge-base and not a kind of shooting from the hip thing -- which I worry about.

Because we're dealing with very complex stuff and the amount of support that's going to go into these community action sites is going to be so substantial that a community that tries to just jump in in a sort of a half-haphazard kind of way, may in fact

Plenary Session Morning -- Fourth Commission Meeting

experience some success; may also in fact put themselves deeper in the hole. And I worry about that.

CHAIRMAN: That's a good point. Steve.

STEVE: Josh you worry ... and there's no stopping it ... a couple of good ...

Marty Kraer and I have had the opportunity to talk to a number of large cities, in fact all of them one or another, about the work of the Commission and the general acceptance out there, and to the degree that those professionals represent a cross-section of the ... in the larger cities in North America -- the appetite is very big.

Everybody wants to go from here to there without categorizing what "here" is now, in terms of ... and not ... progress ... call it what you want -- they all want to get up to there. And they're very excited about what might come from the work of this Commission to help them get there. And that ...

The beauty of the guts of the Commission's work, I think, is that they ... to address a lot of the issues that many people around the table are talking about, by focusing on community and personnel. We have to have the people that are going to do all the great things that we're talking about around the table. You can't get into the programmatic options that people are talking about, if we don't have the right people trained to attack them. I talked with Maurice a little bit about what he was saying -- while someone else was talking -- and ... personnel because what Maurice described ... really taking your market and segmented it or from the social work ... starting with where the client is at

Plenary Session Morning -- Fourth Commission Meeting

and drawing them in and then taking them on to a higher level, And we need trained people to do that.

The one thing I wanted to angle on better, Rabbi Lamm mentioned -- it might sound curious -- it had to do with the day school movement example. Coming out of my community organization background, I've lived and died by consensus. And yet I remember now the Solomon Schechter people beat their way into our federation. It's not so long ago. It may be, it may be that the Commission's successor doesn't provide all the time support for those kinds of institutions that are upsetting to the communal agenda. And there is still going to be plenty of room in North America for the people with the great idea who are going to just create facts.

My guess that ~~where the Commission's successor~~ is heading is going to be rooted in ~~consensus approach~~, because of the kind of liberal linkages that are moving forward. I think what we have to agree -- to what Rabbi Lamm says -- is no mechanism is going to be all things to all people. My guess is we're simply going to try to take a systematic approach for change, and that requires consensus and broad kinds of support. That will rule out by definition, not by inclination, certain kinds of radical change. Others thank God will be around ...

CHAIRMAN: Thank you Steve. Folks, I'd like to remind you about what's going to happen now.

If you look at your name tag which I hope you have on, there is a letter on there. And I remind you that's the group in which you are assigned. Let me tell you where they will meet. If you have an "A" -- conference room "A" is this way, as you walk

Plenary Session Morning -- Fourth Commission Meeting

out; it's back here, after you get your lunch. Conference room "C" and the Wiler Room and there will be guides out there -- are both to the right near the escalator. They're both to the right near the escalator. Conference room "C" and the Wiler Room. So ~~there's~~ "a" which is back this way; and "c" and the Wiler room which is that way -- after you help yourself to your lunch, except for the beverages which will be in your rooms.

Thank you all very much. Take the lunch with you.

END OF MORNING PLenary

3/1/90

f

February 14, 1990
Morning

MLM

Annette, thank you. It was a lovely presentation, very well done. I hope you could all see the slides, and at this point folks, the meeting is wide open for your comments, and don't feel disciplined in the sense that there is any given subject. There isn't. Wherever you want to start is where we will begin.

OK?

Jack Bieler

I have several points, but the one I want to talk about right now really to a certain extent takes issue with something that was said earlier. I mean a certain theme in the paper we got that's really expressed on page six, and expressed in other places. That is that the major thrust of this whole operation is the interest of Jewish survival. That might capture the imagination of certain segments of the Jewish community. It will not capture the imagination of the people who don't necessarily see their communities much at risk. It will also not necessarily capture the imagination of educators who are in the profession, not because they are necessarily bent on making sure that the Jewish community will survive, but because they think that the endeavor is an endeavor which is worthwhile, independent of whatever that goal is.

MLM

That is what I meant to say earlier.

Jack Bieler

I think that it . . . more adequately represents the issues that a lot of us are concerned about. Granted that this is certainly a major, major issue, but

transcript of
Feb. 14, 1990
meeting

there also has to be some sort of reflection of the fact that we are committed to an excellent endeavor of Jewish education,, not simply one that is utilitarian or pragmatic to accomplish the goal of Jewish survival.. Similarly on page seven the statement is made that the key to raising the quality of Jewish education is top community leadership.. I don't know if it is the key.. Annette in her own comments,, by presenting it this way,, implies that the major appeal is going to be to the key leadership,, and it just so happens that the key leadership is very interested in Jewish survival.. But if you want the educators also to be interested in this,, then something has to be said to also address their concerns and their issues.. Furthermore,, I hate to make several references to the same theme of the idea that commissions,, as they exist today,, are the models for taking the leadership in various Jewish communities.. I'm not convinced that that is necessarily so.. Perhaps it's not.. What is the profile of those commissions? To what extent are professional educators represented on commissions.. Are they basically lay commissions,, or are they thinking about the pulse of the professional community as well? And therefore,, talking about community,, finally on page eight when you say that these three things should be discussed,, I could see how lay leadership would be interested in one and two.. I don't necessarily see that they would all equally be interested,, or even if they are,, to be in any position to be able to evaluate number three.. Therefore,, commissions must involve the various groups that are representative in a group like this.. We have representation of professional leadership and also people who are very concerned with the quality of Jewish education..

MLM

Very good, Jack. Please, John.

John Colman

Taking on Jack's suggestion here--the work of this Commission and bringing together all the different, not only disciplines, but the whole communal life, I think that it has been a wonderful experience for us. I hope the report can capture that so that that essence could be replicated in the communities. [Not just the lay leaders.]

MLM

Good point. Building on Jack's, it's getting the whole circle, not just one piece of the pie. Excellent, excellent point.

Haskel Lookstein

Getting from the whole pie back to a piece, I'd like to go back to my first comment at the first meeting of the Commission. I just hope that we won't lose sight of that comment, which was "Unless we're going to substantially increase the salaries and benefits of Jewish educators, I think that all the other things we will do, will not bring qualified people into the field." I know right now, for example, of few young people who are coming back from Israel, and they are going to go into the Yeshiva College and may have to make a decision in the next year or two. Are they going to go into Jewish education

where each of them would make a terrific contribution,, or are they going to go into the Sy Sims School of Business and eventually go on for an MBA and/or maybe law school or medical school.. And they are going to make that decision to a certain extent based upon whether they are going to be able to make a reasonable living for themselves and their families.. Based upon whether young men in particular,, when they go to take out a young lady,, and they say they are going into Jewish education,, will that young lady think to herself "I guess I better be a lawyer because I will have to support this guy." Or will the person feel we sacrifice,, we all understand,, but that a good living will be made and that benefits will be there.

I don't know the hard data, but I understand medical school applications are down around the country. I suspect it's because people considering medicine see greater problems of making money down the road. That's what's happening with medical school applications. I think you could have the most wonderful training institution in the world, but unless there is going to be a feeling that these salaries are going to double soon and triple well before the end of the ten years,, because in ten years if they double that is standing still, we are not going to be doing what we should be doing. So, if you look at the paper, I am worried about the listing of recommendations in "C," on page 14. I'm worried about priorities. "C," first of all, comes after "A" and "B." Training comes first and then recruitment comes second, and then conditions of work comes third. Now that just may have been necessarily put in the order of priorities.. I simply would like to reiterate, unless we are going to do "C" first, we won't get to "A" and "B" and if we do, we will not be attracting the kinds of numbers that Annette was talking about. It's frightening, the figures that Annette gave. Where are we going to get those 400? Why should they go

into this profession unless we include in our planning some way of drastically changing the level of benefits and salaries for people in the field of Jewish education on a full-time basis.

MLM

By the way, I might point out I remember the first meeting, too, and someone talked at the first meeting about the Flexner report on medicine in 1910, in which the same kind of overview study was made of medicine. The expression in there was that the practice of medicine at that time was in such low esteem in society, that parents didn't want their kids to be a doctor. Now that's what you are saying. Parents are not standing up proudly and saying "Hey, my kid just decided to be a Jewish educator." So if they did it in medicine, maybe we can do it in Jewish education.

Robert Miller

Mort, I'll tell you something. If we wait about three or four more years, we will have made the full circle. Parents will not want their kids to become doctors. What is happening? We have a great opportunity here. I'm glad Haskel remembers what he said at the opening session, because I want to go over the same point. I think we are talking mainly here about priorities and focus. That was a very interesting chart that was put on the board, which says the way to begin. What I think Haskel is saying is the same point that I am going to make, coming from a totally different perspective. That is that all that we have to offer can only succeed if we establish the priority of personnel. I think that the Commission set that in its very first meeting. As I read the report, I see a series of ideas and so forth, but I don't think that

they have been formulated the way that I would like to see them in this report.. For example, I'll use a simple, illustrative example.. When it talks about initial funding, the way I see it, there should be a slash that says "part of which shall be for a national effort to do the following"--clearly in focus.. Secondly, when we talk about community action sites and the actions of the local community, part of the job of this new mechanism that we talk about or whatever form the implementation takes place, is the essential and urgent task of educating the local community leadership on the importance of national personnel efforts.. And when we talk about the answer, no one should be talked to to, unless part of that discussion on financing is that we have at least a formulation of an idea to design the plan that will create some national standards, help to elevate salary levels and the personnel benefits that are required. The point that I am trying to make is that this has got to be put right up in the front in a variety of ways and it's not in that . . .

MLM

It's not dealt with sharply. I wonder if at this point, I could ask Chuck, take just a very short period of time, Chuck to relate the experience in Cleveland with regard to a wall-to-wall participation of everybody. Cleveland has tried to deal with this whole question of salaries. It's just one case-history, maybe the best way, maybe not the best way, but a good way. Chuck, just take a few minutes.

Charles Ratner

Sure. It's premature to say that it's even a good way, let alone the best way. After a process of building the coalitions in Cleveland, we determined, quite independently of this process, that personnel and profession building was the key priority in the community. We went through a long and very difficult process of whether you throw money at the problem or is it more? One of the most powerful things that I have heard here is the experience in Toronto where they effectively raised salaries very dramatically, and I believe they have not been necessarily successful in making that perform the way they hoped to in raising the standards and the quality and the numbers in the profession. So what we determined early on was that we have to put a serious effort in place that would elevate the salary level and at the same time hope to begin to build the profession, and almost in reverse order. The place where we determined the salaries were extremely deficient was in the day schools. We studied the gap between that salary level and that of public education, which by itself isn't as high as it ought to be. But that was our standard, believe it or not, to try to get there and put in a program which said over a period of years we will, through direct subsidy, improve the salary level in the day schools. We have begun that program. We made partners out of the day schools. It's early to say, but it certainly has been exciting in terms of the experience in recruitment the day schools had last year, as opposed to what they had the year before. A second part, and I think the more important part of the ingredient, was a program which would elevate the field. We put something into place which we are just in the process of doing, which is the training base. We built a

coalition in the community between the Bureau of Jewish Education and the College of Jewish Studies and the synagogues. Incentives are given for participation, including incentives for institutional participation modeled after another community. So far, we have, I think, doubled the number of teachers involved in a more, rather than minimal, intensity level in training. The most important part of the ingredient is something we call Cleveland Fellows, modeled obviously after the Jerusalem Fellows Program. That is the longer-term sort of thing in which the objective is to convince people that Jewish education can be exactly what the rabbi said. It can be the opportunity in this field for stature, for status, for contribution, in reverse order. The contribution, the status, and the stature. We are in the process of recruiting the first class of masters degree students and a director for the program, and we believe it could change the whole community's outlook, and it's been very exciting. The most exciting thing about this process, our process, was the coalition building, the community building. What's so exciting here obviously is what I just referred to. I think you have to make some priorities. I am concerned that in this document, one of the things that you recognize was the deficiency early, which may be here, is that the key player in that coalition is the congregation, where 70 percent of the kids are in our community, and I would judge in most communities. While we talk about all of the partners throughout this document, JWB, JESNA, the Commission, and the denominations, etc., in the community, it seems to me, the key partner in wherever the community action site is has to be the congregations.

MLM

Good. Thank you.

Alfred Gottschalk

I think that it is interesting to note that Mort Mandel and Gorbachev began about the same time. With notion of restructuring, in this particular aspect to Jewish life, as to the same kind of audacity and tenacity. . . , I think we've seen some remarkable results today, especially in the contemplation of a ten-year plan. About 22 years ago, the Hebrew Union College pioneered the creation of a school of Jewish communal service. It was done because there was a perception in the field that this profession needed to have recruited to it, young women and men as confident as the counterparts in Jewish social work. That these be the individuals who were recruited for the sole purpose of serving the Jewish community because it had this rather interesting experience in the Jewish communal field. In lieu to the various programs that the government engendered, the Peace Corps and the like, the best of our young left Jewish agencies in droves and went to these other great social programs. We didn't create such a school, with all the risks entailed, and there were many, until people such as Hank Zucker and Bob Hiller and others in the field of Jewish community service said we will support such a school. We will encourage the various communities around the country to send students to it, we will supply scholarship and fellowship aid during the term of their being students and we will, upon their graduation, welcome them as social workers in our community. Since that time, seven other schools with communal and like purposes have been developed. That's wonderful. Each of them still is

struggling with the same severe problems.. And I want to get back to Haskel's point, which is what I think was the crucial one.. The average Jewish communal worker, a student graduating from our school today, ends up with an indebtedness upon graduation to his undergraduate institution, and to the Hebrew Union College, which has advanced that individual \$25,000 to \$30,000 or \$40,000, a total indebtedness of \$50,000 and \$60,000 upon graduation.. At the range in fields, which may pay a starting salary of \$18,000 to \$22,000, depending on the community.. It takes a rather unusual person to want to persevere in a vocation that rewards in these proportions.. I think this is a problem of the entire Jewish community, and we have been saying it in so many different ways.. And it's no different from the problem we are dealing with here in the field of Jewish education.. The average full-time religious school educator will graduate with the same kind of indebtedness, given the number of years of study that will have to be, which means that there has to be development of a the mechanism that gives scholarships and fellowship support.. During the time that they are in school, there has to be support, and there be a kind of forgiveness of debt.. We are all engaged with individuals who can't possibly repay \$50,000, \$60,000 in the course of their professional career as social workers or Jewish educators.. And this cannot be done by any one institution.. It has to be part of a coalition of institutions that are tackling this problem of finding 400 qualified Jewish candidates a year with good Jewish education.. Or for that matter, for the field of Jewish communal service.. And the realization is that we all need people for our own institutions, our own little segments of the totality of the Jewish community, but it's a problem that is universal in the Jewish community.. That's why this room is so important, because here we are dealing with the problems together.

I would think, therefore, that of all the points raised, unless we finally get to a point of resolving this one, we are not going to move to the others with any great success.

NLM

Thank you. Just a reminder, I've got a bunch of names, I want you to know that I've got your names, but if I don't have it, of course, I will add to the list. Esther Leah Ritz, Al Schiff, Dr. Twersky, Matt Maryles, Josh Elkin, Maurice Corson. That is what I have so far. There may be others, now I just added Norman Lamm, ..so Esther Leah, please..

Esther Leah Ritz

I have a very strong feeling that I'm in a chicken and egg situation. We are talking about developing community leadership for Jewish education, and we are talking about recruiting personnel. The question occurs to me where to begin. This body, no matter how prestigious, no matter what kind of clarion call it makes, cannot legislate higher salaries and benefits that improve conditions for educators in communities across North America. We can issue that call only to the people who can lead their own communities in developing those standards, creating and enforcing those standards. One of the reasons--have heard of the developments in Cleveland--I was going to say success but we still don't know how far the success has gone, is that Mort Mandel and Chuck Ratner, and Hank Zucker, and Bennett Yanowitz, and a whole bunch of people who are committed to Jewish education, and are themselves major leaders of the American Jewish scene and in the Cleveland Jewish community, have made it their business. I'm convinced that nothing will happen unless this issue, the general issue of upgrading the quality of Jewish education, including ^{*} personnel, localizing

u-- ux/vsS

local resources together to perpetuate a program. That message is carried from this body into every community and becomes the property of the community leadership locally as well as nationally or continentally, and I can't say that often enough. I think we are tending to mix programs (outcomes) and means,, and as far as I'm concerned,, the motivation of community leadership to commit themselves--where the decisions are made about the resources apply to Jewish education in the local community--is absolutely a key,, a key,, I wouldn't say the key--there may be keys,, but it is certainly a key proposition in carrying this thing through. I think we have to keep that difference in mind.

MLM

Alvin Schiff

Alvin Schiff

In Jewish tradition,, we are told that if a person is meritorious,, his work is done for him by others.. So that the preceding speakers,, more eloquently than I,, have put what I think should be the focus back on personnel. Remember I told you at a previous meeting,, Seymour,, I said that I felt that we have to return the highlight to focus on the matter of personnel. You said speak up at the meeting,, and I'm going to do that now. We had originally indicated that with two enabling options,, the over-arching enabling option has to do with community support. That was done. That was accompanied by the enabling option called personnel. I think we ought to return the focus of our deliberations to highlight personnel. Unbelievable progress has been made. It has been done professionally,, it's academically sound,, it's practically purposeful,, and I think in order for us to get the show on the road,, we have to return the focus highlighted,, highlight personnel. It's all right to say that this enabling

option includes several things. It's salaries and fringe benefits, conditions of employment and look for that social status that's a part of it. Recognition of excellence. How do you, with a person who is meritorious, how do you earn that merit? It has to be done financially, among other things. We have to create more full-time positions. The day school is where they are. There are no opportunities of supplementary schools, and we have to put on our thinking caps. You know my feeling is that in every supplementary school, there should be at least one full-time family educator who will deal with the family and the classroom. That will give us 2,000 full-time slots. There are some 2,000 supplementary schools in the country. If we do that, we will then build the possibilities and opportunities for full-time professionals in the supplementary setting. Accompanying all that has to be the professionalization. You can't establish professional standards without recruiting those people who meet professional standards and apply them to those in the field who can qualify. Those who are already a captive audience. I will say to you that after our supplementary school study, I'm now engaged in a survey studying the day schools in New York. I'm in the middle of collecting the data. Let me say to you that jumping out of that data, we have 210 schools that we surveyed. There were 140 returns so far. Jumping out of the data is that unless we get the kind of personnel and can pay them, we will continue to lose them. Twenty-five percent of the best people leave within the first five years. That's been established. It's not only in Jewish education, it's throughout the country. Many states have done this study. Let me just give you an example. In greater New York, there are 3,000 people--Jewish educators teaching in the public schools, members of AOJT, the Association of Orthodox Jewish Teachers and the Jewish Teachers Association--3,000 who are from intensive Judaic backgrounds who would qualify to teach almost anywhere. But they don't come to the Jewish school, they are in the public school. Many of

Do you
want to
use
Squid
data?

whom graduated in Jewish Theological Seminary, Yeshiva University and the Hebrew Union College, who are in the public school system. The only way to attract them is placing the hiring of this multi-prong emphasis . . .

Procedurally, and that's where Esther Leah put her finger up, I suggest that procedurally this ten-year program ought to be divided by steps. And we ought to have guidelines for communities. Not every community is going to handle it the same way. But every community must be supported and helped to institute the changes regarding personnel. And we ought to do it in two-year cohorts. What do we want in the community in the first two years? What might you do? The second two or three. Ten years is a long way, and if we wait to somehow get the total impact, within ten years we may losing. We may be losing the total war because we haven't fought the battles along the way.

MLM

You want milestones.

Alvin Schiff

That's right, and I call timelines for programming, and guidelines for communities in achieving that. All the other information, all the other things we want to do are absolutely essential. They are the handmaidens of this enabling option. We should continue with them, and they should be sidelined, accompany, the focus of personnel.

MLM

Thank you Alvin. Matty Maryles.

Matthew Marvles

Thank you. This is a truly complex subject to address,, because there is a tendency to seek a quick-fix,, bottom-line,, tangible result which will sort of justify what we have done in the past year and one-half.. I don't think that we are going to get to that point.. We may write a report with that result.. The reason I say that is that simply the problem is too big for any one commission or any one group,, or any group of philanthropists to tackle.. Let's try to parse the problem into pieces.. We have a large number of Jewish children who are getting some form of Jewish education--day school,, supplementary,, or reformed,, and we have demonstrated that the shortage of qualified personnel,, who are addressing the needs of those students.. There is an even larger body,, probably,, who are getting no Jewish education in any formal or even informal sense.. So even upgrading the quality of personnel,, and certainly I'm not against that, I think it's a given,, the question is will that deal with the issue you put up front? Intermarriage,, for example.. How are we going to get all those other kids who are not in the system whose parents don't think it is important enough to be in the system,, into some system of Jewish education? Personnel alone is not going to do that,, because even if we are immensely successful,, let me throw out the some numbers at the risk of being oversimplified.. If there are 30,000 full-time Jewish educators,, is that the number? Oh, 5,000 full-time.. So let's assume that we decided that we had a pool of money and that we were going to immediately upgrade the financial compensation of these educators were receiving by \$10,000 per year.. I think that . . . most would agree that that's a step, but it's not as far as we

would like to go if we really want to achieve the objective of raising levels of compensation. At 5,000 teachers, that's \$50 million per year--\$50 million will require, if we were going to endow this, a fund of \$500 or \$600 million, and that's only to deal with 5,000 day school educators and you know I'm a proponent of day school education. But we will be dealing with a narrow segment in an insufficient way, with an amount of money that would appear to most people to be insurmountable, and we haven't touched really what has driven the formation of this Commission. That is that loads of Jewish kids are not getting the Jewish education we'd like, that those who are getting some are getting an insufficient amount, and we haven't even touched that problem. What will address this problem is creating an atmosphere in each community which says Jewish education is a very high priority. Now, even in the day school movement where presumptively the parents have said Jewish education is a high priority, they are spending money to educate their children. They are doing so consciously. One, there are parents who legitimately cannot afford what it costs to educate their children. Secondly, there are many who will say they can afford it, but I'm only willing to pay so much to educate my children. Now that's not going to be changed simply because you raise the quality of personnel, even though it will have some psychological impact. What will change it will be a sense in the community that Jewish education is the sine qua non for the continuation, and I agree with Jack that we shouldn't oversimplify survival as what's driving us. The Jews have done that for many, many years. Nevertheless, the way to get people's attention is by addressing the fact that there won't be even whatever minimum amount they have in the next generation unless we reach those children. So, I think what we are looking at is a partnership of empowered people with status, both lay and professional. I think we are looking at philanthropy and Jewish communal

leaders as the leaders and catalysts for a grass roots movement,, in which everybody says ultimately that Jewish education is the priority.. It is what's going make everything else go in the next ten generations.. We cannot walk away from it. I think we have to recognize openly and honestly that there are different forms of Jewish education.. All must have an opinion,, each of us has an opinion as to which is better.. But we ought to recognize that if we really want to give Jewish education of high priority,, if we tell a teacher become a supplementary school teacher,, and we think that's very worthwhile,, one,, the very name supplementary school suggests something else,, which is top priority,, as opposed to supplementary.. If we talk about informal,, we are saying there's something formal which has got priority over informal.. Its very hard,, even with good salaries,, to convince someone who's looking to make his own mark in life.. This is what I did,, this what I contributed to humanity,, and tell them that this is someplace they should devote their attention.. Even in the day schools,, we have to convince teachers that they are an empowered partner.. That means that they are part of the decision making.. Empowered doesn't mean that everybody takes one task and divides it in two.. It means that two people come to the table with two different sets of skills and reach for a common objective.. I think that's what has to happen with lay leaders and with professionals.. We have to recognize what we can do,, what we can't do.. We have to understand that ultimately if Jewish parents and caring Jewish leaders who'll make this system go.. There just is not enough money around in one certain place,, even to make it go,, we have to get down to grass roots and convince them that we as leaders,, and I think that's where the Commission can make a tremendous mark,, that this Commission and a lot of people who make their marks in all aspects of Jewish and American life,, we are prepared to say with

everything we've done, as individuals collectively as communities, we've missed on Jewish education. Obviously, there are a lot of good Jewish institutions that are around, and I'm proud of the one I'm associated with and I think that many people here are proud of the ones that they are associated with. But we have missed a lot of people. There are places we can improve. With everything we've done, we have to recognize Jewish education is the priority for the '90s.

MLM

Excellent. Dr. Twersky.

Twersky

I thought I was going to take off from Robert Hiller's comments, which I was very happy with, but in the interim, I'm led to two preliminary statements and then something about the way I see the nature of the report. I feel very strongly about this matter. Two preliminaries are that I think we must avoid two conceptual, philosophical extremes. One is that without us, Jewish continuity is in danger. We said this at the first meeting in I've stated informally and on other occasions, I think that's clearly not the case. I mentioned this in the letter to you, Mort. Our task really is to increase the numbers of people that will be found in an ongoing, confident Jewish community that's committed. But we are not going to create that. That's there. The other extreme is to say that with us, we'll achieve a messianic goal of making education available to everybody. That is the Talmud already, Sanhedrin, I'm studying now describes this as a messianic goal--that one would go from their to the Yeshiva and not find one ignorant person. I think both of these extremes should be avoided. I think that we will make a difference in PR, creative, and committed, and true to our mandate.

Here I want to speak very personally. I ask myself what is and what was our mandate? I go back to the discussions that preceded our first meeting on a hot August day when the air conditioning broke down, but nevertheless, we were moved. It was great. Expectations were high. I thought that we had taken as something axiomatic that education is important. Perhaps the single most important component in Jewish continuity. It's not something we need to prove. It was an axiom. Nobody gave us a mandate. I was not told that we were asked by the Jewish communities in North America to meet and to issue a ten-year report that can change the nature of Jewish education. I think there is something grandiose about that, and that's not what we should be doing. To my mind, the report that comes out of this Commission, should start with a description of the genesis of this Commission, what were the initiatives that were responsible for inviting the commissioners who are here, to the extent we can capture these reactions, why the commissioners accepted the invitation. I know I can be very specific about what I was told and about my own thinking that led me to say yes, I'll make an exception to my own rules and accept this invitation. I think after the description of the genesis of the Commission, we should go on and list the results. What have we accomplished in the course of these two years, being very specific. I think we should talk about the fund, whatever amounts will be made available to enable us to begin, and here we agreed upon two areas, personnel and community action sites. I think we should then say something about the implementing mechanism that will be set up before the Commission dissolves itself. Perhaps mention some smaller projects that were discussed along the way just to show that we are we--Commission.

Vb /

C.V 3 1

Cv'cataJA

y t +/

CCW'vw

I think what we are talking about is improvement, enhancement, not necessarily change. There is much out there, as we said at the beginning, that is going on that is very encouraging. And if not for what is out there we wouldn't be sitting here today. So we need to improve, to enhance, what is happening out there. That's the way I see the report being structured and I would like very much and I hope to get some reaction. I feel strongly that to do it the other way, just begin with generalities, grandiose rhetoric about education and about the woes, the achievements and the woes, will not give our report the impact that it should have. Now, if I may, just one question really and my reaction to this. I for one don't remember. I attended all the meetings. I missed that last October one but I read all the minutes. I don't remember that this group ever discussed or approved that long list of research papers that find in our report here. I think that too might tend to deflect attention from what we are really all about and what we want to accomplish. My own reaction, if I may say to the first of them (on page 33). What I am referring is the link between Jewish continuity and Jewish education. It seems to me that everybody here knows very well, intuitively, that Jewish education broadly defined, as we have done from the very beginning--formal and informal--I don't see anything demeaning when we say formal and informal or day school and supplementary. We're just spelling out what we mean by comprehensive. Jewish education in this sense is the single most important determinant in Jewish continuity. That doesn't need research. I don't think that needs proving. It's axiomatic. There are many ways that contribute to Jewish continuity. I think of an encounter with Israel or knowledge of the Holocaust. Meeting a Jew with a great mind or a great heart, or both--if they exist. Any such experience will contribute immensely to Jewish continuity. Reading a book. I recently read a

story of somebody who picked up a French translation of..... on the Left Bank and that turned on and turned him back.. All of these things are important, but the single most important is clearly Jewish education and I find it redundant that we need to undertake to prove that.. Now I have comments on all the other proposed papers, as well, but I'll save them for another time.

MLM

Thank you Isadore for your very thoughtful comments.. Josh Elkin, Maurice Corson, Dr. Lamm, Sara Lee, Mark Lainer, Eli Evans, David Arnow

Josh Elkin

As I sit here and listen, the list gets longer and the need to respond to some of the comments. If I could just for a minute, just a preliminary comment in response to Mr. Twersky's remarks. I think everyone in this room does accept Jewish education as the critical piece in promoting Jewish continuity. There are other things but it certainly is at the center of it, but I think its instructive just to look at what's happened in the community from where Professor Twersky and I come, which has just launched a commission and the commission is called the Commission on Jewish Continuity. I think the choice is deliberate. I think that if the Boston community, where it's at right now, in all deference to the wonderful things that are going on there, were to convene a commission on Jewish education, I would say at this point, given people's consciousness, the caliber of people that manage to get on that commission would be different. Hopefully, 18 months from now, which is the time line of that commission, people will be sitting in a room in Boston and

will be looking around and will reach the conclusion I think that we've already reached. I think there's a marketing piece here in getting people to realize that in fact there is a connection that we all see as being very obvious.. I want to go back just for a moment to a point that was made about the complexity of the problem. Far be it for me to disparage at all the comments that have been made about salaries and benefits. I think they are interplacred and appropriate,, but two additional points I'd like to make about this.. One is that the report that is written might want to relate at least in part to the fact that there is a lot of literature in general education that suggests that salary and benefits by themselves, which I think is the Toronto experience so far at least,, don't make a difference and so we are dealing with a multi-faceted problem. I would like to propose that in terms of trying to make sure that people reading the report don't put the Commission in a position of having to pigeonhole itself into one particular section,, I would like to suggest that even among the enabling options that we are discussing here,, that there is very important focus on personnel,, very important to focus on community. I would like to suggest that the enabling options are in fact going to enable each other. That this relationship between the two of them,, that yes the enabling options of personnel and community will enable a lot of programmatic things to happen but there is a symbiotic relationship between the two of them and if, in fact,, we are working on building community support,, that will have an effect on the profession and all the things we want to do in the profession. If we intervene on the profession,, part of being able to do that and to raise the money that is necessary and to hold on to the people,, we're going to have to convince the community to be more supportive which gets to Matthew's point of the ambience that's going on. I would like to sort of

suggest that in casting these two enabling options,, that we are careful to not let people be very reductionistic about this and say that there's a certain place that you can intervene. You really do have to intervene on both simultaneously. You'll get a synergy if you do that. Relate it to the community. I want to go back to page one of the material that was sent out. If you take the formulation there as far as the community,, it's much better than the formulation that Jack pointed out was the problem where the focus was just on top community leadership which I think implies from its language lay leadership. In the fourth paragraph on page one,, "a process of communal mobilization for Jewish education will be launched,, of outstanding leaders,, scholars,, educators,, and rabbis," and I would just like to underscore the fact that it goes back to the point about the supplementary schools,, that we've got to keep all of these people invested and we need them to really become involved. The rabbinic community is critical from the movement that I'm most associated with. We have a lot of work to do there. The educators themselves feeling empowered in the process and not feeling that something is happening to them without their being involved in that process. Thirdly,, I think that one of the exciting things that we have experienced here has been the linkages and the networking that have gone on among people from a variety of different perspectives,, and I would think that one of the things that we should be encouraging is that if indeed there are to be local commissions and committees that are going to be working in various communities,, that there be an awareness up front,, and possibly included in the report,, that some mechanism for continuing those linkages after a process of self-study be anticipated even in advance. When we started this Commission,, the notion of some successor to the Commission was very very unclear and it will have a particular role on the

national level. In the local community, it can keep the players talking to each other and keep the synergy going and make sure that the community doesn't go back to its very fragmented and fractured way of functioning. And lastly, just because a lot of others want to talk and I don't know when I'll get another chance to get something out, I want to clear something up that does not have to be related to right now but I think that we had better be thinking about and I'm sure that some people have thought about it already, is that when was there a time in Jewish history when there wasn't more than one big agenda that was coming on the horizon? I think that everything that is happening in large measure since the last meeting concerning Soviet Jewry. I don't even think that we're beginning, maybe only the people in the uppermost levels of leadership in the federation can begin to grasp exactly what's going on. But I think that we have to be cognizant of the fact that this report is going to hit the community probably right on the mark with a whole other set of issues and I just think we have to be thinking about how do we deal with this. We could propose a \$500 million fund which has been proposed already. I mean, we need \$500 million here. How are we going to do this all? I think that that's something that we have to be realizing--the milieu into which the report is going to be put. I don't expect things to be much different than they are right now. The agenda for Soviet Jewry is probably going to be more and more urgent and pressing and needy.

MLM

Thank you, Josh. Maurice Corson.

Maurice Corson

I'm going to touch on three areas, two of which at least have been discussed in part by other members of the Commission, in their comments. I want to touch

upon inconclusiveness, implementation and personnel. I want to begin by saying that Professor Twersky's comments had a deep resonance with me. I think that we need to be earthbound to some degree, to a greater degree, both in terms of our expectations and our self-perception as to what the Commission possibly can do and the potential for change. Lifestyle changes, that's what we are talking about in terms of the American Jewish community, will not result quickly. They won't be the direct result of increased funding or bright young people graduating from our training institutions. I'm reminded of efforts made by the various denominations over the years to effectuate lifestyle changes in the lives of their congregants. United Synagogue had a program for sabbath observance a number of years ago, and these efforts have taken place from time to time. What we are talking about is a very significant portion of the Jewish community that does not place high premium on Jewish education and is not willing to spend a lot of money out of pocket, and therefore the Jewish community itself is trying to develop a way of upgrading Jewish education without necessarily making increased demands on those who will not be responsive. I was talking to a young man who worked for me some years ago who lives now in Riverdale and is very committed to intensive Jewish education, and he earns a modest salary as a Jewish communal professional. He wants to send his child to Schechter day school, and the tuition is \$6,000 a year. He simply can't afford it, but he will afford it because he has a very deep commitment to that kind of education and somehow, someday, he's going to find a way of doing it. I remember my own experience as a congregational rabbi where, if we asked people to increase substantially their dues or their tuition for religious school or the number of hours or the requirements for participation in a Bar Mitzvah program, we would lose some number of people who would go to some other

institution that would have lower standards. So I think that we have to be rather cautious in terms of our articulated expectations and we do need a marketing plan to create some excitement in the Jewish community. Although, that's the soft stuff that I wanted to talk about. Now the hard stuff. I want to commend you, Morton, and those who are working with you for expanding the Commission to include those who Chuck Ratner said before are really at the forefront of Jewish educational delivery on the local scene. That is the synagogical community. Participation here of Bob Abramson from the United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education and Bob Hirt I think is the salutary extremely welcome, and I think will help in whatever implementation is to come out of this Commission in the future. I would hope that we will have similar representation from the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. I sound like a voice that repeats itself all the time. I have shared this with Seymour and with Hank and with others. I hope that we will come to a time when Hillel will be represented around this table before the final report is issued because it seems to me that for every youngster who goes to a religious school or a day school, there are twice as many who find themselves on a college campus because if 50 percent of the kids are getting Jewish education formally, 90-some percent are on college campuses and they are on college campuses at the most critical years in terms of formulating their own values, articulating their own lifestyle, their own priorities, their own Jewish loyalties and affiliations and if we omit significant participation, both as recipients of the funding increases that we are talking about, Hillel which is a star system, both in terms of personnel and in terms of funding and programming, I think we are going to be missing a major opportunity for impacting on the Jewish community in the field of education. That's inconclusiveness. In terms of

implementation and I don't think anyone has referred to this, I simply want to repeat in this forum what I have shared more privately with Seymour and others. It would seem to me a gross error if the implementation mechanism agencies to a christen of national agencies who have, for the first time, come together very successfully and I think very meaningfully, to work the field of Jewish education and then sort of the three national agencies that are joining in sponsoring this Commission, namely the Council of Jewish Federations, JESNA, and the JWB. I would hope that that consortium will be able to be perpetuated, because one of the, perhaps unintended but nevertheless most beneficent consequences of this Commission, for which you are to be commended, is that they were brought together to talk about something they never together talked about before, and they've done so, I think, with a good deal of commitment and with very positive results. I would hope, and I put my hat in the ring as one voice at least, that the implementation mechanism will be placed under the operational auspices of JESNA, which is our national body for addressing the quality of Jewish education and the relationships between local communities and federations and the larger American Jewish community. That agency, I speak not as a partisan, but as someone who simply looks at that agency in the large Jewish community is, I think, like Hillel, underfunded, understaffed, underappreciated, and underprioritized, and if there is anything that I would urge this Commission to do, it's to reverse that and to give that agency the status, the personnel, the funding that I think it needs, and with which I think it can have a profound greater impact in the Jewish community, and I would hope that the implementation mechanism will be in some way significantly a part of, although under a separate board of directors and separately funded by the Commission. Thirdly, personnel, and here I speak with

with a little bit of experience, namely that of the Wexner Foundation, which for the past four years has been thinking about this problem, and for the past three years has been working in this area. The problems are much more complicated than I would like to go in to, or that you would permit me to go into. I do want to touch on a couple of issues that I think that we have been made sensitive to in our work in trying to recruit the brightest and the best young women to go, to undertake graduate training for careers as Jewish educational leaders. We have learned that there is no national recruiting mechanism for the field of Jewish education. There is something that exists in some of the other fields that we are trying to address. Each of the rabbinical schools has something of a recruiting mechanism. Each of the denominations is supportive of it. In the communal service field there is a recruiting mechanism of some kind, but of the three fields that we are dealing with, the most impoverished is Jewish education. So there needs to be a special fund created just for developing a recruitment mechanism. The second thing that we have learned is that even when we try to aggressively recruit, it's hard to do it because the climate is not particularly supportive yet. Of the three fields that we are trying to upgrade, the smallest representation in our Fellowship program comes from the field of Jewish education, and it's something that we are trying and struggling with. Sara Lee's, who's on our graduate fellowship selection committee is shaking her head. We talked about this at our recent meeting. We are trying to deal with it. But we are only dealing with one part of that problem. We are dealing with the top educational leadership. We need to recruit people for the broad field, for teachers in classroom as well as top educational leadership, and there is nothing that is being done there, so I think that's imperative. We need scholarships as well as fellowships, and

that's been talked about in terms of tuition remission and forgiveness of loans. We need to improve the training programs that exist and create new ones. That's been alluded to in the findings. We need the fringe benefits and salaries, and then we need to address, in a much more thoughtful way, the problems of retention. No one has given us any scientific data as to how many people enter the Jewish educational field stay in it. The impressionistic information is that a lot leave. So we at the Wexner Foundation are trying to deal with that problem in some area and that is by developing continuing education opportunities for people in the field, and we hope thereby to, in some way, raise their self esteem, give them a feeling they're part of a profession that is worthy and to enrich themselves professionally as they continue. But each one of these fields of these fields that I have mentioned, recruitment, fellowships, scholarships, training programs, salaries, continuing education requires a lot of attention, and I would suggest keeping with what Bob Hiller said at the outset that we need to put some dollars on what it's going to take to turn those specific areas around into some area of improvement.

MLM

OK, very good.

Dr. Lamm

Mort, I think I would like to think through a little better my comments, rather than do them raw. So I would prefer to pass now, and come back a little bit later.

MLM

OK, Sara Lee

Sara Lee

I would say, I would certainly affirm with any of the comments that they made up to this point, but perhaps take a slightly different cut into what I think is an implementation problem. It's interesting to sit here and listen to people take as givens a bunch of assumptions about what is going on in the Jewish community, the role of Jewish education, the value of it, what's happening. I wonder if we went back to the very beginning of this Commission, whether all of those assumptions that inoperate people's comments would indeed be there. In other words, there has been a whole process of developing awareness and being given information and learning, that I think, even the very outstanding leadership on this Commission has gone through. Therefore, it appears to me that because this is essentially a voluntaristic community, something I think we have to keep remembering. We live in a voluntaristic community no matter what Federations say, no matter how much money they give out, no matter how many commissions they commission, the reality is that Jewish education is delivered in congregations and in schools that are independent, that are not part of any system which can mandate or that can set up rules and standards to which these educational institutions would adhere. Consequently, it seems to me that one of the next steps that this Commission needs to contemplate as part of its facilitation, is an educative process for the people who are the deliverers, and the employers, and the conceptualizers of Jewish educational institutions. That is to say, somehow we need to have the most significant people who will be implementing the thoughts and ideas of this

Commission brought together in some way to go through this kind of experience, albeit not as extensively over three years.. As Professor Twersky said, nobody, I guess, authorized you, Mort, or anybody else who convened in this body, and in the same way it appears that we do not need to seek authorization to invite people to very important gatherings in which this education process takes place. And I think unless we do that, none of the initiatives that have been suggested here, by the way, even those in personnel, even if we would have mandated raises and salaries, and if we would have mandated benefits, and if we were to give fellowships and scholarships, the fact of the matter is unless the context in which Jewish educators work and in which Jewish education is carried out, unless that is profoundly changed, none of the changes will have any meaning whatsoever. No program, no new curriculum, no new initiative. Therefore, I see one of the tasks as highly educative. There is a whole body of people who have to come to the same assumptions and understandings. So if we go back to say that to some degree that people have pointed out, that the statements this Commission wishes to make are somewhat rhetorical. We are speaking to a Jewish community that does not have these same assumptions. Therefore, I think that education process is essential and it meets the part of our consideration of the next steps.

MLM

Thank you, Sara Lee. Mark Lainer

Mark Lainer

It seems to me that the discussion we have had so far raises some questions about the focus of what we are doing. I am not sure that they can ultimately

be answered, but at least the questions have been raised. One possibility is to take what's been written already, which has gotten us this far, as we see how it is going to come out in the end after our June meeting that's coming up. You can rewrite in such a way where, for example, you could give the personnel issue the main focus, which apparently some people feel very strongly we should do. I've been dealing with the question in the sense that community awareness, community consciousness-raising, in and of itself, may be, for me, a pretty important goal. The reason I say that is that in Los Angeles, for example, we have gone through a process recently in light of the new immigrants who have been coming in, we have been required to raise monies to be able to have scholarships for them. Some of these schools were taking these young people and were just overwhelmed by them. So we actually were able to get certain foundations and groups a few extra \$100,000 in the last few years to be able to raise scholarships. To me, that's good enough. However, for some people around here, I would feel that if we had that extra money, they would say that we should then focus it in the area of personnel, that just putting it in scholarships is not good enough. I'm just wondering whether here we have a certain amount of mixed signals amongst ourselves, as to really which way we want to go, and possibly whether we need to really ask the question to ourselves as we close this thing down and we move it into the next level of implementation, are we giving the kind of message we really want to give? I must tell you when I heard the first few speakers, and I listened to Sara, and of course this is something that I'm aware of, I think that the question of personnel really kind of strikes you and hits you very hard. But then after I

think about it, and if I see it in practicality from the particular community,, I personally feel that we are better off with what we are doing,, which is to give a broader base, albeit emphasizing personnel,, but still give a broader base. I'm not sure that everybody necessarily agrees with that,, and that's why I'm really raising the question..

MLM

Very good question,, Mark. Thank you. Eli Evans..

Eli Evans

My reaction to the report was that we need to remember that we are writing an advocacy document on one level. Therefore,, the goals,, and mission,, and vision of the report have to make demands on the communities. And the idea of putting a pricetag on what we want to happen,, I think is a good idea and a good discipline for the community. I went through this with the Carnegie Commission,, the first one on the future of public broadcasting which commission demanded and said that it was going to take \$400 million over the next 15 years in order to put the public broadcasting system on the map. It became an advocacy document for people inside the system, in Congress, in the local communities,, and it happened. You can argue all you want about public broadcasting is become in the last 20 years, but it is a much different system than it was before 1960. I think we need to put pricetags on it and make demands on the community. However it comes out, we can set goals, salary goals

equal to the public schools,, and say this is what it would cost to bring the current system up to what public schools are doing and this is what it would cost. That's going to be headlines and that's going to get this whole idea debated in a much more dramatic fashion than vague demands for salary..

Secondly, I don't believe all of the fringe benefit issues are essentially local issues, and I argued this point very early in the Commission meetings. There are benefits of us sitting here as a national group that we can look at this system nationally. I think we ought to look at the health and determine issues as a possibility of the national system that it be underwritten by major philanthropists at, perhaps, enormous costs--\$50 - \$100 million, but with a set so much for the recruitment issues of the local level, because people do have wives who want to teach or others to then come into the system and get the kind of coverage they couldn't get in their jobs and that they could give to their families. That would be a tremendous contribution to the field. I've had some preliminary conversations with people at TIAA and CREF, because you remember, Andrew Carnegie dreamed in 1916 that should be retirement for teachers, a simple idea, and put up a little money to make that happen. It is now a \$60 - \$70 billion system, the envy of the world. It is one of the reasons that professors in this country can move from institution to institution and it has been one of the main reasons why we have been able to have a system in this country that allows people to go in and out of the universities and not lose those benefits. I think that that would be a tremendous contribution. I realize that the demands on the staff in thinking about such a thing and the consultant demands to think about it. If we came out with an idea that was specific in this report, it is not impossible that a major philanthropist would step up and say this is what it would take to save Jewish education in

America. I'm willing to devote my fortune,, and do it.. We should give them the opportunity around the country to do it. Lastly,, Matthew Marylles made reference to the other half, the people who are not involved in education, in Jewish education, who do not belong to congregations,, and I argued this point in the beginning and I think that it's really my major argument with the cast of the report as it now exists.. I realize that in this room we have a lot of professional educators,, and I don't argue with the point that the pivot of this report has got to revolve around Jewish education and its institutions in America today. But we cannot write the report for the 21st century that doesn't it address new technologies,, television, cable, VCR, which is now is 70 percent of American homes, and in 95 percent in American homes by the end of this century, and the opportunities with cassettes. We cannot write a report for the 21st century that doesn't address this opportunity that families have to introduce themselves to major issues and questions in Jewish law and where we can give them the opportunity to do so. Now, Dr. Twersky mentioned the encounter with the Holocaust, the meeting with the great minds, the interaction in Israel, is three elements that are important to the Jewish soul. I would contend that possibly I don't want to misquote you on that, but I would contend that there are so few ways without the, or us to encounter the Holocaust as the century comes to a close. That we must take the opportunity to do something seriously. We have been, as a foundation funding the video archives of survivor testimonies in jail, and now at the museum in New York, and has some 2,500 testimonies on video that would not have existed otherwise, and we have linked up with Facing History and Ourselves/in Boston and developed a curriculum for the public schools around those testimonies. When Abraham

Joshua Peshel appeared on American television some 15 years ago,, ABC asked for anybody interested in a script to write in,, and 25,000 letters came in the week after he appeared on national television.. Recently,, we uncovered the raw material of the editorial tapes of Edward R. Murrow's interviews with David Ben Gurion. There is a 15-minute interview that will appear,, and you will see it now in 1956, but there was an hour and one-half of conversation that went on and here's Ben Gurion addressing with Murrow all of the great issues of the future of the Jewish people,, which are in terms of their relationships with the Arab community around them,, are so critical and central.. Everything that is being discussed is just an unbelievable experience and Mr. Ben Gurion addressed in 1956 terms the issues that we are really debating today.. The opportunities are extraordinary for us to do this,, for us to introduce our children to do, and to begin to train teachers and the teaching community how to use this material. I think that this is a critical opportunity for the Commission of a writing a report that will be far-reaching and visionary in that sense.. I think it would enable philanthropists to think about education,, not just in terms of the classroom,, but in terms of the way in which there are certain truths involving an American life today.. The average child in this country,, Jews included,, under six years of age spends four to five hours a day in front of the TV set, and is there anything Jewish there? The Hillel campus kids watch TV and love to go to the movies in the dark, as somebody said to me. These film groups have an enormous attendance:: 15 to 20 million people,, according to the Nielsen's, 15 to 20 million watched Shalom Sesame. Now, I want you to think about the implication of those numbers and what it means. It means that the ratings were equal to Sesame Street and every city across the country, including in the Midlands and the South, and also people, a great

success of Sesame Street to major cities and now 45,000 of those tapes have been sold to Jewish homes in America. So I think that there is a hunger there for families to introduce their kids, and I think we need to address that as an important issue, and not just an afterthought of this report. It seems that the media and the technology fits in very well with the need to try to address those people who don't belong to ...in the home and I don't see any other way to do it.

MLM

Thank you. David Arnow

David Arnow

A couple of points. As a psychologist with a research background, perhaps I'm somewhat suspicious when I hear about axioms. Dr. Twersky, I must respond to your statement about an axiomatic relationship between education and continuity. It's one that is why we share, and I was particularly curious when I came across an article a couple of month's ago, which I wound up sending to you, Mort, of a research study that showed that at least in terms of intermarriage, you can use that as a very gross way of thinking about continuity, that Jewish education is the third most important factor in predicting intermarriage. The first factor was merely associating with other Jews and having a large proportion of Jewish friends. So if we're going to start thinking about continuity, I think we have to be perhaps a little more realistic, and perhaps that means a little bit more modest about the role Jewish education plays. Two: In terms of the thrust of the report and the tone of the report, I think that the tone in general needs to say that Jewish

<?CJC «

3

\J6SpJ.

education is really a value itself, and we want to enhance that value, that we are not, as Jack said, interested primarily in Jewish education as a means to any other end--the end of continuity, the end of raising money for Israel, the end of making loyal organizational servants of our people. It's an end in itself, and I think that this issue is the high ground and I think that that's where we want to be. We want to be above all of the other issues about Jewish education for this or for that. Related to that, I think conversely there is a real danger in focusing in the report on the issue of continuity. That gets us focused on the "to be or not to be" question, which Jews have a great deal of anxiety about, understandably of course, but the point of our endeavor is really to say how to be, how to educate, etc. We don't want to get into the "to be or not to be" issue, particularly because I think that that is connected with the very kinds of anxieties--will the Jewish people be?--that may in the long run have created some of the problems with affiliation that we have. Who wants, after all, to jump into the boat if you are being told by your community leaders, that this boat is going to be sinking unless we do this, or unless we do that. We've sold for too long and, maybe even too effectively, this image of the boat that is about to sink, unless we do this or unless we do that. I would like us to steer very clear of that.

A point that Joshua made. We do have something to say. We want to sound trumpets, the clarion sound, but when to do that? Right now, as I'm sure everybody in this room knows very well, there are other trumpets about ready to start sounding and I think it would be undermining our efforts to sound the trumpets at the wrong time. For pragmatic reasons, there are going to be people around this very table who are going to need to be raising hundreds of millions of dollars to send someplace else. And for this to come at a time when it seems like if it will perhaps inherently make it a lower priority item than it would be otherwise would be from a timing point of view, I think a real mistake. So I think that in terms of the ultimate release of this report, and if a little judgment has to be exercised in terms of when to spring this on the community, there are some real serious discussions to take place.

MIM

I'm going to ask Matty Maryles to help us out. I'm sure you know when to buy and sell stock, Matty, so you can help us on this one.

Maryles

I know more about this than buying and selling stock.

Ismar Schorsch

I think that the success of the Commission is a consequence of staff work and I think the Commission departs from the staff work at great risk. I think the staff work behind this Commission is superb and the report that we are deliberating on has the kind of balance that we ought not to abandon quickly. The balance can be depicted structurally. There are three levels I think

that this report talks about. It talks about the delivery of Jewish education to youngsters at the local level. It talks about the training of teachers which is level two, and it talks about research and the creation of professors of Jewish education in level three. All three of those levels are vital and I think we would impair the quality of the final report if we abandon the balance of those three levels. What cuts through this debate is an enormous tension over personnel and that is what is pulling us away from the balance of the report. And I would like to just offer a few thoughts on reconciling that tension between the three levels and with their balance and panic over personnel. The problem of personnel is a real one, but I think we ought to formulate it positively and here I pick up on what David Arnow just said. I do not think we should come to the community in desperation. That if we do not do this, there will not be any Jewish future. I think we ought to come positively. In the last 25 years a lot of very exciting things have taken place in the American Jewish community. And we don't have enough personnel to fill those places. We are talking about the creation of a day school system. We are talking about the creation of Jewish museums. We are talking about large summer programs, camps, trips to Israel. The number of religious, cultural, educational, achievements of this community over the last 25 years is staggering. In some ways, it is comparable to what happened in the area of Jewish studies, which is another great achievement. All of a sudden American universities opened their doors. Positions were being created across the country. We didn't have personnel. We had inferior individuals stepping into positions that were begging for competence and we addressed that personnel issue. In a sense, that's what's happened elsewhere in the Jewish community. Through the creation of dynamic institutions at all levels all over the place

though
need
for
personnel
is a
positive
thing

that are begging for professional competence.. So that's the positive message it seems to me that ought to be our point of departure. I do think we ought to concentrate on personnel. I think the three levels ought to be related in terms of our preoccupation for creating the kind of personnel that these institutions merit. So I would suggest that much of the local effort also be directed at the production of personnel.. There are a lot of people manning the trenches right now. They are not necessarily well trained.. Much of the local effort, it seems to me, ought to be invested in inservice training.. The people that are there are dedicated. They may be not as knowledgeable as you would like, but they are to be salvaged and improved. So a lot of effort at the local level, which is indispensable for mobilizing the community, ought to be about recruiting personnel to manage at the local level.. Personnel is a complicated problem. Just articulating it is not talking about a solution. We don't have the institutions to train personnel today.. I asked myself, how would we train 400 teachers a year today? Where are the places that could train 400 teachers today? They don't exist. We have yet to create the infrastructure to produce the teachers. That's why the third level of your staff's report is so crucial. That is creation of professorships, institutions, and research. We don't have the personnel to train the teachers. Certainly not in the numbers that we are talking about. And that's why I think the balance of your report is so crucial. That third level of creating professorships in Jewish education at the right institutions across the country is indispensable for training the teachers. Training the teacher is more than just teaching a kid Hebrew or a little bit of Jewish history which he is then going to go out and dispense. It is a lot more sophisticated than that and we all know that. But where are the professors of Jewish education?

Where is the research? That's why I think level three is so crucial. And if level three is done visibly and systematically, you will also raise the status to the whole field. Right now the field does not have a university base. And there is no serious academic feel in this country without a university base. So I think that level three will address level two and level one and we ought not to short change it and I think if you think of all three levels as addressing the personnel question, it may break some of the tension.

MLM

Thank you. David Hirschhorn.

David Hirschhorn

As has already been said by several, this is a very complex problem. It raises for me a number of questions and I'll start by also making a point. As far as I am concerned, there is much of the report that I agree with and therefore I want to dwell on those things on which I have some concern and questions. Not necessarily answers. As Eli Evans has mentioned, I wonder whether our report should be primarily an advocacy type of report as opposed to suggesting that we're going to be involved in implementation. I don't clear, even though there is indicated in the report that it will be working with existing institutions and I realize that much thought that is involved as to how you work with it, but it leaves open what this relationship is. And I don't think we can issue a report leaving it that open. I would be inclined, and I'm not sure of this, that I would be inclined to lean in the direction of relying on existing institutions to be the implementers as opposed to this Commission being

involved in implementing. Which suggests also the question I have, whether there is a rationale for creating another body. I'm not sure that that is justified. Other than for advocacy. So those are questions on my mind that disturb me about the report as it now stands. I also realize it's a very ambitious program that's been set forth and it suggests that we have a ten-year plan. A ten-year plan suggests that at the end of ten years, we are going to identify some goals which you're going to say have been or have not been accomplished. I question the desirability of including a timeframe of ten years. It bothers me unless we have an objective which will say at the end of ten years we will know that this is what we have accomplished. We are going to be saying to people, this is what we expect to do. I don't think we are in a position to do that. I also endorse the suggestion that some qualification of the effort needs to be undertaken. It's going to be very difficult but even if we deal with , it's helpful as part of the advocacy effort and being able to identify the scope of what we're doing so that it can be dealt with seriously. The matter of timing disturbs me too. We didn't know at the time that we started that this was going to be a problem but I do think we need to be seriously concerned about whether this is the time for us to embark on another major effort, and I'm assuming that it will be a major effort. Just a final comment about Jewish survival, that has been discussed here. I suspect that the real concern about Jewish survival probably is based on birth rate. I've seen a report recently which makes a point that unless there is a significant change in the birth rate, which I understand is 1.8 for American Jews, demographically we will not survive. We will go out of existence. So that is a real significant problem. I don't know whether it comes under the heading of Jewish education, but it's a reality.

MLM

Thank you David. Bennett Yanowitz and Norman Lamm is what I have left or is it a reverse order?

Bennett Yanowitz

As I read the report, I kept reading it from different perspectives as JESNA president, as a member of our federation board of Cleveland Jewish continuity, of the first president of our supplemental communal Hebrew high school, CJF board member and I recite all those not in terms of any special "yichis," but in terms of the complexity of the problem and what has to happen is to be wary of the moment as you read it I think influences your thinking on it. What we all have to be aware of is that there is a large Jewish educational establishment out there that is very complex and involves a lot of dedicated people who are doing a lot of work, raising a lot of dollars, I don't know if it's \$500 million or \$750 million, but somewhere in that range and going annually into our Jewish educational endeavor. And that we have to be aware that we are moving into an area which is large, established, and complex and trying to have impact on it. I suppose I should also mention one other as the husband of the chairman of the board of the College of Jewish Studies in Cleveland and I probably get more on that at home than any other piece of Jewish education. But it all comes down in most cases to finances and personnel when you're dealing with the problems and how you impact on it. For many years the only day school movement of any consequence was

orthodox, and it was largely supported, not by federations, but by the commitment of the parents who had a belief in the importance of the education of the child, and by teachers who sacrificed financially because of their belief in what they are doing. We've broadened out the day school movement now, but I think universally while the salaries have not come up to the level of the public schools, the amount of the salaries, which are the major components in Jewish education, are enormous. If we were take that budget and increase it by 5 percent, we are dealing with more dollars than we have raised on the Passage to Freedom programs for Soviet Jewry this past year. I think we have to keep that in perspective. I asked myself as I have read it, could JESNA have been the convening agent for this kind of Commission, as the central body for Jewish education in the United States? My answer was no. It takes the impact of a Morton Mandel, this remarkable staff that he has assembled, the impetus over a year and one-half to first bring it together and to carry it through, because I think JESNA is part of this complex establishment that I have described, would of and by itself not have been able to convene this remarkable group and bring it around the table, on the number of occasions that we have. But in terms of where we go with it, I would agree with much of what has been said, I think it has been a fine discussion here this morning. I think we have to have a visionary document, one which has an advocacy character to it, as Mark has said, consciousness raising in the community. I think we have to be guarded on our premise and our goals of the conclusions. With all of those things, I think there are some things that we describe in the implementing mechanism that our goals may be a little overly ambitious. I agree wholeheartedly with the statement on page 27, that the mechanism will act as a facilitator and resource for local initiatives in planning and

bringing together the appropriate local and continental resources. But when I go on to the next page in terms of where we say it will be a driving force in the attempt to bring about across the boards systemic change for Jewish education in North America. That's a healthy bite, and I think that if we are going to set that goal, we have to be pretty careful in defining what we mean by that and how we hope to do it. In terms of whether it should be the the national agencies or separate implementing mechanism, I think that's a complex issue by itself. My instinct, wearing the JESNA hat, when Maurice Corson says give it to the national bodies is instinctively to say "amen." But it is much more complex than that, and I think we have to again look at our goals. Whatever that body is, I'm sure that there will be a large degree of cooperation and involvement by all of us. I'm not concerned about the institutional character as much as I am about the total involvement and dedication to the goals however they are defined in here.

MLM

Thank you, Bennett. Norman.

Norman Lamm

We have been at this for about one year and one-half, and I think a couple of years before then, we had this earlier group that was meeting. How many years was that, Mort?

MLM

That must have been two years and different group, but nonetheless the same general subject.

Norman Lamm

We have been building up to this, and I'll tell you, it has been very exciting for the faint signs of hope that the larger community is waking up to certain realities, and it's been building like a crescendo. I find that thrilling, hopeful, encouraging, whether or not the it's axiomatic that education is the single most important element in Jewish continuity is irrelevant. Maybe Jewish friends is more effective, but we are not going to be effective in influencing Jews throughout America to move back to Jewish neighborhoods. Demography, certainly, is terribly important, terribly important. The success of the effort to increase demography depends upon the nature of your constituency. That's a completely different kind and almost intractable problem for most American Jews. What we are involved in, therefore, is a Jewish education, which is of all the available options, the one that is the variable that we most can do something about. So it's very exciting. But now I must tell you now that we are here at the penultimate meeting, which means we are ready for "tachlis," and I'm getting a little nervous. That all the investment of time, and effort, and work, and staff, and everything that has gone on with it, it has to succeed. I, therefore, deeply appreciate some of the warning signals we have heard this morning, from Professor Twersky about the need for some collective modesty in our aspirations, from Matty Maryles, who brought an eloquent warning, not to expect to solve all of the problems because if we try to solve all the problems, we will solve nothing. I would add in addition to the problem of timing--the whole Russian Jewry effort is coming out at the same time that we are. There are other problems. We are going to be asking the community for money. Our community, the money-givers in our community to a

large extent are people who are related to Wall Street,, and that's not exactly the healthiest condition these days,, as recently as this morning's New York Times.. and the real estate people,, and the real estatemenicks are all running scared right now. So it's not the best time,, but then I console myself with the thought that it never was the best time for Jewish education.. So we have to go ahead, we can't postpone this effort,, that's out of the question.. Because I can assure you that after the Russian Jewry effort will be over,, another crisis will develop.. We Jews are a crisis people--not the chosen people as much as a crisis people.. So,, let's not forget,, what where are dealing with is an equally great crisis,, except that it is chronic.. It keeps on going and going instead of making a dramatic splash at all times.. But,, therefore,, I would establish the following general principles in what we are going to do. (1) The idea of getting community leadership mobilized--that, by all means,, has to be done. There is no external reason why that should not be done. We started it. That is an absolute must,, because without leadership, nothing else is going to get done; (2) We are facing here--in this whole conversation we have had this morning, two different points of view have emerged. One of them has been we can't do the whole job,, let's take one thing and do it well. Take the 5,000 full-time people and develop them better.. Give them each a \$10,000 raise, no matter what it takes.. At least we will be sure that they are going to live well and, therefore, do a job. Others have said you can't. You have this, you have all kinds of things that have to be done, and there is an interrelationship between them. Looking at one thing will mean that you have to neglect the others and, therefore, only that will be done, and even that won't get done because they won't have professional status, they won't have training institutions, and so on and so forth. Yes, we have to go

into all fields. But clearly when it comes to where we are going to put our money, there it comes down as so much of life does, not to great principles, but the quantification. And here I believe that we will to make certain choices. I think we will have to work to recommend certain choices. I shouldn't say we are going to make the choices. The people who give the money are going to make the choices, but they are asking us what our opinions are. I believe that we will have to not put all our eggs into one basket, but we'll have to be rather careful in putting more eggs in the better baskets, and less eggs in the other ones. I, for one, would put more money into those areas where I think we are going to succeed rather than into those areas where we have a quiet feeling, but know we will not succeed. Therefore, as between educating those children whose parents have at least some interest in educating them, as opposed to those whose parents just don't give a damn, I would go for the former, rather than for the latter. I would simply try to help those families where we know we stand a chance, because the parents are predisposed to the values of Jewish education, rather than to the millions who really don't care at all. Similarly, in the matter of personnel, which I think we've all agreed is so terribly important, here too, it requires a determination. Which of these areas is most important, which is of secondary importance, which is of tertiary importance. And the quantity of help that will be given should relate to such value judgements, which we can't avoid, even if it's going to break consensus, because now that we are ready for action, it has to be that kind of choice. This group has to continue as, I suppose we are going to continue in some way, primarily as an advocacy group, and become a lobby throughout the country, throughout the continent, to see that the other things get done as well.

MLM

There's one more person who has requested the floor, is there anybody who hasn't spoken that would like to say something? We are going to be meeting this afternoon in small groups and we'll be meeting again this afternoon in plenary. If not, I'm going to call on Esther Leah Ritz.

Esther Leah Ritz

Thanks, Mort. I should have allowed Rabbi Lamm to have the last word because it was a very effective last word, but something occurred to me and since I spoke early, I missed the opportunity to react to a number of things that were said... I want to go back to the very beginning of this Commission. When we were talking about Jewish education, we were not talking only about teachers and classrooms, and I think it is necessary at this penultimate session to repeat that. In fact, the report must say in some way or other, what we mean by Jewish education. I would offer as an example and I don't have it here, the definition of Jewish education which was used by JWB's commission on maximizing Jewish education, which said, in effect, that education, learning, Jewish living for its own sake, and to strengthen the Jewish people, is a lifelong process that had to take place in a whole gamut of settings, including the school, the center, the club, the neighborhood, the family, and so on. Something like that must be said, and I need to reiterate it now because we have had the feeling expressed by Eli Evans that the tendency was to look only at the classroom and, therefore, we were ignoring media and other possibilities, and then immediately confirmation of that by the fact that the rest of the discussion dealt with the classroom and teachers. I beg that the report itself and that this Commission think of Jewish education in its broadest terms. We tried at JWB, and Mort chaired that commission, to find

some term other than Jewish education and certainly not substituting for the word continuity. We couldn't and, therefore, we had to define what we meant, and I think that's our task also.

MLM

Good. Very well put. Folks, two subject headings. One, my own reaction to the statements this morning is that I am just so happy that every word has been recorded. These were a group of extraordinary statements, in my opinion, and it's not that I didn't know who all of you are, it's just that after a couple of years, we have arrived at a common language and we are using words that I think that we all understand and maybe some ideas we have talked through together. I was just terribly impressed, and I would say to you if you by popular request decide to vote to leave right now, that this all would have been very, very worth it. It has just been a wonderful, wonderful morning. But don't you dare make such a break. Secondly, I just wanted to go through the mechanics again, there are

AFTER DISCUSSION GROUPS:

MANDEL: Folks, will you take your seats. We want to convene, reconvene. The wonderful microphone is not on.

Is it on? Pardon? How about this? Could I have something here -- could I have that here?

... is pretty much what we advertised. We're going to call on --

UNKNOWN: Wait, there's some people --

MANDEL: Oh, are they not here? Oh sure.

UNKNOWN: Give me 30 seconds.

MANDEL: O.K. can you hear me. Is the microphone working?

O.K. welcome back. Are you different than you were when we adjourned at 11:00 o'clock? Outside of being more tired maybe?

I had a chance to visit briefly each of the sessions, and there was action at each of them. And I thought a very spirited discussion at all of them, from my point of view. And of course, we're very anxious to hear in all of these proceedings as your sessions were, I tape, will be taped, as this one all day has been -- very anxious to hear your reactions; reactions, comments, suggestions. I remind you, in addition to the discussion which will further illuminate whatever you are reporting today, this afternoon -- in addition to this discussion we will have the benefit of a very careful analysis, that will be made immediately after this meeting adjourns of all of the issues, of all of the suggestions, all of the points of view, some substantial disagreements among you or among respective groups. Nonetheless, all of that we believe will serve to inform us greatly in terms of next steps.

transcript of

June 14, 1989

c7E/vA n'ee'v'v)

Next steps will be to prepare harder documents than anything we've seen thus far, for our next meeting this fall. A word about that: We are attempting to set a date that will be good for many of you and not in conflict with all sorts of things that go on in Jewish life, and what we're thinking about now is November. We have been unable to clear a date yet; we're working on it. As soon as we do, we'll get it out to you as fast as we can. My guess is no later than early July.

And I will say that all of us, certainly me personally, appreciates the manner in which some of you undoubtedly have jockeyed your schedules around to accommodate these dates, which is why we want to get them to you in July for November. I'm hoping you'll be able to accommodate them as you did in the past.

The agenda for this afternoon, I remind you, is individual report from the chair or whoever is reporting, supplemented by co-chair and I suppose any member of the group who wants to. Then a discussion. And we'll then proceed -- start with group A, and then Group B and Group C -- for no reason other than it's just A, B, C. And ask questions, have different points of view, whatever pleases you. We will adjourn at 4:00 o'clock so that -- as we promised. We should be O.K. which is why we asked you to adjourn a few minutes before 2:30, so that we could be starting now; it is now 2:30.

With that, I'm going to ask Benny Anowitz, who is the co-chair -- Charles Bronfman left -- Benny Anowitz, if you're ready Ben -- you've had about 4 minutes to get organized maybe --

B. ANOWITZ:: I too was a drill sergeant in the army,, do I need the mike?

Our group had a very interesting discussion all the way through,, both morning and afternoon.. Initially as we looked at the community action sites,, the question was raised:: what were the alternatives that the staff considered in community action sites,, what were the other ideas that may have been played with and were thrown out,, what really should we be thinking of if there are alternatives? And what really came through was that this really was the principal focus,, there wasn't anything that we could really focus on,, not materially..

We talked about what we ought to be talking about,, whether we focus on community action sites or personnel and community and decided we really wanted to stick to community action site first. And when we got to personnel,, the question is where do you find the great teachers.. The point was made that at Brandeis Institute,, it's successful if you have a Shlomo Bar Deam,, and when you have these kind of great motivators,, you have successful institutions.. And the importance of personnel was stressed.

The question was:: how do you build the profession,, how do you go about it to entice people in. The importance of training,, developing full-time positions and ladders,, professional ladders to make it attractive to people as was stressed. The question was raised by John Coleman of --

MANDEL:: Alvin,, Alvin that was a test; you handled it beautifully.

ANOWITZ:: The question was raised as to how you define community; is a community a particular city or is it a group of organizations such as Orthodox day schools across the country,,

regardless of the site. We didn't really answer it. We said that we all should be taking a close look at how we define community. A question raised, are there models of community action sites. Jon Woocher's point was: yes there are many successful programs going on throughout the country continuously, which are successes and each community though when they do it and are successful, can't afford to spread the word and can't necessarily afford a continuation of the program itself. They've ... their funds in the project, in the pilot project, and not necessarily able to continue funding it. They're not sustained in that sense, and not disseminated and what we might be looking at is some idea for publicizing and replication throughout.

The point was made by Dan Shapiro in terms of building community, that you need to involve community leadership. And it's important -- it came out later in the discussion -- that this involvement should come early on in the process, that without that you are not going to have the same possibility or probability of success, unless you get lay leadership involved in the programs early enough.

Dr. Gottschalk stressed: don't neglect the existing institutions, and faith communities and their own institutions. There are many excellent programs now that are in existing vital organizations and they ought to be used.

The point was also made that we ought not to neglect compiling information on what we now have. It was stressed in a different context, that we need data base to move ahead, to find out what's out there and what is working, and right now there is

Third Commission Meeting -- June 14, 1989

a climate in the American Jewish community for change in Jewish education. We're a part of that; it's important that we capitalize on the bulliness out there and our sense of timing is right. The programs should be successful.

It was stressed though, if they're going to be successful, that we must build in standards; we must have some high standards for the programs and that we also must have evaluations.

When it came to what goes on at the local communities, in terms of the need for research, there was some feeling that there is a need for research; others felt that we were over our head in research. WE've got enough information; let's go ahead and start doing things. And it's more important to be doing at this time.

There was strong feeling that whatever program we go ahead with in the action site, that there be a requirement of reporting and possibly even quitting post-programs, if we had a successful program that the community, that the reporting level be from the community up. And the possibility of reporting out, not just up, but to other communities. And using their experience that others could build on with their cooperation.

This afternoon our format was simply to take the issues posed in the memorandum; this morning was a non-structured kind of discussion. And looking at those, ... on the question of community action sites -- do we approve the concepts? Yes. Can we -- but some people felt gee we can't do only this, there's a lot of communities out there. The question is can we get the message out quicker? Can we be doing more than ... communities, and not neglect the rest of the country? The feeling was somehow we ought to find a way to. It was suggested by Dr. Twersky that the

project itself is a message for the rest of the country; that we don't necessarily have to wait for us. There are successful programs; you can start your own process. But we may be able to pitch in and help you in various ways. But the initiative may come from the community.

Hank Zucker stressed that the community action sites would not be the sole product of this Commission, but we ought to have a good deal more to say about the quantity, quality, goals and means of Jewish education in this country, and not simply focus with a -- or not simply conclude with a program on community action sites, but really have a good deal more judgmentally to say and more programmatically in terms of guidance.

But the part of that is, a number of cities are doing their studies now -- 11 or 12, more are probably going to in the future. And that we ought to be guiding them where we can.

On communities -- I stress the point I mentioned earlier -- involve your lay leadership early. On personnel there was an endorsement of the validity of the 4 elements -- these are valid, they are proper steps. Some people felt that we ought not to neglect curriculum, that a part of this process of the entire educational program, curriculum is a key element; it may flow out of the others, but it ought to be very much in our minds.

On the question of personnel still, profession-building is very important. There is a feeling that the profession is now characterized by low esteem, the issue is how professionals see themselves and that if we're going to build the profession, part of our job is raising that esteem.

On point 4, which is the bringing personnel and community to bear on mounting or strengthening specific programs -- here we say we have to really look at the precise roles within the education profession that people have, and build that esteem and training around the precise objectives and levels that each person has. Don't deal in broad concepts, but deal in specifics. Wherever people are or should be.

Relating local and national action, we didn't really focus in on that. We generalized on it this morning, but then tried to sum it up this afternoon. On data gathering, again we stressed, as I've said earlier, the importance not only of data gathering, but of the conclusion of the process, of evaluation and assessment and here we had felt there will be some -- within the report of this Commission -- some more finite kind of statements on the importance of these things and the state of the educational facts as we find them today.

On item 7, move from Commission to implementation and what are the steps, what's the role of this Commission -- it was mentioned by several people, and there seemed to be no exception within the group, that this Commission is something very important and very special. The fact that was expressed at our very first meeting that we were coming together with the diversity of backgrounds and branches of Judaism and training and perspectives that all of us have, coming together, first time probably in American educational history -- sitting around the table, not for one meeting, but now 3 and going on from here -- that this itself represents something special that should be built on. We didn't use the phrase, but I think it's both a

Third Commission Meeting -- June 14, 1989

message and a medium message to the American Jewish community in terms of our ability to do so. And the medium being a vehicle for implementing the recommendations. And it is an appropriate mechanism for doing so.

How we relate to the national and local agencies,, is something that has to be looked at carefully in the future,, to be sure that we get the best implementation in practice from what we're doing and use existing resources,, but that somehow this Commission ought to be overseeing the ultimate outcome of its recommendations. Thank you..

MANDEL: Ben thank you. That was a wonderful report.. I'm going to suggest at this point that anybody else on Group A,, the group for which Ben is reporting,, who wants to make a comment or add anything,, please do. And then we'll move on to Group B and finish all the groups and then we'll have a general discussion.

So is there anyone else -- yes Henry..

HENRY: Just supplementing --

MANDEL: Excuse me,, can you hear?

HENRY: As Ben has said,, there were 2 paths that were recommended for follow-up so that we prepare for the next meeting.. One has to do with community action sites -- a strong endorsement of the idea of local community action sites,, but also a suggestion,, recommendation if you want,, that before the next meeting of the Commission,, leading to the next meeting,, there should be a detailed statement covering various aspects,, what do we mean by community action sites,, how do we select the sites,, how will this idea be implemented. Something in considerable detail to be sent

Third Commission Meeting -- June 14, 1989

out in advance of meeting number 4, and available for discussion at that meeting. So that we see whether we endorse the specifics suggested and so on.

And the second was that the -- we suggest that we begin to prepare a rolling outline of our final report,, the idea of coming out of the thought by several people in the group that the community action sites should not be the product of this commission,, but a product of the Commission. An important one,, but nevertheless that the Commission must address itself to the total question of Jewish education in America -- what is the state of Jewish education? What vision do we have for the state of American Jewish education five or ten years from now? And more detail about the community financing aspect,, more detail about personnel,, a fuller paper so that we get some ideas and by the end of the 4th meeting,, the one next November,, of where we're heading now in our total report as well as what we do specifically on this new idea of a community action site.

MANDEL:: Anybody else in Group A that we welcome a statement or a comment? If not, we'll -- alright.

I'd like to ask Esther Lea Ritz and maybe Esther Lea you can stay right there.

RTTZ:: I think so.

MANDEL:: And David, you might move.

RTTZ:: My report is going to be very short. My expectation is that members of the group will want to comment either immediately afterwards or in the general discussion. And in fact some items on the agenda, we didn't touch and we'll leave for the general discussion.

In a manner of speaking,, I think we've devoted all of our attention to community action sites,, but interestingly enough in doing that we wound up discussing personnel,, community implications,, relations between the local and national enterprises,, and the continuity of the effort represented by this Commission..

I think it was taken almost as axiomatic that the community action site -- can anybody not hear me? -- I never was a drill sergeant..

But I have still ... We took it almost as a given that demonstration projects,, or community action sites,, were a necessary part of the process for the Commission; not the end but the beginning,, in order to test out in a variety of communities methodologies,, programs and approaches that might be replicable across North America. We felt it extremely important that we define -- we the Commission define in advance criteria which would then create the framework within which the Commission could invite communities to become sites for demonstrations,, rather than our sitting in some meeting room, no matter how lovely,, and picking some sites -- or conversely,, inviting everybody to come in and tell us what they'd like to do and then just deciding out of hand which ones we think we wanted to fund or relate to.

Criteria should be -- include willingness to look at new ideas,, that is -- and openness in the community,, and a flexibility on our part to accept those ideas. A comprehensive view by the community and this gets into the question of community building and community response -- that we would expect

tant programs that would be funded for community action sites would involve coalition building within the community,, as wide as possible,, in some cases across-the-board,, and in some other cases that might not be possible.. But more limited.

The willingness of the community to accept the monitoring and evaluation by the Commission or its successor,, by some framework in terms of the criteria and in terms of the effectiveness of the pieces put together locally..

We recognize the need for money.. In the community action sites as well as elsewhere,, what would hopefully be forthcoming from some components of the Commission -- but we felt that it was important that a local community in undertaking to become such a site, would commit its own resources as a match to those -- as a goodwill effort on its part and an indication of interest in the community in strengthening Jewish education..

As well as top lay leadership commitment -- I'll get back to that because we weren't so sure that only top leadership had to be involved.

Quality control, including an emphasis on enabling options for personnel and community and oversight, as I said.

We see, although the focus of the community action site is a local one, a continuing role for the Commission or for some entity coming out of it to create a network among those communities and between them and the generality of communities in North America, so that information can be exchanged; and in addition to create linkage between those local efforts and the national agencies already in the arena -- not only JESNA and JWB, along with CJF but the congregational and rabbinical bodies, even

voluntary organizations. They were not mentioned in our group -- but I -- Hadassah for example has a major national adult Jewish educational program -- that sort of thing ought to be encompassed and part of the linkage system created through ... the Commission..

Particularly with respect to training institutions,, which must be involved and they have to be challenged to take an active role in meeting these needs of the local communities -- as well as undertaking national initiatives themselves -- it was interesting,, and I'm sure this was true of your own groups -- we had people whose experience is mainly in national training or educational settings,, and people whose experience is almost entirely in local settings.. On the one hand we had people expressing concern and conviction that the national training or educational settings produce the overwhelming number of Jewish educators; and on the other hand, we had the concern expressed for the great number of what were called "avocational" teachers, who spend two hours a week or perhaps 4-6 hours a week and that's it, have never had national training, and had some training locally, mostly in-service. And who represent the bulk of the current Jewish educational enterprise in North America.

In talking about community action site, we did talk personnel and we talked community. Personnel we agreed to the four points, the action points that were in the agenda from last time. We added a fifth that I want to call to your attention. Because it struck us that it had not been raised before. Lay leadership development in the field of Jewish education, and now

I think I'm speaking more specifically of formal education, in synagogues, supplementary schools and even in day schools has what can only be regarded as a primitive level of lay leadership development. It doesn't begin to compare with the major efforts that have been made in federations, in centers and in other agencies, where the president of the synagogue is practically single-handed in spite of his school committee, his or her religious school committee, behaves ... towards both the administration and the faculty of his school. It's a matter which we thought ought to be included as a criterion in dealing with some of the local programs -- that there be lay leadership for the functional elements within the community, lay leadership development programs across the board, as well as the incorporation of top community leadership into the leadership of the Jewish educational enterprise.

We believe that we should be supporting, developing community action sites in a variety of communities, that is variety by types of community, even by level of sophistication. If we deal only with those that have already demonstrating relative degree of success, and I want to comment on that, we will be ignoring the needs of many of the communities which aren't there at all, and can't begin at the level which the most sophisticated communities have begun at.

We did not discuss the question of research; obviously that's a function of the continuing entity, which I think we took for granted. There has to be some continuity between this effort and whatever report comes out and the product of the demonstration program, the dissemination of information and the

collection of information and the dissemination of information from those demonstration sites, and from others which may be undertaking their own initiative. The dissemination of information and the networking between the local efforts and those of the national bodies. And so we leave it to the generality of this plenary to develop the design of that continuing body, and we heartily endorse the community action sites as a component of the product of the Committee.

MANDEL: Esther Lea, thank you for a very excellent and clear report. I don't see Donny Mintz, he may have stepped out. He was the co-chair. But would anyone on the same group, Esther Lea's group, care to make a statement or a comment?

Steve and then --

STEVE: I just wanted to drive home one point that kept coming up which is the need for money to accompany whatever ... mechanism to --

UNKNOWN: A little louder Steve.

MANDEL: Maybe you'd better stand.

STEVE: People think ... money behind whatever we're doing with a successor mechanism or group -- that is to say there has to be some inducement for a community, other than goodwill and personnel reasons ... staff resources. ... spend a lot of time discussing whether we just throw money out and see what's out there and then respond to the money, versus a more focused approach to the money, but -- and that's where we ended up -- but, as Rabbi Lookstein's father ... put money ahead of everything else, but they want to make sure that money was behind

Third Commission Meeting -- June 14, 1989

everything. Did I get it close?

LOOKSTEIN: You should never put money before everything, but you must put money behind everything.

I'm glad that Steve mentioned it, because that's a major concern that I think was expressed at the meeting, and certainly we all agreed -- you don't just throw money, nor I think there was general agreement, also in the group that you don't invite grantsmanship. In other words say, well there's money available - - give us a grant -- and then everybody goes to figure out, how can I get the money, so they make up grant proposals.

But that rather the Commission should say what it really wants to do, and then either pick communities or specific institutions, places and places that have some record of success, places that are also open to new ideas and to oversight and will accept authority on them, to make sure that they're going to do, you know, what the Commission would like to see done.

I think there's one more specific suggestion and that was that the major rabbinic seminaries should be given grants that they would match -- I think there was general feeling that we should have matching grants in everything -- to train rabbis and/or teachers, rabbis who would be teachers or teachers who would be teachers and who would commit themselves to a period of service in return for that training, and to have very well developed programs in those seminaries which do represent a very important source of potential personnel in the field of Jewish education.

MANDEL: Thank you Haskell. Anybody else in group B want to add any comment? O.K.

Then I'd like to call on our third group -- David -- can we hear from you?

DAVID: Well, our group had a rather spirited discussion, which I thought was helpful. The -- at one of the questions that was raised, sort of an underlying question is: are we taking for granted that there is a market out there for our efforts to raise the support for Jewish education? Do we know that? And is there possibly a need for some market research to determine just what the interest of the community is in having the focus on Jewish education placed to the degree that we're discussing here?

And also, we discussed in relation to that, whether or not we need to identify what our goal is with regard to our programming, whether or not there -- our goal should be limited, and not be too ambitious, and do whatever can be done effectively as opposed to spreading our efforts, both efforts and funding too thin. An example of what was discussed, and there was no unanimity on this -- was that we know that there is a large group out in the population who are essentially unaffiliated with the Jewish community, sometimes estimated to be some 50% of the community -- how much of our effort should be devoted to outreach towards, including that group or should we say that while that's important, but it's more important for us to deal with the group that is affiliated, and to preserve that group?

One area where there was general consensus was in stressing the importance of family education. I think virtually every one in our group recognized, identified the importance that should be devoted to sensitizing the family to the importance of Jewish

education, and that without family support it is not likely that the offsprings are going to be as responsive to our efforts as we would like them to be.

With regard to the community action site,, I'd say many of the people in our group felt that the concept had merit,, that it ought to be pursued,, yet there were questions being raised as to how this might be done effectively.. There were some who even suggested that these pilot efforts in the past have been done,, and have not succeeded and the question as to why.. Within the discussion regarding the community action site approach,, the whole question of the role of the various denominational groups in the community and their participation in the effort was discussed quite at length. The question of accountability versus autonomy was part of that discussion and I think generally recognized that this was something that needs to be looked at very carefully.. The suggestion was made that it probably may need the -- that there may be a need for some kind of new community alignment created to in effect get a change of attitude within the community towards Jewish education. Recognizing that what we're talking about varies considerably from one community to another.

With regard to any national effort that might be expended,, there was general agreement that there is a need for national effort in improving the level of training and recruiting and retention and providing for better compensation, particularly benefits, pensions and other fringe benefits. These were the ideas which were identified largely for national effort. One other area that was identified in our group, as has already been

mentioned by others,, we recognize the need for the importance of evaluating.. And as it was pointed out,, some \$650 million has been spent on Jewish education and the question is: how well is that being spent? And if we're going to be funding larger sums,, how well will that be spent? Our recommendation or suggestion here was that the -- that this Commission should be giving recognition to the need for evaluation; it does not necessarily mean that the Commission will do the evaluation,, but that we would give priority recognizing the need for that being part of the process. That in the past evaluation has sometimes fallen by the wayside,, even though it's been identified as something that should be done -- the question is, is it really being done as well as it should?

There were suggestions,, there was a suggestion made with regard to training,, the importance of having a training,, training the trainers; having available within the system experienced teachers who will train others to teach.

With regard to supplementary school education, the -- one recommendation we had was the -- that whereas most supplementary schools operate with part-time teachers, the importance of having at least one full-time faculty member was stressed. There was reference made to the importance of training Jewish community center personnel to be better equipped to deal with the programmatic efforts with regard to Judaic content.

END OF SIDE OF TAPE

TAPE 2. SIDE 2

GOTTSCHALK CONTINUED: ... earlier this morning for the Heschel School. And here I was reminded of another giant of Judaism, who was brought to America by the Hebrew Union College which literally saved his life, together with that of 9 other scholars who were saved in the last hour of European Jewish existence, were brought to America -- and Heschel taught for 9 years -- at the Cincinnati School of the Hebrew Union College.

And Heschel developed this important philosophy that underscored the centrality of time as a factor for the evolution of a Jewish soul. The Greeks, he said, were concerned with the conquest of space, the control of environment. Jews were concerned with sanctifying time, with sanctifying the moment and consequently one sanctifies thereby human life and human experience. In that way Heschel gave birth to a whole new way for moderns for looking at Jewish life and history. It was an elemental way of looking at it, and yet it was in consonance with what Judaism was and what Judaism today is.

We have an awesome task ahead of us when we talk about creating a framework for Jewish education that will provide Jewish continuity. Let me tell you I was raised in a little ... town in Germany. I grew up standing between my father and grandfather, aleihem shalom, every shabbat at services and at all other times. But somehow we knew what it was to be Jewish. Everyone in ... all 37 families somehow knew what it was to be Jewish. Only when we came to America did what was being Jewish become problematic. Our first Rosh Hashana we walked from 30th

COMMISSON MEETING JUNE 14TH, 1989

street and Fifth Avenue to the Conservative shul on 9th street and 7th avenue. As we got to the door, a man said to my father -- where is your ticket? My father did not know a word of English; he turns to my mother, and says to her: yiddish. So my mother says: I think he wants a "billet", which was the German equivalent in Rhineland usage, of a ticket. My father says: yiddish -- yiddish. Is it a theater I'm going to? I'm going to shul. Well he finally got in and they relegated us to the pauper's gallery. Comes the next morning, the ... And ... half of the men were called upon to lead public worship, could easily do so. And most of them could also read Torah. My father was one of them who loved to read Torah.

And the rabbi made an announcement: Is there anybody here who can read the Torah? The cantor has laryngitis. Of course, the question was -- why couldn't the rabbi read the Torah? If the cantor had laryngitis. But no one budged in that synagogue, packed with people, no one budged.

And I'll never forget this as long as I live. My father got up and he walked down the aisle, up to the bima, he looked at the rabbi and he said: Not I can read, ish can reason -- he looked at him and said: daf nish vasen -- may I read. And from that time on, every shabbat when my dad was in the synagogue, he was accorded the privilege of reading.

He felt it was a necessity to defeat Hitler -- so he took a defense job and worked on shabbat. But he wouldn't keep the salary he earned on shabbat. That he gave to tzedaka.

Now when one thinks about the problems we face, of course those experiences are not normal experiences for young people in

our day or for the Jews of our time, they nevertheless are experiences which if you had them in some element form, stay with you and shape you for a life time. And the problem of Jewish education in America today is that we are perhaps too affluent, that we perhaps have too much, and we are not basic enough in our fundamental love and loyalty to the basic rudiments of Jewish life, whatever they be -- Orthodox, Conservative or Reform.

So I want to be a bit contrarian today and I want to read a mishna which I always read to the graduating class of seniors at the Hebrew Union College.

This is the way of Torah. ((In Hebrew)) You shall eat a morsel of bread with salt, drink a measure of water, sleep on the ground, and live a life of hardship as you're taught in Torah. Imagine going to a prospective Hebrew teacher and saying: my friend -- we're recruiting you for Jewish education. This is the way of Torah -- you're going to starve -- you're going to sleep on the ground, it's not going to be a posh apartment. But if you do this, ashreah -- you're going to be happy, ... it's going to be good. You know I think that's a better argument in many ways to persuade someone initially to be a Jewish educator than talk about all the other things, because if they don't have a commitment to this, whatever else you give them it's not going to mean terribly much and it's certainly not going to persuade them to remain in Jewish life. So my plea is, however we do it, to -- through audio-visual means, through Torah learning, through Talmud study, through whatever experience is available to us -- let us teach our young people the rudiments of Jewish life. And

COMMISSON MEETING JUNE 14TH, 1989

somehow I have a feeling that much of what we worry about will fall into place and everything else we shall attempt to do will then benefit..

Thank you very much..

MANDEL:: Two quick announcements.. First may I say Fred, we're grateful to you for a very moving and in many ways a very personal statement and thank you very much,, it was beautiful..

Two announcements -- one, this lovely building some of you maybe familiar with; some off you may not. And as we adjourn there will be two guides to take you to either the library or to see the synagogue on your way out if you choose to do that.. Guide one is Linda; Linda do you want to stand up so we can appreciate all you did to make today possible -- she really did all the work. Linda,, is there anybody with you or is there -- O.K.,, very good.

And secondly, let me thank you for -- it's been a privilege to chair this meeting.. I think it's been a wonderful meeting and you're just a wonderful group.. Thank you very much.. See you soon.

END OF MEETING

P

TAPE 2. SIDE 1

CONTINUED; ... or the high spots or the principle points that were covered,, raised — I know there were others -- and I'm sure other participants in our group will want to supplement what I've covered and my co-chair Mr. Berman may want to supplement at this time..

BERMAN:: Well,, I don't have much to say. I think that David has covered most of what we did do. I think some of what's important is also some of the things we didn't do -- because I don't think we did take a look at data gathering and research very much;; we certainly didn't talk about the move from Commission to implementation.. Because we talked about stuff that was of interest to us and we just didn't have time to get there..

I think that as part of that,, there was a concern on the part of one or two members of our group that whatever we do should not build another bureaucracy;; and I think that all of us agreed that that would be the case and is not something we would want to happen,, although we did not go further than that.. And at some point I think we're going to have to talk about that -- this whole group of course..

David did talk about the considerable discussion we had about the varying points of view about whether or not a community action site could work,, or whether we should be talking solely about national approach.. There was disagreement I think on the whole,, we pretty well felt as the other two groups did, that a local,, or if you will community action sites are where the action is, so to speak,, and that national programming could be conceivable for us and important perhaps in the personnel area

particularly -- on the other areas we felt that action sites make sense on the local level.

There was some discussion and David mentioned it of denomination groups and whether or not we're focusing enough on the issues that are involved with us as they operate in an individual community. I think that for the most part we felt that perhaps that, those positions were exaggerated -- but at this point, the denominational groups are, depending on what community you talk about, more, more than less are involved now in working together because of their mutual concerns. Except of course for the far right.

I would hope that covers the points I have. Others, of course, might be ...

MANDEL: Good, thanks -- thank you both David and Bill.

And now any other members of Group C -- Jack, and anyone else, please.

JACK: I think particularly during the afternoon session there was a strong counterpoint between the approach that said let's take finite projects that we are more or less assured of completing, versus taking on something ambitious, which on the one hand might have the potential to fail, but on the other hand would perhaps make a more significant change within an entire community. And I think that there were fairly defined viewpoints about that. On the one hand, identifying what's there and enhancing those things and making modest, you know, undertaking a modest type of program as opposed to something much more comprehensive and ambitious, global, with all of the potential ...

MANDEL: Rabbi.

RABBI: I expressed some concern that while this Commission consists of some of the most distinguished leaders of the North American Jewish community,, there's one group that really is responsible for 90% ... of Jewish education that's not here. And nothing can happen in Jewish education on the local level unless the people who are the sponsors of local Jewish education, namely denominational institutions,, synagogues and ... groups are involved and feel that they want to participate. And I think that it is an unfortunate absence that --

MANDEL: Who are you talking about,, rabbi,, who -- what type of person are you talking about? Do you mean the,, the people who are like the -- rabbis who are actually delivering the teaching versus the seminary.

RABBI: Well in any local community you have most people involved with supplementary Jewish education in synagogues.

MANDEL: Well we have rabbis you know on this as rabbis.

RABBI: NO, no, no no no.

MANDEL: Alright,, just make your point.

RABBI: I am sure that Dr. Gottschalk is vitally concerned about Jewish education,, but Rabbi Schindler who is the head of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations is also vitally concerned.

MANDEL: Absolutely.

RABBI: And the same thing is true in each of the denominational groups. The major delivery of Jewish education is not through the seminaries,, and not through the national organization, other than the congregational and ideological group. I think that if we come to the point == and I hope we do == where we want to try and

dramatically improve Jewish education on the local level,, that there has to be a moment of truth when we interact with these denominational and ideological groups..

And that interaction is replete with political and other complications that need to be carefully thought through. Otherwise,, I think anything we try to do at the local level will not be able to reach its full achievements..

MANDEL:: Thank you. Florence..

FLORENCE MELTON:: I think one of the things that we couldn't agree on is the -- what to me is a reality -- that the awareness that has developed in the North American Jewish community is responsible for a growing concern and involvement of federations in upgrading the quality of Jewish education. So in this new milieu,, I see a growing possibility -- and I've seen it happen -- for all parties,, denominational,, secular,, all groupings of people to come together with varying degrees of involvement, but with the federation as catalyst -- to come together, to make plans, to do research in the communities,, to set goals and to set up committees and long-range planning and budgeting financial too. So what I'm saying is -- we're living in a time now where if this Commission is to be considered as part of change, that we need to confront the reality that we need to take a positive view of those positive opportunities that are developing now, instead of talking about the status quo.

MANDEL:: Thank you Florence. Anybody else in this group before we throw it open; I think I saw some hands over here -- I thought I did.

RITZ:: Mort.

MANDEL:: Oh, ... no yes.

RITZ:: There are a couple of items I want to add to the report.

MANDEL:: To your report.

RITZ:: My workshop report.

MANDEL:: Just a second; just one second. Anybody else on Group C? Alright, now.

RITZ: In general I think I've told you about the things on which we've agreed; I want to identify two issues on which we had enough disagreement so we could not say there was a consensus.

One had to do with the question of how much focus, how much emphasis should be given to innovative, developing programs as compared with those which have been undertaken and perhaps under-funded or not generated sufficiently across the continent. That's an issue on which there was some disagreement.

The other issue on which there was disagreement was on the question, on a statement that was made by one member of the group, as a - he offered it as a criterion -- that we should encourage or support efforts on a non-denominational basis in the communities. AND there was a strong feeling among others that the term was very restrictive; that most of the current, at least formal educational experiences, in a community in supplementary schools are under a denominational auspices, and that at least cross-denominational or inter-denominational efforts rather than "non-denominational" should be the focus.

That did not -- it was very clear that that were also people who believed that there should be included in the gamut of programs in the local community some which are specifically tied

to denominational groups.

MANDEL:: Thank you Esther Lea. O.K., I think where we are now is we're really ready to get just generalized kind of comments or inputs on anything you've heard or any point you want to make that maybe were your mind was jogged by a report from yet another group.

So what's your pleasure folks? Again,, this is very valuable stuff for us; it will be carefully reviewed and analyzed..

FLORENCE MELTON:: I hate to be speaking again..

MANDEL:: No,, Florence,, we need a beginner..

MELTON:: But I have a specific contribution to make in terms of a recruitment effort that we really didn't cover to well either in the report,, or actually didn't have time enough to cover in the meeting really.

I would like to think,, that even though some people think we don't need a national effort,, I would like to initiate a national recruitment program that starts with high-school age youngsters whereby we have a pool of funds with which we offer scholarships to kids in high school who are qualified candidates to go to Israel,, where we would develop special programs for them, for 3 months,, of Jewish advanced education,, with a university in Israel and that they would receive a junior teachers degree.. And with this degree,, that they would be involved in limited teaching jobs in their communities..

Now this training should result in credits towards college,, and the students should be expected to teach in limited context in their community for one year at least..

At the college level, I would think it would be very helpful if we had a recruiter who would find interested college students who would be willing to go to Israel for 3 months training in special programs which would result in college credits and which would require one year of teaching in the community that the student will be living in for the next year.

Now I think this is a specific kind of program which I think is acceptable on every level of discussion we can talk about. The only thing that needs to be determined is how the fund will be compiled.

MANDEL: Eli.

ELI: I just wanted to address a plea to the staff in drafting up the next level of this report which I understand from Hank and from you, we are going into hard copy as you put it for the next stage.

Looking back on the history of educational commissions, I've just made a list here. You know the great commissions, the Flexner Report in 1917, the American ... Mordals Report in 1940, the ... Report on Public Education in 1950, the 1960s brought the Carnegie Commission on Public Broadcasting, the '70s the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. All of those commissions reached -- had a couple of things in common. One was the level of information in them was very high. So that the people in the field had to read this report to get a current picture of what the situation was in American education.

The second thing was that the level of rhetoric and aspiration was very high -- they were very visionary in their aspiration. And I would like to see us not pass up the

opportunity to take a really lofty, visionary approach to the future of Jewish education in America. And lastly, the level of ideas in them were very rich.

Each of those reports are read by students of the field today and by practitioners in the field today, and they had -- and they're now 20, 30, 40 years old. They had a level of writing and ideas and aspirations that had a continuing function in the reform of education in the fields that they ran. And in that context, I hope we don't get so wrapped up in the sort of localized issues of community action grants, number one; and two, in the sort of top-down how we fund the successor institutions, that we overlook this opportunity that there may be some national solutions to local problems that we can overtake and need to staff out in a very particularized version, way.

For one this, there has been in this decade a tremendous amount of money made in this country. And there are a lot of funders out there looking for ideas and are ready to put significant money behind significant ideas. And three of them really jump to mind to me. And there may be many many more.

One was the whole idea of pension and health care, as not a localized issue, but a national problem. This may be a \$30 million idea -- I don't know. But there may be money out there, there certainly was in New York in Joe Gruss' case, which could really address this issue which would have a lot to do with recruitment and particularly with retention on the question of staff in Jewish educational

The second was the training fund. Local communities do have

MI-NA Commission Meeting -- June 14, 1989

a localized training need, but they also should be nationally development centers of training for summer time work and for degrees and so forth, refreshers,, continuing education -- that could -- that ought to be developed nationally.

And lastly, let me get on my old horse -- you cannot develop media on the local level; it is not that kind of activity.. National media programs take a tremendous amount of money,, a tremendous amount of planning,, a tremendous amount of skill and so forth. And it's just not there locally.. And therefore, there has to be a technique whereby Jewish education is brought into the 21st century.

As the father of a 4 year old who is trying to do the best job he can, my problem is that he has friends and his friends watch T.V. and they watch it constantly,, and he's deeply influenced by it. And all of my work, and all of my concern -- that makes no difference when his friends are wrapped up in this

.... I plead with you, so that it won't come as a surprise to the Commission when it shows up in the report -- that we take the issue of linking up media and curricula and education very seriously and take as one of our major missions, because I think it is inevitable if Jewish education is to be effective, that this be a major issue that we address institutionally. Set up some sort of national way in which national ideas can be funded, supported, created and distributed and then test it on the local level in schools and areas where they could be ...

MANDEL: Eli just two comments. First with regard to your 4 year old and the challenges you face -- you ain't seen nothing yet.

Secondly, with regard to your hope that we turn out a final

report Eli that's worthy of the quality of this Commission; I think a lot of us, certainly I speaking for myself, share that. And hope that we'll be able to. I don't know whether it will equal or exceed or whatever the Flexner Report or the Carnegie Report -- but certainly the other more generic comments about being at a high level and being worth reading just for the contents of it, within itself, I hope we pass that test. And that's what I very much want.

ELI: I just want to mention one more thing Mort which is that the one model here that is relevant, it seems to me, is the Carnegie Commission on the Future of Public Broadcasting. Because they did create, suggest that there be a national entity called the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, then disbanded, then helped create the Corporation for Public Broadcasting with some initial funding and --

MANDEL: Yes. Exactly. As a continuing mechanism.

ELI: As a continuing mechanism, so that the body itself that made the recommendations would have one sort of link up, but not necessarily become the body that actually was the functioning body. I think that is a good model.

MANDEL: Very helpful. Hank and then we'll go around the table. Oh, you've got -- Josh.

JOSH: ...

UNKNOWN: Could you talk a little louder Josh.

MANDEL: We need a little shouting.

JOSH: Um, let ... if you ... points to make which I'll make in a minute, but it seemed to me that maybe the given the power of the

-- and giving your very fine words and the ... that you sent out to us about it, maybe one radical thought that the Commission could consider in terms of one of its outcomes -- given the fact that we're dealing with this issue of community building, we're dealing with trying to bring in quality lay leadership into Jewish education -- maybe one thing that we need to consider is a media component to whatever is going to succeed this commission in terms of trying to give in the hands of both community action sites and maybe the community at large, quality material that can help propell a larger group a more critical mass of lay people to get involved in Jewish educational --

MANDEL:: As a tool for our work.

JOSH:: Yes, in other words something that the Commission could have a written report, but there could be a piece of the -- but the hard copy that will in fact be in media form. That whether it's -- I mean this has been something that federations have used very effectively in campaigns, and I mean you know the psychology is changing all the time. So we might want to think about that.

I'm thinking particularly the issue of trying to bring lay people involved. I also want to just underscore the issue of being aspirational. I think that the kind of report that I'm familiar with is the one on "Teaching as a Profession" and they have a nice section in there on the vision of public education 10 or 15 years from now. And I think this would be a wonderful opportunity to be able to do justice to the programmatic options, to really dream and to paint a picture of the Jewish community in the year 2000. And be able to put a lot of the exciting synergy into connectiveness and give people a sense of what they really

should aspire to.

MANDEL:: Thanks Josh. David.

DAVID:: We've probably been -- we're devoting ourselves to discussing the various enabling issues, and yet we've been talking about programs. As I mentioned in our group we had given emphasis to family education as being a high priority area of programming. I'm just wondering about the role of the Commission in helping us better identify the priority of programming that we should be recommending. And that to my mind is not a simple job.

And the mechanism has something to do in my mind with trying to identify more effectively what is working,, and also what does the community want.

MANDEL:: Very good. Fred.

FRED:: Relating to what you've just said David and to our elaborate upon,, I want to link what I'm going to say to Eli Weisel's remarkable eye toward the past Sunday in the New York Times in which he was discussing the nature with which the Holocaust has been addressed through the media.. And how difficult it is, in a pluralistic society which is governed by many motives,, among them the profit motive, ... exploitive motif, to render the kind of authentic picture of the Holocaust that those who were its victims and those who were its observers can relate to as having congruence.

And here I'm concerned that the question of the media is such a complex one, that it would probably take a board of experts that relate to that phenomenon to deal with the vast mainstream, what we call Jewish history, to try to get out of that

something which replicates what might have been at one time.

And in a pluralistic society where you have again so many points of view and interests to relate to, it becomes all the more complex and frustrating to deal with. So I would say in this area, tafasta ..., well tafasta -- you're going to try to relate to the entire matrix of Jewish life and Jewish education and try to get the media linked to that -- you're not going to succeed. But we can take a portion of it and try on an experimental basis and progress if we do, what Abba Eban did. Some say successfully; some say with limited success; but at least it was a serious effort to try to deal with Jewish history in some comprehensive way. And that may be the high road for the few; there may be other roads that could be explored.

It certainly is a necessary road to take. And there I agree with you.

MANDEL: Good thanks. Alright, yes, Robert.

ROBERT: I am delighted that there have been a number of suggestions that have been made to take broad, comprehensive and in-depth examinations as a part of this Commission's ultimate and final words. I have to come ... all the way around 180 degrees the other end, which is what I believe the Jewish community probably will look for as well on the 180th degree of the other side. And that is -- what is here, and what guidance and what help do we have in terms of practical development tomorrow in the fields of Jewish education?

And here I believe that this Commission has an opportunity to do three or four things. First of all, it has the opportunity to actually serve as a catalyst to some kind of movement. That is

different than being a broad expose of what is and what should be; but rather as a series of suggestions on how we can make positive movement. And positive movement in very definitive areas. I'm not going to suggest what those definitive areas be, but I would suggest that we have that kind of a ... Secondly, I would suggest, and here I'm picking up what has been said and we discussed it in our group and it was mentioned by Steve and others, that we'd better start talking about how you implement what resources and where those resources will come from, and to serve as a catalyst in the development of these resources. Because this will be not the kind of a report that will be well received, if we only take that very high road. Strangely enough, we are in a kind of culture where the high road is important, but also the road that leads to mechanisms and resources to take us along the journey.

Thirdly, I think strangely enough, that this Commission ultimately ought to be talking about the mechanism, or a series of mechanisms that I don't care how it is done -- that deal with what I call the perception that is necessary in local communities to make movement, again this is the catalyst. And that I visualize as something that has status, stature and is recommended and implemented by people with whom there is great faith and that it's backed up by financial resources. So I'm talking now about status and dollars.

And finally, something that has been talked about here earlier, and we mentioned it when we were talking about denominations and other aspects of Jewish life -- I think that

what has to be done if we're talking about movement and if we're talking about catalytic suggestions,, is that somewhere we talk about how we do this with the ability to relate all parts of this Jewish community. Now we don't have to say that this is totally comprehensive and limit it. But at least to what we are limited and recommending,, I think we better talk about mechanisms that can tie together those parts of the Jewish community that will be essential in making these steps forward. If we don't talk about steps forward,, then in my opinion this Commission will have had - - it will have a lovely report,, but a hollow one. And I'm hopeful that all of these things can be put together in the ultimate report.

Now to do this,, is going to require an enormous amount of staff work between now and next November,, the stage you're talking about. I don't expect us to see a final report. But I would like to begin to see some of the suggestions that relate to at least these issues.

MANDEL:: Bobby the plan now is and we'll regroup tomorrow and try to analyze what happened today -- beginning immediately to plan the next piece of work. The plan now would call for that. How much of that will happen in November, I don't know. Maybe a lot; maybe a little; because you know the size of it. Yet nonetheless, that's what our planning is this minute. And you're right on I believe.

Please Henry.

ZUKER:: Following up on Bob's comment about financing. The Commission is committed to being proactive, following up the ideas, including the ideas that relate to financing. And so

there's no question that after next June that will be done..

My question has to do with whether it's timely now -- it's a matter of judgment -- to begin to address that problem and specifically,, should we ask our Chairman to convene a group of foundation principals to talk about the Commission and about what we would hope they would be prepared to do,, not necessarily in terms of specific dollars,, but see what the degree of interest is and also do the same thing with the federations,, ... side of the final equation..

Should we begin now,, rather than six months or a year from now to address these principals of these organizations and see what reaction we get,, recognizing we are not yet through;; we have no report to make; but we have a pretty good idea of where we're heading and presenting that to them and just see what their reaction is? I ...

MANDEL:: Yes yes. And there are a number of principals of such foundations in this room,, and you or may not want to express yourself publicly.

HANK:: ... federations..

MANDEL:: Yes,, and federation endowment funds which are huge and getting huger..

I will only share with you Hank and -- and maybe I did it before,, that one such family,, very substantial foundation said they hoped that maybe we would do that this summer.. Just get together and try to get our arms around what might be happening and how we all feel about it and so on.

If anyone wants to respond,, you're welcome, but we'll be in

touch with you privately if we don't discuss it publicly..

Yes, Rabbi.

RABBI:: I just wanted to say for the record that the Wexner Foundation is already very heavily involved in the multi-million dollars annually level in upgrading Jewish education through a variety of programs which have been disseminated to this Commission. Our graduate fellowship program which seeks to attract the brightest and best people to undertake graduate training for Jewish educational careers; our institutional grants program through HUC for development of supervised, internship training programs for people who supervise people training to be educators; grants to Gratz College, Stanford University, etc. etc. etc.

I think that we have a full table in terms of our funding programs. And I'm delighted to have others join in this effort and I think the Commission as a catalyst for that kind of effort is a very positive development. But I would be remiss if I didn't say that we ...

MANDEL:: Oh sure, right, you should now and if this will make you perhaps feel any better -- I hope it does. You should know how much we highly regard what you and Less and so on are trying to do. So we know you're a big player in this. There are other players, maybe not as well advertised, but who are in the same business as well.

Florence.

MELTON:: Well I think that's a very good idea; I think foundations that are engaged presently in upgrading the quality of Jewish education certainly should allow the American Jewish community as

a whole to know what it is that they are doing. For example, there are very few people that even know what the Melton program is, even in my own community as a matter of fact. So that I think this is one of the things that needs to be considered, is those foundations that are actively involved should be talking about what it is they're doing and how, what they're doing perhaps, can be beneficial. Because is it working for us? We are involved in a very interesting and very successful program for the education of adults, and mostly young parents. Also in a high school program that is keeping kids in high school program ... bar mitzva, is very successful. But really, nobody knows much about it.

But I think these things are important to profess.

MANDEL: Thank you Florence. I agree with you; I definitely agree with you.

Yes Al.

AL: I'd like to personally ... question of the foundation. What is to be discussed valuable contribution of the Commission would be to do a survey on what the foundations are doing. ... And that ... take the information, the Melton and the Wexner and all other foundations, on Ely Evans ... work with the ... educational contributions. I think that that in a sense would give the Commission and the community a holistic idea of what is being done, before we ask them to do more.

But if we're going to approach foundations to discuss granting more funding for educational programs, and challenges, I think there has to be -- two things have to be done. One, there has to kind of -- not necessarily finalized prioritization, but

there has to be a kind of menu given to the foundations that show: look fellows, we're in it for improvement of personnel and for providing community support to make sure in the long run, the long-range those personnel work most effectively. And for that, these are the kind of programs that we will probably want to -- and it's maybe premature to do that -- but foundations have to know that.

Secondly, if we're going to talk to foundations, most foundations want to know what the price tag is. The whole price tag, for the whole bag and for the parts of it. So I think that before we jump to the, we have to know what the parts are. That's point one.

MANDEL:: Alright, just a quick reaction to that. I know, it's a semi-colon.

We didn't want to spend a lot of time on this foundation matter. I'd like to finish it by sharing with you how we started.

There was a hope expressed to me personally by a number of the foundations involved that maybe we would develop a blueprint for the next 10 years, 20 years possibly -- a kind of a roadmap, so that each foundation could or could not do whatever it felt like doing. That's sort of the genesis of this. What will proceed beyond that cooperatively, individually, we don't know. But if we add to the richness of the data and information and idea bank that's available for foundations to pick up, that's what we would want.

And I further said, that part of my own personal interest was that our family was looking for such a roadmap and guidance, to know how we, personally, could invest our money the most

thoughtfully. And when I talked to people,, some of whom are in this room,, that desire was shared.. Now what goes beyond that,, I don't know.

So maybe we ought to get off the foundation subject ... Do you have something else -- yes?

UNKNOWN;; I want to share information about my knowledge and experience now. Two points: one has to do with the question of denominations.. I, for one,, don't believe it's a problem.. I,, for one,, believe that there are initiatives local,, international,, national,, local initiatives that address the problem of personnel,, personnel by itself is not necessarily ideological.. All will want to buy into it if you're going to develop a program for full time personnel in terms of providing pensions and health benefits -- there is no ideological problem there..

There is no ideological problem in solving a lot of other programs. If for example you want to develop family educators -- everybody may need family educators.. I don't -- I ... exaggerate the problem of turf. I don't think that there's a problem with national denominationalism or local denominationalism.. If there are good initiatives,, initiative ... help everybody;; everybody will want to be partners in that I think. That's point number 1.

Point 2, regarding the report and where we go from there.. The staff that the Commission has is not an ordinary staff. It's more of a think-tank than just staff that report on what happened. And I think they should be given the opportunity to develop further than what we have discussed.. And for the conclusions that we have come to at this point,, to bring us

beyond a report that we would ordinarily hear based on the discussions we had this morning and this afternoon..

And so my view is the following:: Depending upon the audience,, the eventual audience of that report,, we then have to judge what goes into the report. We know we're going to go beyond the report,, but I just want to talk about the report for the moment. Eli was right. If you read the major reports that I'm familiar only with the educational report -- they talk to a national audience; they talk to people who are economists and sociologists and ordinary citizens; they talk to academicians and they talk to politicians.. They say to them -- this is what the situation is like. And this is where we'd like to bring it to and how we suggest it be brought to.

Now our question is: who is the audience for that report? Is it people who are sophisticated? Our counterparts around the table? Is it educators? Is it people who are knowledgeable about Jewish education? Now,, the knowledge, or the information about what exists will be one level.. But if it's for a broader audience,, if it's for getting other people whom either have the funds or have ability to move funds,, into sync with what the Commission wants to do -- then there's another kind of report.. That decision has to be made.

I for one think there's enough knowledge to integrate the information and experience, for integrating information about -- it doesn't have to be 100% right -- but there has to be a report.. This is what it looks like. Then,, this is the vision we have and like to see it be. There's nothing wrong with dreaming.. And so we won't fulfil the whole dream, but we have to have, we have to

have that vision. But beyond the vision,, is where -- beyond that part of the report,, is where the major contribution of this Commission will be. And that is,, strategy for accomplishing that which is necessary. How does the Commission go out of business and what kind of business it will go into beyond that,, addresses the question of strategy as well.

MANDEL:: We've got our work cut out for us,, all of us.. Any other comments before I call on Dr. Gottschalk? Florence, please..

MELTON:: I think one of the things that needs to be emphasized before we break up is that the full panorama of Jewish education is a process. And we haven't talked enough about the local leadership and how they are involved in this process. And all of these reports that come out of this Commission are going to fall on deaf ears if we do not consider the fact that every year, or every two years,, there is new leadership on federations and boards and communities etc. And that we need to involve ourselves in an ongoing if you will methodology in concert with federations,, because that's the only catalyst we can count on being there all the time is the federation as catalyst in order to utilize all of the experience and all of the necessary information that we need on an ongoing basis to get to the new leadership people. That I see the need, having sat on boards for many years on different levels and seeing the changing guard and the new people who know nothing who come in and they are given a real responsible job --

MANDEL:: You're talking about some of my best friends -- be careful.

MELTON; Wait a minute -- given responsible jobs and making discussions on allocations of big funds,, and they know from borscht.

What I'm saying is -- you like that borscht? -- what I'm saying is that one of the jobs I see that's basic is to establish an ongoing process of integrating knowledge into leadership, through the federations as catalysts.. Setting this up as structure,, if you will,, and even if we have to make a contribution toward the effort.. For example,, if we have to hire the people who are trained to go into the community to have a mino-seminar every year,, or every other year,, that deals with what has happened in Jewish education, where is the United States and North America in Jewish education, what are the improvements in this and that and where can we be helpful to you and how can we help you prioritize your concerns and follow through on solving problems. I think that's something we need to address, because it's an ongoing process and nothing that comes out of this Commission is going to mean one thing,, even with lots of money,, unless you've got the local community involved in the concern and in the process.

MANDEL:. Excellent Florence, thank you. Very clear. Yes, Sara Lee please..

SARA LEE:. ... about community, I think we're probably ... local initiative and the fact that the community is where it's at. I wouldn't want to overlook, adding on to my colleague's comments, the symbolism of national and major kinds of events and their power.

I've just been ... of this Commission, although a lot of

people don't know what it is,, or whose on it,, or what it does,, or what it is supposed to do -- has already generated a lot of a kind of interest and ... I think unless people capitalize upon,, through the kinds of national visibility and kind off national ideas that Eli Evans referred to,, as well as implementation at the local level -- we will not be able to serve as a catalyst for communities being transformed from a kind off a lethargy about Jewish education to the kinds of communities that would be ready to undertake change initiatives.. So I hope we will maintain both levels,, or be certain to maintain both levels of activity simultaneously.. The big important,, significant national initiative and the local implementation.. So that we can really convey to people that Jewish education is an extremely important and classy enterprise..

MANDEL:: Yes,, thank you. Very well put Sara Lee. Carole..

CAROLE:: Just two. I ... my colleagues" point. By the same token, if all we have is a report and nothing to follow up the report with,, then every 10 years like our friends from secular education,, we'll be writing a new report..

MANDEL:: That's certainly not the plan.. Let's hope that's not what happens. Thank you Carole..

Ah rabbi --

RABBI:: I think I've been agreeing about 90% with Sara Lee all day long --

MANDEL:: Is that a high or low point --

HASKEL:: And 10%, I -- so ... no,, Rabbi Zalman Posner who is the Lubavitch Rabbi of Nashville, Tennessee wrote a book called "Think

MI-NA Commission Meeting -- June 14, 1989

Jewish." If I could just suggest, without spelling it out, when the report is beginning to be written, in whatever form, perhaps a slogan for it could be -- "Think Tachlitically."

MANDEL: That's ... if nothing else, it's at least that. Thanks Haskel.

Please, you're welcome, we actually have a couple of minutes, if anybody has any other comments. If not, I remind you there's no way to summarize; no summary is necessary. We have been summarizing for two hours almost. And to conclude, the concluding comments, we've started what I think has been just a delicious practice -- of asking someone who we've had two prior concluding comments -- someone to conclude, and Fred, we're very pleased to hear from you. And would you want to come up here maybe and just take this mike.

FRED: Thank you for your invitation Mort to say a few concluding words.

First let me tell you how profoundly pleased we are that this meeting could take place at the Hebrew Union College today. Hebrew Union College, Jewish Institute of Religion, which is a conglomerate organization, how else could you explain such a ... name. But the Jewish Institute of Religion in part proclaimed the philosophy in 1922 that of Stephen S. Wise, the philosophy of Jewish education. It argued that one had to address the clock. There had to be, in this great city of New York which he called the laboratory of Jewish life, one institution that was non-denominational. And so he formed a Jewish Institute of Religion, which had as its primary philosophy that an American young undergraduate student electing to become a rabbi, given the

normal kind of Jewish education that he might have -- there were no women in those days -- could not possibly know upon admission whether or not he wanted to be Orthodox,, Conservative or Reform. He hadn't begun the serious dimensions of Jewish study..

And so Wise said to his students: decide at the end of the process what it is you really should be,, what your Jewish understanding has led you to. Then decide your affiliation.

It was a tremendously innovative idea in its day,, and after some 25 years of existence on that level,, Wise was then at the end of his life, cancer was literally devouring him and he was concerned that his idea should be kept alive.. And he agreed then to merge the Jewish Institute of Religion with the Hebrew Union College. And there was brought together the idea of reform within Judaism, with a small r, which has always existed, reconstruction within Judaism which has always existed, the love of tradition and the love of Zion -- all brought together.

END OF SIDE OF TAPE

THIRD COMMISSION MEETING

*Presentations
Mandel, Fox,
Hochstetler*

MANDEL:: Folks,, if I can have your attention.. I'm not going to use the microphone unless somebody in the back holds their hand up.. Can you hear me O.K. Harriet?

When I was in World War II -- everybody want a World War story? I was one of the people that occasionally in what is called closed order drill -- anybody know what close order drill is? Anybody --

Close order drill is when soldiers march in formation and do all sorts of things with ... in many ways,, don't have an explanation other than the idea of discipline -- anyway,, when we were marching,, I was one of the people occasionally called out to -- with large groups -- to help direct the soliders in what is called "close order drill" because my voice could be heard from one end of the camp to the other.

I still have that; when I'm sitting in a restaurant and talking sotto voce -- is that the right definition? -- Sotto voce -- everybody hears me across the street -- so,, I ... microphone and I'm not going to use one.

Some of our presenters don't have that blessing or curse depending on how you feel about it,, so we do have that microphone..

First of all let me say welcome.. This is,, as you know, our third meeting. I continue to be impressed by the attendance of our commissioners coming from all parts of the continent to be with us, and all of us understand, as everybody around this table in one way or another is an accomplished, experienced chair --

that that's very supportive of those of us who are I must say in the administrative positions; but more than that,, the lesson that keeps being stated I think by your attendance over and over again,, is you think that what ... is important; that it's worth your time; and that the hope is I guess that together we can do something that will make all of us feel that our time investment was worthwhile. And that will contribute to improving the Jewish tradition. That's why we're all here; that's the way so many of us spend a lot of our lives,, either professionally,, sort of full-time in in a voluntary capacity -- those of us who are volunteers..

There are some guests whose presence I would like to acknowledge. We have a number of guests from Hebrew Union College and from this particular school right here in New York. Dr. Fred Gottschalk,, Alfred Gottschalk is a member of our Commission and of course Fred I personally want to thank you for giving us the hall,, this beautiful setting. And I hope if you've never been in this beautiful building,, you have a chance to see some of it; including in passing the beautiful synagogue on the lobby floor,, which is really a very special room as is this whole building.

Also,, as guests because we're here,, we're very pleased that we have the Chairman of the Board of Hebrew Union College,, Richard Shoyer,, where -- right there -- whom I'm going to call on to say a few words of greeting. When I asked him to do it, he said I will say a few words of greeting,, very few -- and, um, but we're very pleased. We have the Vice-President of the Hebrew Union College and Dean of Faculty,, Dr. Paul Steinberg -- again,

Paul thank you. We also have the Dean of the New York school, Dr. Norman Cohen, who is right there and Dr. Cohen, we appreciate that.

Linda Robinson is not here. She really did all the work. She's a member of the staff here, in charge I guess of community affairs, who has been very gracious and very wonderful and all of

SPEAKER: I don't know if ... We're delighted to have you all here; certainly Jewish education is the only possible foundation for Jewish continuity in this country. We all have to work at it; and this group should help guide us to work at it in the best possible way. In addition to looking at the synagogue, and the floor above, where you'll find the windows that ... at one end of the arch and ... at the other end of the room. If you have the time, take a look at the library on the second floor where Max Abromovitz, our architect took a diagonal slice out of the messianic so that the library looks towards to the NYU campus -- in a very effective way. On the fourth floor we have a few archeological exhibits and a little atrium to liven the place up so both those floors are worth taking a look at.

MANDEL: Thanks. I think -- Fred, I don't know if you want to ... but Paul or ... Yes, you're our real host ...

SPEAKER: Yes, and in that spirit let me just say "bruchim habaim" -- we're just thrilled and honored that you're here amongst us in our place. As we share a common mandate and vision in terms of a vibrant educated Jewish community, certainly which is ours. We're thrilled that you could be amongst us. I will apologize for a quick exit since today is our final faculty meeting of the year.

Third Commission Meeting,, June 14,, 1989 - MI-NA

And unlike a Mort Mandel meeting,, it doesn't start on time,, which allowed me to be here and then go upstairs.

So Mort,, we're just pleased to have you here today.

MANDEL:: Thank you very much.

Folks,, we also have one other guest I'd like to introduce,, who is not a member of the Commission but who is a volunteer,, as many of us are. He lives in the United Kingdom,, is very heavily involved in many Jewish communal affairs and maybe others of general affairs as well -- but I know of his deep and keen interest in Jewish continuity and Jewish education.. And he is here for another meeting that I will be attending also tomorrow. But we're delighted that he could be with us. Please welcome Felix Posen of London.

I'm going to take you through the book in a moment. Some of you had a chance to see it. Let me first remind you that one of the things I feel so good about this Commission,, is that we do have the four-way sponsorship between the private sector in a sense and CJF,, JESNA,, JWB -- the public,, if you want to call it that,, the public non-profit sector -- working. And we have found ways to continue working together and hopefully that's a pattern that will increase in other settings with private foundations and endowment funds of federations and national agencies,, continental agencies,, local agencies -- finding ways to work together on a common agenda. Such as we are doing this time.

If you'll take your books -- which you all should have -- and look through the table of contents,, which is your first divider,, I'm going to spend most of our time this morning on item 6 of the agenda on the table of contents. But you see what's

in the book and then if you go to the Commissioners tab,, that's just for reference -- the list you know.. Behind that is the senior policy advisors,, the people who are really our principle consultants.. Then the next tab is something called "Background Material" -- it's the substance of what we're going to be dealing with today essentially,, in many different ways.. Then,, after that,, there's something called "Minutes of the December 13th Meeting" - - that was our last meeting you recall; that was our second; this being our third.. Then the original design document,, getting more and more out of date,, but nonetheless still a good piece.. And finally the agenda itself,, which I'd like to take us through to give us some idea of the way we planned the day.. It's a different plan for today; you may find together that this is a wonderful plan,, that I hope you may find it has some flaws,, and we've thought about it a lot; a lot of you have been involved..

We're starting as you see with Roman numeral II,, and I will make a brief introduction, which I am making at the moment.. Then we're going to have an update.. Really highlighting some of the implications of the material that was sent you -- and the background paper by Annette Hochstein and Seymour Fox,, two members of our staff.. Then we're going to have a very brief discussion until 11:00 o'clock -- so you see that discussion is not meant to be an expression of various ideas and maybe even some informed ... rather,, the discussion is to understand pretty much what Annette and Seymour share with us -- moving to Roman Numeral III,, where it's our hope that the discussion will take place..

And you notice under Roman numeral III, it says "Discussion Group: Session I" 11:00-12:30. I'm going to skip and come back to it. Item IV, commission lunch in the dining room -- 12:30-1:30 -- the dining room is right down there; it's when you came down the stairs there were some round tables -- that's where we'll be having lunch. Then I'm going to item V, which is Discussion Group: Session II, and it's a continuation of the session 1. So that we go from 11:00-2:30, interrupted of course by lunch. 11:00-2:30. And the same physical arrangements I will discuss in a moment under Roman numeral III when I go back to that. Then at 2:30, we'll come back to this room and we'll have reports from each of our three discussion groups, and discussion about those reports. And finally, we will conclude, as has been our practice, with a concluding comment by Dr. Gottschalk.

Back to Roman numeral III -- this is really the substance of today. And it will permit, we hope, more personal involvement in the discussion, because we will have 3 smaller groups. We've asked in Group A -- and by the way, on your name tag, if you can read it -- there's a letter and that tells you whether you are group A, B, or C.

In Group A -- we've asked Charles Bronfman to chair it with XXX which is a co-chair and there are also -- there will be a number of, you might say professionals in that group. We've asked Hank Zucker and Seymour Fox to be there from the standpoint of community, and personnel -- our two major headings at the moment. Then Group B -- same agenda, but there the chair will be Esther Lea Ritz, co-chair Donald Mintz. And the two consultants we've asked principally to be involved there are Steve Hoffman,

community and Joe Reimer, personnel. Group C -- we've asked David Hirshhorn and Bill Berman -- I don't see Bill, but my understanding Carmi is he will be here. Bill Berman will chair that, Mandel Berman. Any guy with a first name Mandel can't be all bad.

And then the staff for that, the two we've kind of asked to act as consultants are Bob Hiller for community and Annette Hochstein for personnel. And of course, spread throughout those groups will be Jon Woocher, David Ariel, Carmi Schwartz and Herman Stein -- all of whom will serve in a sense as resources.

There is a discussion guide that will be passed out to you at the meeting. You're going to hear more about it; the Chairs have them, you will have them. Essentially, it states some assumptions or preliminary conclusions or trends or directions of what have you, and has immediately below that statement some questions. And those are questions for each individual group to deal with as that group sees fit. We really don't mean it as a tract on which each group must run, but a track on which each group can run, or really go wherever it and its chair want to in terms of illuminating the fundamental issues so that all three groups essentially will be discussing the same general kind of material. They may end up in different places. The exact discussions undoubtedly will vary. But really what we want is your input; we want your ideas, we want your thoughts, we want your reaction.

This is a commission report, which is being shaped very heavily by commissioners. IN the document that was sent out to

you,, that's behind tab 3, in that document is what you said -- what we heard you say. Every point made by every commissioner is not in the document.. It's where there was some content,, some consistency or continuity or a point was made more than once. And the document is rough. We haven't finalized anything.

So what we want today is to benefit from the rich resource that you,, our commissioners,, represent.. That we represent as informed volunteers or as ... in the field. And when we come back we'll ask the chairs,, supplemented to whatever extent they want to by the co-chairs,, to report on the sense of what happened.. And one member of the -- one of the professionals there -- I'm sure will keep the proceedings and report on what happened and what the ideas are. We're not looking for consensus at this stage of the game; we're just starting ... We will -- ... our first year,, our agenda is starting to emerge; it will emerge more sharply because of today,, because of what we do today..

So this is a very important meeting and nothing will be carved in stone by 4:00 o'clock, but my guess is that certain things will begin to emerge and we'll start to have a sense of direction so that where we want to be a year from now,, I remind you,, is publishing a report that is in fact -- and it's our hope that it will be worthy of the people involved here -- worthy of all of us -- that is in fact an agenda for the North American community for the next 10 or 20 years,, a roadmap for those of us engaged in the business or who want to be more engaged in it,, to find ways to improve Jewish education. Jewish education again I remind you in its larger definition -- informal,, formal,, camps,, whatever.

And so that's what we're after. And so today is kind of a mid-point and the balance of the second year in this two-year project again, I remind you we're aiming for completion in say early summer, late spring, 1990, will be this report leading again may I say to action, where the first steps of action may in fact already been underway. That would be a dream; I don't know if we can do it. Maybe the first steps for action start when we finish the report, maybe they can start before. There's still so much of this we're discovering together.

But, this is going to be Commission and this is what you've all said to me and what I've said to a lot of you, and what I said to a lot of you when I talked with you about serving as a commissioner, those that I ... I would be thrilled, I suppose one could say, if this were merely a wonderful report with lots of superb findings and recommendations. But I would be bitterly disappointed at the same time if we can't somehow cause something to happen -- that's why I got into this. And so, that's our agenda -- it's tough one. And my guess is we're up to it.

A few other things that I want to say before -- points that I think might be helpful again. This 10:00-11:00 hour is my remarks and remarks of Annette and Seymour Fox -- principally theirs is to really set the scene for 11:00 o'clock for the discussion groups. I remind you that since December 13th what I can say and what's already expressed in the report -- there is indeed widespread agreement that improving Jewish education requires that these preconditions, the two preconditions, there may be other important conditions, but that these two

preconditions be somehow dealt with more constructively. An organized systematic attack to get what we want in personnel, I'm not going to define it, we'll be talking it all day -- recruitment, retention, making it a profession, career building, whatever -- as we defined it very carefully -- a more systematic attack involving more people -- not that there haven't been efforts -- but a more systematic attack involving more people and more money. Theoretically one could argue more power. And the second, the community -- and you will recall there were some questions about what we mean by community; I think those questions are starting to be clarified in your minds. We mean a community in which the ambience is supported, in which the leadership is supported, and in which funds in an increasing amount are allocated to improving the quality and quantity I suppose of Jewish education so that future generations of Jews will choose to be Jewish, in the proactive sense that so many of us feel is important to Jewish continuity.

A lot of this is spelled out in the background paper. Next what seems to be very clear since December 13th is that all of these preconditions, that all of the things that we are doing, must lead to our being more able to deal with the programs, because that's really how it's going to translate down to the contact with individuals; community is a precondition, all the things that we talk about in community. Having the right personnel, the right people in the right spot at the right time is a precondition. It's the programs that touch people. And all of this has to lead to our North America being more able to deal with the programmatic options that we have listed -- the 26 or so

that we've listed and others not listed.

Since December 13th we've encouraged to take some of the existing ideas and find new ways to deal with them,, to test out,, find ways to test out new ideas,, and find ways to seek out and combine best practices. There are a wide -- there's a wider range of best practices. They're not all in place everywhere,, but they are there. And so new ideas,, a fresh approach to old ideas,, combining best practices and getting the combined power of all the known best practices being maybe tested out in a single location or locations,, whatever -- we've been encouraged on that.

And the last point I want to make,, that I have in my notes,, which I've already made -- I want to say it again;; I think it's worth saying again. So many of you have said to me,, our ultimate findings and recommendations must lead to action.. Everybody here is a little bit -- I won't say everybody -- most of you I've talked to are a little bit impatient. I'm a little impatient.. We don't want to just turn out another good report;; we want to cause change to take place,, of the kind I'm not going to define -- we'll define it together in North America in terms of Jewish education. We want a North American Jewish education process that's worthy of this North American Jewish community.. And we started out,, all of us,, feeling that what we have today with all its good spots and so on is not. And so,, so many of you are saying to me and believe me as much as you,, I want us to capture ground and hold it. I don't want us to simply capture ground and lose it. So we need to be clear and sure that we can find a way to march forward together in a -- utilizing the best brain power

and talent that our North American Jewish community has -- and that's a very formidable amount, if we can tap into it in the right way.

One other point the I'm finished with my remarks. And it has to do with the involvement of existing institutions, organizations, people and the future. And first let me say that all of the stakeholders, whether it's organizations, denominations, whoever that play on the North American scene or the Canadian or the U.S., but on -- in the larger arena -- that we have to find, or have to seek, we may not find it all by next June -- we have to seek ways in which roles are redefined, if they need to be redefined and where the role is clear, support is made available, financial support, people support -- so that we end up, if I could wave a wand, with the right design in North America of continental bodies doing what they should be doing, enough of what they should be doing, in full measure and doing it well.

So we know we need to end up with a construct that's the right one for North America. We need to involve the foundation community more fully; some of the foundations are fully involved now, more fully, whatever that means -- family foundations, endowment funds of federations. But ... the foundation community. And lastly, on the local level, we need to get all the players working together to the extent that we can -- congregations, federations, the relevant local organization. And if we can see ourselves either as commissioners, or however we continue beyond the life of this commission, individually, together, whatever -- and that's all stuff we'll be talking about in the balance of the

year -- many of you have said to me -- it would be a shame for this Commission to end; well this commission needs to end, all commissions need to end. What life after the commission is -- I don't know. It could be a second commission, it could be who knows. We have to decide what that is together. It might be something informal, it might be the best. But, if what we do on the continental scene, on the local scene is to help people clarify their goals and objectives and work on things that seem to be high priority -- and if we can put more power, the power of our energy and the power of greater financing -- then we'll have the kind of climate that I think all of us want. And if we have the right climate, we have the brainpower to produce the positive change that we're all so hungry for.

Thank you very much. Now back to the agenda, and I remind you we're going to get a presentation from Annette Hochstein, Seymour Fox -- and that will probably be in the 20 minute area; we'll have a few minutes for clarifying questions. And then we go to our discussion groups. And with that, Annette Hochstein -- where's -- right there -- I'm very pleased to welcome you to the podium.

ANNETTE HOCHSTEIN; Ladies and gentlemen,, two major questions emerged from the last meeting of the Commission.. And from the subsequent consultations with many among you,, and with other experts..

Assuming that the Commission will decide to ... with personnel and the community at the center of its agenda,, do we know if anything can be done to bring about significant change,, to have the kind of impact this Commission wants to have on the life of children and on the lifestyles of their families,, of college students,, of *adults*? In other words,, when it comes to the community and to personnel,, are there ideas about what could be done? And if there are,, do we know how to translate these into action? What strategies are available to us in order to implement change?

These are the key questions we would like to address today. I will try and present the issue in 5 points. First a brief review of the meetings of the Commission to date,, how we ... these questions. Second,, positive strategies the Commission might consider to bring about change.. Third,, we will discuss the criteria that should guide the choice of the strategies for change -- this will allow to review some of the decisions already taken by the Commission. Then fourth,, we'll make recommendations for action. And fifth,, I will ask Professor Fox to illustrate how these recommendations might work.

The first slide please. First a brief review of the meetings of this commission,, how we reached three meetings of commission to date. As you remember,, on August 1st suggestions were made,, ideas and programs were suggested. We talked about

specifics and On December ... the focus was narrowed to 26 options and the Commission ... we focused first on personnel and the community,, recognizing that they are preconditions to bringing about significant change in most programmatic areas. At the same time,, much interest was expressed in programmatic options. Today,, June 14th,, we will be discussing ideas and strategies -- what to do and how to do it -- two major issues that were raised at the last meeting and in subsequent interviews. Do we know what can be done by personnel and the community? Are there ideas about what to do? And if there are ideas,, how should they be translated into action,, what strategy should be pursued?

Looking at the first question -- are there ideas? During the past six months,, since the last meeting,, the staff spent time creating an informal inventory of ideas. We spoke to many people in the field,, to practitioners and theoreticians.. And we were quite encouraged. There are a large number of ideas about what to do. They range from granting seed money to experimental projects,, for providing in-service training for teachers,, on the use of the media in classrooms,, to developing full-time positions for supplementary school teachers or ways to build up the training capacity of the existing training institutions. Some of these ideas have been implemented and are working. Some have not yet been tried. Some could be viewed as best practice in the field today; others as visions of what education could or should be. All need to be further studied before decisions.

And this brings to the second point. What strategy should

the commission choose in order to find out what ideas to select? In other words,, how should the Commission bring about implementation of these recommendations and bring about change? And we asked ourselves,, among the many means available,, what should be the means for action that are worth considering? We reviewed some key obvious strategies.. First,, the Commission could of course undertake to prepare a comprehensive national development plan for personnel and the community,, with recommendations such as: multiplying the training positions,, create full-time positions for community educators,, etc.. Second,, in view of the scope of this task,, the Commission might decide to focus its efforts on selected elements: for example,, increase salary and benefits across-the-board for all teachers in North America,, prepare a national recruitment plan to train them,, train personnel for early childhood programs.. A third strategy might involve a more practice-oriented approach,, and decide on the establishment of demonstration projects.. Fourth,, we might undertake a mixed possibility: a gradual implementation plan that would start with one geographic area in North America,, or that would start with communities of 50,000 to 100,, 000 people,, etc..

The challenge then was to find a way to decide among these and other possibilities.. We asked ourselves: could we define the elements of the characteristics,, the criteria of the strategy that would have a good chance or good chances of bringing about significant change? This brings us to the third of the five points: what elements should guide the choice of the strategy for change?

The next slide please.. O.K.. We are suggesting that the way

to act should include these 3 major characteristics: comprehensiveness, across-the-board impact -- that's number 2 -- and concreteness, which is learning by doing. I hope to demonstrate that these in turn will call for a strategy that has both a local component and a continental/international component. And ... briefly detail. What do we mean by comprehensiveness? We mean two elements: one, personnel has 4 components and we believe they ought to be dealt with comprehensively or simultaneously. Two, personnel and the community are inter-related and they too ought to be dealt with simultaneously. I would like to address both personnel with the next slide please.

Thank you. If we return to the logic behind the decision to deal with personnel and the community, with the shortage of personnel -- you may recall that it started with an analysis of programmatic options: supplementary schools, Israel programs, day schools, adult education, media, informal education, early childhood and many more. They were presented in the options paper in December. We reached the conclusion that in order to improve many, if not all of the programs, we must deal with the shortage of personnel for these programs. Now, we then asked ourselves: what is involved in dealing with personnel? And the following elements were identified: recruitment, training, profession-building, retention. We realized that these 4 items are related. If for example increasing salary of teachers may be an important element, but it is only likely to bring about significant change if it is combined with developing more attractive career opportunities, intensifying training, empowering educators.

Therefore, we believe these 4 ought to be dealt with simultaneously.

Now I'd like to get to the second point. Just as personnel has multiple elements, so has the community. As you have read in Henry Zucker and Joel Fox's papers that came with the background materials, the way to address Jewish -- how the Jewish community will relate to education, will demand that outstanding leadership be involved, that the appropriate structures be built, that significant additional funding be generating -- the financial aspect -- and that the climate in the community concerning Jewish education be changed. The conditions for creating and maintaining good personnel, so we believe, must be created by the community. Whilst serious leaders will only be attracted to take leadership in education, if serious personnel is available. This is why personnel and the community are inter-related.

I'd like to go back to the strategy slide please. This was our way of elaborating on the element of comprehensiveness which we believe a strategy should have. The second point is that the strategy should allow for across-the-board impact. Indeed, this Commission wants to have more than a marginal impact; it wants to effect the personnel and the community picture across-the-board. In order for that to happen, we need on the one hand means for the diffusion of innovation and change; and the strategy must allow at the same time for a sustained effort to be carried out over a significant period of time -- of course, the duration is open to discussion.

The third element, that we've called concreteness or learning by doing. This Commission from its very onset wanted to

have concrete results. Moreover, in education as in all practical fields, one finds out what works by working it out in practice. One learns by doing; by thinking and planning specific programs, then trying them out on real people, then learning from the experience, and re-thinking, retrying and relearning. In this way, the complements our sources of knowledge about what works. As a result of these 3 elements, the strategies to be selected must have a local component, because much of education takes place locally in communities, in educational institutions, such as JCCs, synagogues, schools, in programs such as Israel programs, Shabbat, etc. But at the same time, some elements of personnel and the community are continental or even international. Training is a case in point. Few communities could provide the training needed locally. Training is a central function and will remain so. There is also an important contribution that national organizations and institutions can make to Jewish education and must make. Funding will not always be found locally and may often be -- have to be dealt with on a continental or national level.

I would like to get to my fourth point now. We reached the next challenge. I will ... recommending a strategy for action. When one considers what approach could address our problem with these elements in mind, it appears that an approach involving actual doing is called for. We suggest that the Commission consider adopting a strategy that will allow to demonstrate, to develop and to try out, solutions to the personnel and community problems in real-life situations, through specific programs in

specific communities. After studying the literature, consulting with experts and with Commissioners,, we suggest that the Commission consider the establishment of what is called "community action sites." Community action sites would be places -- they could be an entire community,, a network of institutions, or one major institution -- where the best ideas and the best programs in Jewish education would be initiated in as comprehensive a form as possible. It would be a site where the ideas and programs that have succeeded,, as well as new ideas and experimental programs would be undertaken. Other communities would be able to see what a successful approach to personnel and community could be. And might be inspired to apply the lessons learned in their own communities. Such a program, if successful,, would have many advantages. It would be visible, tangible, it could show what Jewish education could be,, it would invite local initiative and ownership, and it would allow to translate visions and best practice, and to bring many -- sorry -- to translate visions into best practice, and bring many examples of best practice in one site. And this brings me to the last point, and back to the first question.

That was: what would happen, or what could happen where such a strategy were adopted? What could happen in community action sites?

I'll ask Professor Fox to take the next few minutes in order to sketch for us in a very preliminary form what might happen in a community action site.

FOX: Thank you Annette.

Mr. Chairman, if a consensus is emerging that this

Commission should end its work with more than a report, no matter how important such a report might play -- no matter how important a role such a report might play in setting the agenda for Jewish education in the next 10-20 years, if this Commission wants to set implementation in motion, then it must somehow work together with local communities.

Annette Hochstein has summarized why we believe that the critical arena for education is the local arena. I should like to emphasize only one of her points. What really distinguishes an educational idea from a philosophical, sociological or psychological idea is that we hope that we can successfully implement the idea in classrooms, in JCC summer camps, in Israel experiences, or other informal settings. Education is a practical field; in education a vision, an idea becomes operative when it can be translated into practice.

These are the reasons that have led us to the suggestion of community action sites. Though we recognize that a community action site could involve either a network of institutions, several major single institutions or an entire community -- let us for the few moments at my disposal consider together, in the most preliminary way -- how a whole community -- for example, I hope nobody is here from St. Louis -- how St. Louis might emerge as a community action site.

Federation would most likely convene all the significant actors; community leaders, professionals, educators, rabbis, Jewish academics concerned with Jewish continuity. Those responsible for the supplementary school, the day schools, early

childhood,, Israel experience,, the media -- the would be convened to address the question what must be done to help the existing educational institutions and programs rise to their fullest stature. The group would soon discover,, as we have,, that there are many exciting ideas and programs that are successful.. Schools and JCCS,, educational programs in Israel that are having an impact. They may be intrigued,, as we are at this point.. They will be sufficient if we only put all these programs together in one place,, what we've tended to call "best practice." If they were brought together in one community,, connected,, related,, maybe even integrated into plan,, into what educators like to call a curriculum,, informal and informal education,, of early childhood and family education,, of Israel trips were all put together -- the effectiveness of each of these programs and certainly their combined impact would be very great..

To introduce much of the best practice that currently exists into their community action site,, will certainly require significant funding. However,, there is reason to believe that if exciting ideas are offered,, if a case is made that there is a good chance that they will be implemented,, then funding may be found. Those responsible for building the community action sites will soon discover that an even greater challenge than funding is to recruit and retain the qualified and dedicated personnel that is indispensable for the implementation of any or all of their programs..

They will learn that the supplementary school,, the JCCs,, and other institutions need more full-time staff. The principals of supplementary schools cannot be part-time. They will discover

that they have to raise salaries, grant pensions and other fringe benefits so that educators can live reasonably well in the community. But where will they find the personnel?

Where will they find the teachers, the principals who are educational leaders, inspired educators for informal education, to staff the community action site? This challenge will not really be responded to until we create a comprehensive, thoughtful, recruitment plan for the personnel of Jewish education in North America. Oddly enough, this is another reason to consider adopting the community action site strategy. We tend to believe that it will be easier to find the number of people needed to staff such a community site than to find personnel for a major national undertaking at least in the beginning. But why will people be attracted to the community action site?

Why will personnel want to work there? This we believe will happen if we are able to communicate to educators, that here is a place where they will be given the opportunity to do their very best to change the trend lines. If they believe that they will be empowered to help set policy, to innovate, that they will be given the opportunity to convince leadership that their ideas are worthy, that they will even be able to create new forms of Jewish education -- then we will be able to attract people from other fields that normally are not attracted to Jewish education. We've mentioned in our background materials that we've distributed to you that we have every reason to believe that there are students in Judaic studies programs, people who are considering career change from general education to Jewish education, who believe

that in -- who would believe that in such a community action site their lives could make a difference.

One idea that has been presented to us is that we might be able to supplement the expanded and expand -- and to the expanded pool of full-time personnel by recruiting a new kind of para-professional. One that sadly enough we've not be able to recruit for the field of Jewish education.. Those of you who have been fortunate enough to work with the camping movement in this country,, with Masad,, with, with Ramah,, with Horasha -- know that these institutions -- and I think we can say with some degree of confidence -- have had an enormous impact on their campers,, on their youngsters,, on their clients --

END OF SIDE OF TAPE

TAPE 1. SIDE 2

FOX CONTINUED: They've decided to become academics or businessmen or professionals of other kinds,, and they don't want to devote their lives full-time to Jewish education. But we've begun to survey and question some of them and ask them: if you are accepted to Washington University in St. Louis,, and if the right conditions were created -- would you be willing to sign on for 4 years to work in a JCC? Would you be willing to work in a supplementary school? Would you be willing to supplement the work in a dayschool? Our feeling is that these and other ideas would introduce an enormous new pool of energy that could make great difference in a community action site..

But there's another reason why they might be attracted. One that is indispensable to the concept of the community action site, and that is that they will grow on the job,, they will learn. And it is here that Annette's point of the contribution of central, of national institutions, of the training institution, or regional or local training institutions would make their contributions..

Why will the training institutions respond to the invitation? Why should they want to take on the problem of helping us plan community action sites, of training of personnel in community action sites, of helping to develop best practice and new ideas? Well, first of all if education is developed -- if we learn by doing -- then the training institutions will learn how to service the local community in the act of doing. They will learn how to train by training. This could be the rehearsal for their enlarged role in pre-service education. There are other

institutions that should and could be invited. The departments of Judaic throughout the United States have just begun to begin to make their contribution to Jewish education. The linchpin of the entire issue of personnel is building the profession.

A community action site will learn of possibilities that no one has considered to date. Right now the only way a Jewish educator can advance is he can become a teacher, an assistant principal or a principal. This linear route is not the best route. There are many teachers who are wonderful teachers, fair assistant principals and not such good principals. In a community action site, we would discover that a teacher who would serve as a Bible specialist for an entire community; an early childhood specialist -- someone who would work with the problems of special education, the handicapped, the disabled -- learning difficulties. People in family education, people experts in how to get the into the classroom, people who would work in evaluation. All these possibilities could exist were Jewish education was approached in a community action site, with an entire community in mind.

There are more than a few questions that have not been dealt with in considering the strategy of a community action site. Some of them, we have thought about; others will be raised by commissioners and other experts. By establishing community action sites though, we would have the opportunity to address questions that have never been dealt with. We finally will be able to ask the question of what works in Jewish education, how does it, why does it work. What else could work. Some of us feel that Jewish

education has never really been given a fair chance.. Community action sites might be a way to being..

One thing we know for sure, that we will learn a great deal as a result of today's discussion.

MANDEL: Seymour,, thank you and Annette.. Folks -- in the next 10 minutes or so,, what we really would like -- if that's O.K. with you -- is just to be sure you're clear about the 11:00 o'clock discussion session and to ask the questions that aren't clear to you from Annette or Seymour of what they've presented,, rather than to get into the substance which we want to get into as soon as we break.

So does anyone have anything that might be you know clarifying.

QUESTION:: Mort a question -- ... what will happen with the discussion material from the discussion group afterwards?

MANDEL:: Yes,, I -- you came late -- but the answer is yes. At 2:30 -- we'll break at 11:00. Really from 11:00 to 2:30, you'll be in your individual discussion groups,, interrupted of course for the hour for lunch. And lunch at your suggestion and so many of you, is informal,, sit where you want -- you can sit together,, you can sit with other friends,, whatever..

Back here at 2:30 Bill where each chairman,, chairperson will report supplemented by the co-chair and we'll have discussion about all of these ideas and we're not looking again Bill,, must quickly for consensus -- we're looking for thoughts,, reactions,, ideas etc.

I think you're ready. Anybody else? Yes ...

QUESTION:: ... you've got what we hope to be,, and after the

session is over -- we then go to work to redo these papers and develop a statement that really reflects what the Commission has learned --

MANDEL: Right. Thank you Hank. Yes. We will then have as our newest acquisition, the fruit of today to move forward with -- absolutely. Thank you for ...

Yes?

QUESTION: I'd just like a clarification on the balance that's being sought in this discussion group between talking about strategic issues, you know how we might go about implementing and ideas, what And I just would like some guidance as to whether these are both on the table, with equal weight -- or whether there is -- it's up to the group to decide where it wants to go.

MANDEL: Yes, I'm going to stick to weight part, because I really haven't thought about that. It's all on the table. And you will have, your chair has a discussion guide, been briefed -- the chairs have been briefed, essentially to let the group take its own direction. We hope, it's my hope, because we need to get it -- we hope somehow you'll get through most of the gut issues, but -- that are listed on the discussion guide -- but ideas, reactions, strategy -- we really want the most we can suck out of your head, heads. I don't think any of you has two heads -- I mean --

Alright, I think we're ready. Let me remind you now of assignments. In this room, and I'm going to ask -- that's group A -- Charles -- at some corner here, maybe in an L-shape -- in this room is Group A, so you do not leave if you're group A -- if

Commission Meeting June 14th -- MI-NA

there's an A on your tag. Right next door to this room, immediately in that direction, there's another room -- that's Group B. That's Esther Lea Ritz' group and Don ... Then there is -- and I don't know if this is going to make everybody else feel bad -- ... is a lounge with upholstered furniture, very comfortable upholstered furniture instead of these hard chairs -- and that's where Group C, headed by Dave Hirsshorn and Bill Berman go right now. And we'll see you back here at 2:30. Thank you very much.

BREAK FOR DISCUSSION GROUPS

10/19/83 N.Y. meeting
underlined by DC

1.

Mr. Mandel: Let me set the stage and review the agenda for today. We obviously are expecting a few more but have the vast hulk of those who are coming and I would just like to say to you again our attendance is remarkable. It's remarkable for two reasons: one is that I know almost all of you quite well for some years and I know what you're doing, what your other demands are and secondly to get this many people in the same city on the same floor, in the same room, at the same time is no small accomplishment and I think it speaks to the issue to not the charm of the chairman but I just wanted to comment on that. We've all seen that for ourselves, attendance has been so good. I ask you to flip it out, if you haven't already done so the last piece of paper in the book. It's the agenda and I want to take you through it. First maybe before I go through the agenda, let's just take a look at the dividers in the book. Obviously if you take a look at the dividers, you see the table of contents, the commissioners we put it in again just as a handy reference of senior policy advisors. Then behind background material is the guts of what we're going to be talking about today. Then you have the minutes of last meeting and off course the agenda. Going through the agenda, I have a few comments which I about half way through... Then Annette Hochstein is going to cover highlights, very short brief highlights of the report. We have made the assumption in prior meetings that you have read this and therefore we are not going to try to repeat. We are going to try and highlight the background materials. We should be a half hour from now when that's completed, at which point we want and ask and I know we will receive your questions, comments, reactions to the recommendations to the various major points and minor points in the report. Then we'll continue through lunch which will be in this room. We don't have another room for lunch, there will be buffet in the outer lobby about the time we adjourn and take what you want and come back and we'll use this table

also for lunch and lunch will be 12:15 to 1:15pm. We do have coming at lunchtime David Finn. I remind you that we hired David Finn a public relations firm Ruder, Finn to help us in drafting the report, not content but clarity, style, so that the reader gets what he should as a result of the 2 years of work that we put into this and he will be here talking about his reactions and what he has been doing to help us. Then also this afternoon we'll have a chance to hear from Steve Hoffman who has been a member of our senior policy advisory group throughout, has agreed to head up the council for initiative on Jewish Education to get it launched, help it get formed, help it get started, in effect be the first executive, while at the same time retaining his job as executive head of the ~~preparation~~ ^{Hebrew} in Cleveland. As we all do carry more than 1 load at a time we think Steve can do that and help us greatly in getting to where we would presumably hire a full time, first time ~~2M~~ so we'll hear some of Steve's ideas and where he is and we'll get your reactions to that. Then near the end of the day we'll have a chance to go around the table and react to anything you want to react to including lessons we've learned or should have learned in the commission process, how you feel about that and then we will conclude as you see, our custom has become to ask one member of the group to make some concluding comments in this case, Rabbi Isadore Twersky. We should be completed by 4PM- somewhere between 3:30 and 4PM, it depends on you and how much time we need to discuss together what it is we want to talk about. Any questions about logistics? Lunch here, outside at noon conclusion roughly 4PM and we'll meet in this room as a single group of the entire day. A few comments before I call upon Annette. I remind you that this is now roughly 2 years, Aug. 1 would be 2 years. Our first meeting was 8/1/88. As you know there was a lot of staff work and some of the people on the commission were involved, for about a year.

maybe a little more than a year before we had our first meeting,, trying to put all of this together and you will recall that in part it was the need to improve the quality and quantity of Jewish education in part it was a reflection of some of the people in this room,, certainly me,, personally wanting to use my energy and whatever means,, financial resources I had in the whole field of Jewish education and Jewish continuity. I'm not really having a clear notion as to where to start,, and others felt the same way and the hope then was that we would be able to put through a blueprint,, a program that all of us in this commission could support and see as a way to improve the quality and quantity of the Jewish education process and thereby the richness of our lives. We started on this 2 years ago and I guess I have said at each of these meetings how impressed I was with the response of you,, the commissioners, not just your attendance but your involvement. I know that lots of you have spent time with members of our staff,, our senior policy, the group in one on one interviews, many face to face, by phone, however we could find you. I think it's fair to say where we are today reflects the work ideas energy of the commission and I'd like to mention also how proud I am of some assumptions we made that have lasted throughout this process, maybe some principles. One of them is the principle of We talk about it all the time. It's a sensitive area in all forms of our human society,, certainly among the Jewish people. We have our challenges to find the things that unite us and emphasize those, not just focus on the things that divide us. I'm frankly very pleased and thrilled. It's gratification in the manner in which this group which is comprised of Orthodox, (Conservative), Reform, secular, Reconstructionist whatever. We have lots of things in common, beliefs, ideas, goals, and dreams in common and I'm very pleased and I believe that if we want to we can find ways to work

Other principle that I feel good about is that I think we have made worth the notion that private foundations can link up with agencies, and work together to really fulfill what the agencies are really about and what the private foundations are interested in. I don't think we'll be able to evaluate this for 5 years, but to me I think the combination of GJE, JESNA and now the old JWB the new Jewish Community Centers Association and private foundations, I think that is working. How well, we'll see, but I think it working, we've gotten all we can get out of it until now. Earlier this meeting I thank^{ed} the AJC profusely, Ira I want you to hear it, we're delighted to have you here. I'm glad you- Ira Silverman the exec., I'm glad you could be with us.

Third comment: I have now talked to 13 private foundations one way or another, some informally because I do the principle or principles the others formally, appearing before a group. We think there are about 25 in the first list and I will tell you that thus far, without exception there is great interest. Either there's great interest, because there was great interest or there was interest let's say, or because if the group was not seeing Jewish education or Jewish continuity as a major thrust, and I'm very encouraged. I'm an optimist that private foundations and communal institutions, North American institutions can work even closer together than we have been, can share ideas, every foundation I have talked to has their own ideas wants to and should as I personally want to and should preserve sovereignty and decision making none the less. The possibilities for loose linkages I think are enormous and if there weren't be there, I'm very surprised. I believe there will and I believe that private Jewish foundations will be working more closer together in the future than we have in the past. Just as a generality, and I believe that's one thing I have learned.

Another comment is I feel we have been successful in putting on the commission, kind of a richly diverse group of people from different disciplines in making it work and my notes have just a few of the headings, scholars, heads of institutions of higher Jewish learning, lay leaders, philanthropists, educators, rabbis, maybe I've left something out. We've made this tapestry work, and I believe that we are where we are because of the contributions that each of these has made, individually and together trying to help us define what may be at it's best Jewish education- what it ought to accomplish, where it ought to take us as humans, as Jews.. I believe the report reflects that.

Second lastly I think we agree even at the time some of you were asked by me and others to join in this endeavor that we wanted to do more than issue a report that we wanted to have clear thinking, using the fine clearer minds we can put together, have clearer thinking, clearer recommendations when we wanted them to happen. We'll be discussing that as I indicated later this afternoon, but now at least we're calling the Council for Initiative Jewish education.

Lastly I want to touch on funding. A few comments about that, because along with ideas and heart, strength, and energy what fuels this machine is money. In the final analysis that's going to be an important at where we end up. The year 2,000 or any year you want to pick. I remind you that, among our prior discussions we talked about long-term funding. I'll use the word, it's not scientific, hundreds of millions of dollars in America, I believe in addition to whatever it is we're spending now and I don't remember if that number is five hundred million or a million, we're probably talking hundreds of millions of dollars. I can't justify that number and I don't have any backup for that

number. It's very large because the stakes are very high. I believe that those of us who believe that and for the long term clearly along with tuition income and what congregations of various organizations are putting in out of their budgets or out of fund raising, clearly we see the Federation movement in North America as a place where increasing allocations must come from. The degree to which there is success there depends on our continuing ability to run good annual campaigns and it depends on what the priorities are, where the heads are of the ex. people who make those decisions in Detroit, LA, Kansas City, Rochester, or wherever. We have built in America alongside of specialized fund raising this magnificent machine, Federation System. If this is as important as I think it is, and some of you think it is, and frankly as I believe a growing number of "top communal leaders." I believe a growing number of top communal leaders are believing. That case needs to be made and if it's made it will be supported by the federations, so that tuition income, various other sources that we have today increasing federation allocations I believe and maybe there's other sources for the long term. For the immediate term we have in mind a family foundations, individuals, and federation endowment funds. At this point in time we have just begun talking to private Jewish foundations that were not completed. There are family foundations, individual funders, and federation endowment funds. I thought there over the next 6 to 12 months is touch base with as many of these as we can to try and get a quick start. Thus far, we have varying stages of where the foundations, the 13 that we talked about are some already with the history of involvement for some time, but have been willing to make a 5 year certain commitment. What we have asked for is a set aside and hopefully a look for a 5 year certain commitment. Some are thinking about this and some have not and may not may want to make this

7
commitment, but are or will spend. There's lots going on and what we want to do is add to it, add to it's focus and what we hope will happen is that as we continue in our process, we will be influencing foundations who are already in their head there and bringing on foundations who are not yet to fuel this machine.

On a lower level to fund the council we have already asked 5 commissions to be underwriters, 5 thusfar have agreed, we'd like to add to this group to assure that among the other things Steve Hoffman will not have to do, will not have to raise money. I will tell you that nowhere did I in some cases, I was accompanied by others, nowhere did we not get wonderful reception, not just courteous but interested. In summary let me say where I think we are it's too early to put a hard number on this. It's clear to me that foundations will increase to my own assessment of it, will increase their spending for Jewish education over the next 5 years by a number between \$25-50 million dollars. That's my number, that's my assessment and it's rough but I believe that it will happen and maybe in fact

One thing I want to clarify, there's not much confusion in this room but there could be elsewhere. We do not see a . There may be some thoughts that there will be a . We do not see a . What we see instead is the council working with the foundations to either act as a bridge or help them see opportunities for doing what they want to do best, and really working toward a set of common goals in making nil of this happen. That in general covers what I want to share with you at this point. I'd like to ask Annette Mechslein if she would to quickly take us through in effect the background materials, the highlights of the background materials. Then we want to throw the floor open to really whatever it is that you would like to talk about.

8
Annette Hochstein: Ladies and gentlemen, since the last meeting of this commission background work was done for the summary report

Jewish I'll will try to briefly summarize this work in the hope that today's discussion will give us guidance towards drafting the final documents. The materials that you have in front of you are an early draft, an attempt to take all the information collected, distributed to you and discussed over these past 2 years and formulate them for the purpose of communicating them to the community at large.

There are essentially two parts to those materials. Chapters 2, 3, and 4 are meant to convey to the public to those who had not participated in these 6 meetings why the commission was formed, what it learned about Jewish education, how it decided to come to grips with the problems and facing Jewish education and what it decided to do. Chapter 5 contains the translations of these decisions into a concrete plan for action, perhaps the commission's message to the council it is establishing to implement these plans. What did we try to do in this report. If successful, we believe the commission's report should achieve 3 goals:

1. The report should express the commission's message. Here we want to find out if we succeeded to formulate the content of the work of this commission.
2. The report should effectively communicate this message to the Jewish Community. The challenge was to be correctly understood, to translate the work into terms that would be easily read, that would convey the message and the power of the work that was done.
3. The report should describe what will be done the implementation. wanted to to convey that this will not be a theoretical endeavor something we all have known since the beginning of the work, but one with very concrete implications.

I'd like to return to the first point. The report should express the

Commission's Message. We point to these message. A. The crucial importance of Jewish education in contemporary life and the stand that the Commission has taken on that. B. The realities of Jewish education today, and three the Commission's plan. I would like to stay with that for a moment, and go back to the first point which is the crucial importance of Jewish education in contemporary life. We have tried, and I will read briefly the way this is formulated in the report to express the fact that this commission used Jewish education as an emergency. In face of life and death issues facing the Jewish people the needs of Jewish often seem to be less urgent, less insistent, a problem that can be dealt with at some point in the future. This commission has taken the position that this an illusion, that we may continue to live with emergencies indefinitely so that we can no longer postpone addressing the needs of Jewish education. There is an assumption in the commission's work, an assumption that under law is the whole endeavor and that that the North American Jewish Community has today the will and the capacity to mobilize itself for Jewish education as it has in the past and continues to do for the building of the state of , for the rescue of Jews in distress, for the fight against discrimination.

The second point was to take a count of the realities of Jewish education. There is a large amount of activity going on in Jewish education in North America. There are about a million children and young people between the ages of 3 and 17 of school age children. They are being educated or they receive their Jewish education in about 2,600 schools, day schools and supplementary schools. They retain 220 JCC's in their branches. There are about 200,000 of them who participate in summer camps, day camps and residential camps, about 100,000 participate in youth movement. Every year some 25,000 participate in educational programs in

Israel, there are some 600 programs of at colleges and universities, and all these are served by about 30,000 educators in a variety of positions. However, it should be noted that the vast majority of these 30,000 positions are positions of less than 10 and sometimes 4 hours a week. There are many ways to look at these various activities. The other side of the fact that there are one million children and 2,600 institutions is that about 600,000 children more than half, do not currently attend any type of Jewish education. Less than half of all the Jewish children in North America currently attend any type of Jewish school. A second point is though the importance of Israel and it's impact on the young visitor leave little doubt. Only about 1 in 3 North American Jews has ever visited Israel and of course the figures are lower among the 16 to 25 year olds. And lastly, at this time, when family education is considered to be a particular importance it appears that Jewish parents do not always have the ability to help their children in their Jewish education. Therefore, particularly relevant that only 1 in 10 adults are involved in any type of Jewish learning. So how did the commission decide to address this fact. As I said the commission has decided to undertake a very concrete program of implementation. The questions were, what should be done, who should do it, how should it be done. There are 3 major points to the commission strategy. First the commission decided to undertake a two program, one that would take place initially in lead communities at the local and at the same simultaneously would involve major initiatives at the continental level what we call continental strategies. 2. In order to respond to the question of the third meeting of this commission I believe, of who would do this. The commission decided on the establishment of a council for initiatives in Jewish education. This council would be a driving force for implementing the

commission's plan and for bringing about change.. 3. As Mort has just explained, a funding strategy both short and long term is being developed in order to make the resources available so that the plan can indeed be implemented. Initially, the major thrust of the work of the commission will be related to what we come to call the building blocks of Jewish education. Establishing a professional Jewish education and building community support for Jewish education, the commission felt that these two elements are not just the basic building blocks but also that are inter-related. The reason is the following: in order for talented people to be educated to the field, they must believe that the community is embarking on a new era for Jewish education, in which there will be reasonable salaries, which are large enough today, a secure career line, an opportunity to have an impact on the quality of the methods of education. On the other hand, parents, in order to be willing to send their children to Jewish educational programs must recognize and must believe that Jewish education can make a decisive contribution to the lives and lifestyles of their children and the lifestyles of their families. This was the basis of the two building blocks upon which the content of the work of the commission and the implementation plan would rest. I'd like to get to the second point which is the council for initiatives in Jewish education. We have a slide that gives some sense of the organization involved. At present the idea of who will do the work and what work will be done looks as follows: the council for initiatives in Jewish education will be driven by the decisions of its board. All decisions, policies will be set by a board. There will be a small a few people and much of the work will be done by outside consultants, by the central organizations of Jewish life, Jesna, JCC, JWB, CJF are likely to play a key role in some of the functions that are involved in the work

across the board. I would like to give a number of illustrations because there have been very many suggestions as to what will be done in a lead community. I would like to illustrate some of the things that might happen that have been suggested and that could happen in the lead community. First of all best practices,, programs that work will be imported and for local needs.. Lead communities will become a place where very many programs that have proven successful in other places will be brought together. The question we will be asking ourselves is when many best programs are brought in one place,, what can happen to Jewish education. We will be looking at that under the the assumption that probably very many good things might happen. Second of all,, ideas and programs will be encouraged and tested in lead communities. A major effort will be involved at cultivating new sources for personnel. This in the various interview discussions that we have had both individually and in groups and at prior meetings,, this is clearly one the biggest problem and major challenges facing any effort at changing Jewish education. Can one recruit new people in order to staff in a better way positions that are currently staffed not always satisfactorily in order to create new positions that need to be created in order to staff new programs. A number of ideas have been suggested. They are described in the background documents that you have I would like to mention a few.

The idea is that in a lead communities from a variety of sources we might be able to recruit 15 to 20 new educators initially in a fairly short amount of time and that these would bring in the quality,, level,, energy necessary in order to assist the local community in the new endeavors. Let us take for example the idea of the fellows of the council. The idea has been raised and is even being implemented in a preliminary way in some communities in North America. There are large

number of Jewish people in the academic world in studies, general education, in humanities and social sciences who look forward to the possibility of making their contribution to Jewish life. The question who would want for example recruit two such people to give 2, 3, 4, or 5 years of their life to such a lead community. We have reason to believe that under the proper conditions this is possible. The question becomes if we could across North America recruit 10 such people to give guidance to the educators in the community, what would it do. This is just one idea. I will not go into detail because my time is almost up. There are a number of such ideas that lead us to believe that one could at this point in a lead community recruit a calibery of new people that would be able to assist in the endeavor.

A few of the other suggestions, all educators in lead communities will be involved in on the job training programs. There seems to be an agreement among very many commissioners that this has to be. Everybody in a lead community will be involved in a program of self enrichment and learning so that educators will particippaate in seminars, in courses they may do so in the summer, in Israel they may do so at institutes of high Jewish learning and a variety of universities and settings that are currently offering in service training. That this will be institutionalized and everyone will be involved. We have mentioned and it has been said to me very strongly at some the interviews I had this week with commissioners that unless an effort is made to involve key community leaders in the endeavor, this is going to be very hard to implement. Therefore such an effort has to be undertaken to gather in a systematic way with a program to inform the leadership about the facts of Jewish eudcation, issues, and what can be done about it.

What will happen in a lead community.. Let's assume for a moment that the lead community has been selected and that work is beginning.. The idea suggested is that a local planning committee be created to determine that community's needs locally and to develop a plan in order to address the major problems.. A professional staff will assist the community's leaders and educators in this endeavor and the council for initiatives in Jewish education will lend whatever planning and professional assistance is required. There will locally be a fair amount of planning work and thinking work in order to develop the responses and to decide on those programs that are specifically suited to the community and state. As I mentioned before in parallel to the effort with lead communities, continental strategies will be undertaken.. A number of major initiatives are called for at the continental level in order for lead communities to be able to move ahead and in order for change to take place in a significant manner. One point is work will have to be done for maintaining the momentum of the commission's work and establishing programs to inform and involve many more community leaders I've just spoken to. At the same a broad scale effort to introduce changes in the personnel structures will have to be undertaken. Commissioners have suggested that it will be necessary to undertake a major marketing and recruitment effort if we are able to find many more young people and find ways to attract them to the training programs and to jobs.. Second of all the point called the education of educators.. By that we mean the training and the training programs. It will be necessary and suggested to undertake a major effort at increasing significantly the number of people graduating annually from training programs. You will be receiving this date a third research report by Dr. R.E. Davidson who has surveyed the existing training programs. Last year there were 101 graduates of all

training programs for a field that has 30,000 positions.. 5,000 are full time positions. Obviously this is enormously inadequate.. There a sense that it is possible to raise significantly the number of graduates in fairly short amount of time to 3 or 4 hundred that too will not suffice but would be a significant improvement over the current situation. What will this involve. It will involve things such as creating new positions, endowing professorships, sending young people to train to become professors of education. Currently the full time faculty for Jewish education for all the institutions together is 18 people many of whom hold very significant and load to their in addition to their training loads. Obviously that situation has to be changed if training programs are to be able to do their jobs.

The issue of salaries and benefits is one that also requires careful study but will clearly require change. Salaries in Jewish education fall far below salaries in general education. They are considered inadequate. That question will have to be dealt with.

Educators need to be empowered in order to make their contribution to educational policies of their institutions. It both the need of the institutions and the educators. They need to know that they can make the contribution, be want and are able to make to the development of Jewish education. All educators work in programs. Therefore from the beginning this commission has spoken in addition to the building blocks of Jewish education, has spoken of programmatic endeavors. The creation of programs in the various areas of Jewish education will be one of the challenges of the Council.

Among the ideas suggested, two at the moment are that the council develop an inventory of successful programs and will make that available to institutions throughout North America so that they can use it adapted

locally. As a major piece, the council will build upon the work already being undertaken and begun by several family foundations in a variety of programatic areas and to continue development in whatever means and ways of being developed. The last point which was discussed very much was that the methods of Jewish education is deemed essential by many commissioners. The development of methods for monitoring and evaluating the implementation of the commission's plan will be undertaken. The result of these two endeavors will be throughout the Jewish community.

These ideas have been summarized in the report and by commissioners under 6 heading as the commission's 6 recommendations. I will briefly read the beginning of each one of them. 1. The commission recommends the establishment of the council for initiatives in Jewish education. 2. The commission urges an effort to involve more key community leaders in the Jewish education enterprise. 3. The commission recommends that a plan be launched to build a profession of Jewish education in North America. 4. The commission recommends the establishment of several lead communities. 5. The commission will encourage developments in programatic areas which offer promising opportunities for new initiatives. 6. The commission recommends the establishment of a research capability in North America. These are the 6 recommendations.

I think it would be most appropriate to conclude these comments by reading to a statement that you will find as the last page in your background document. We are fortunate that one of the commissioners, Professor Isadore Twersky decided to share with us his conception of the commission's mission. Our goals should be to make it possible for every Jewish child to be exposed to the mystery and of Jewish history. To the informing insights and special sensitivity of Jewish thought, the sanctity and symbolism of Jewish existence, to the power and

18.

prevundidity of Jewish faith, as a mottto we might adopt a that says
the search and did not find as
usually understood as an ignoramus and illiterate may for our purposes be
redifined as one indifferent to Jewish visions and values,, untouched by
the drama and majesty of Jewish history,, unappreciative of the
resourcefulness and of the Jewish community,, unconcerned with
Jewish destiny. Education in its broadest sense will enable young people
to confront the secret of Jewish and existance,, the quality of
through our teaching with facinates and attracts irresistability. They
will then be able to to find their place in a creative and
constructive Jewish community..

Florence Meltom: If I may respectfully add to Rabbi Twersky's statement
here a broad sense of statement of purpose to include Jewish people from
early childhood to academic scholarship..

Jack Bieler:. First of all, very fundamentally I think the introduction of
this paper emphasizes the importance of Outreach of reaching all sorts of
people that are not being reached right now. I think deals with
improving the delivery system. I don't think that one thing logically
is In other words, the parents that are unable to help with
their children's education is quite different with the assumption that
parents are not interested in helping their children of Jewish education.
Does it logically follow on pg. 45 that if the building blocks will be
improved then parents will recognized that Jewish education can make a
contribution to the lives of their children. I'm not convinced that that
is true. Even if the small percentage of children that get educated will
get a better education that does not address the issue of erosion of
Jewish values throughout the Jewish community. A major piece of this
in terms of dealing with the of dealing with many of the people

who are not confronted with any of this at all.. I think that by putting statistics for children as apposed to talking about further length of adolescence,, adults,, college age students.. What it does is gives the implication the major thrust of Jewish education is in the school.. I think we have reached the conclusion that this is not necessarily so.. Granted statistics are not available,, we have no statistics at all.. We only have charts about the schools to talk how the basis of communities not being reached,, I think we are making a mistake in point #1.. In point #2 we said at the end of the last meeting this issue of the community.. I would fear that the idea of a lead community would not be if various foundations are only interested in particular projects.. I believe the community would really have to constitute an organic relationship of many different kinds of programs and institutions towards creating a comprehensive approach towards Jewish education.. The foundations are interested in another piece of let's say you can't find people to deal with the whole organic I think we won't be able to construct the kind of lead community I envision would not simply be a laboratory for a hit and miss type of system but would rather also be an attempt to deal with the problems of old. Third point is the issue of that that you mentioned. There are only two places in this paper where the issue of comes up. On pg. 9 it mentions that the commission would benefit from the power of various religious persuasions. is not an issue but rather than a value in terms of itself. I think that it should go further than that. about this idea that will be through Jewish education. I don't know if the point of the commission is a statement about towards Jewish education. There is a much stronger statement about is a value in itself and that commission is a of that rather than simply saying that the commission will

advance its goals by

Irwin Field: I wanted to add what the Rabbi started to say because he touched on something which I wanted to discuss. Going back to the first point that he made: There is nothing in this document that speaks to or about the family. The only mention of the word family appears on (pg. 45). It says if we approve with the accusation of dedicated and qualified personnel then families will recognize that Jewish education will make a decisive contribution to their lives. I think that is a significant omission of what we're doing. If I go back to the minutes of the last meeting in the group discussion that was chaired by Eli Evans, there is an important point which says that group members encourage the important focus on involving the family. Back to the minutes of the previous meetings, it also was mentioned in each of those meetings. When you cite statistics that only one half of the children attend Jewish schools, we make it sound like it's the children's fault. The victims are guilty, but it's not their fault because they never make that the decision. No child decides to go to a Jewish school. Parents decide what they are going to do at that particular age and we aren't speaking at all to that issue in the whole framework of Jewish education. We know that in general education today, in inner city schools, in the problem schools, in those model schools where they have involved the parents in the school, the school is approved. As Annette spoke before that if we were to empower educators we would improve the system. If we would empower the parents, what would happen to the system then. In the current issue of Forbes the lead story says that from 4 to 12 years old today is a 75 billion dollar commercial spending consumer market. That's what the major companies are gearing. If we were to say that Jew are 1/75 of that a year and if we could get Jewish parents to invest 1/10 of that additional into Jewish

education you're talking about an enormous to Jewish education. Somewhere in this document we have to somehow focus on the family and parents as a primary part of this whole process..

Morton Mandel:: I would just like to remind you that early on we identified 19 major areas,, any one of which deserves a commission and should have one. The family was one at the other end of the spectrum, early childhood and I'm looking at Eli Evan's how do we end the year of 1990 using the electronic media.. There are 19 major areas that need to be explored. I remind you the was that in our brief life we would not get into any more depth than to identify these major building blocks and hope that we can encourage all of them to be the subject of the commission or where the knowledge is there implementation on the part of some of the folks around this table and others getting them to do what Jack Bieler and Irwin Field at least part of Jack's comments.. There's none of us starting with me, I would sure live my life over again.. I wish I would have been exposed to some of the things my grandchildren have been exposed to. I remind you that we all have strong feelings about all 19 on the life of this commission have not been able to do any more than identify as a major report. That's how we ended up with the family..

Seymour Martin Lipset:: I would like to continue that point,.. I must confess there is a certain underlying logic to what we've done. Mainly what I call market research. I happened to read just this morning in the latest issue of New York Magazine in 7 days that the magazine is closing down. Stern put 10 million dollars into it. He thought that it would sell, that there was a gap between the Village Voice which he owns and New York Magazine. He found that there isn't. There just wasn't a market for it. The question is what is the market for Jewish education? Some of these statistics for example the push for 66 million Jews-- it may turn out

by the way that there are more. There's a new Jewish population survey which is coming up with the fact that there may be as many as 7 or 8 million people who are Jews in The U.S. They did 100,000 random digit dialing to locate Jews. It increases the number of people who are Jewish or think of themselves as Jewish but have nothing to do with the community. If you take our previous data, take 100 Jews, roughly 25 of them are 0--are totally unrelated. So if you start with the 6 million

Of the other 75, there is another 25 who are not involved in the community. When we say one out of every three Jews went to Israel, what is the base of that? If the base is 6 million, it's one out of three; if the base 3 million it's 2 out of 3. If we say only 40% of Jewish kids are going to school, if the base is 6 million it's 40%, if the base is 3 million it's 80%. The whole question of who can we sell to We can't, no matter what we do - stand on our heads - there are a lot of Jewish families who will never send their kids to a Jewish school no matter how good the school is. If we say who are the people sending their kids to Jewish schools, if we identify Jews, 20% are Orthodox, and this whole question of what is the community, who can we sell to and how good a job we're doing or not doing is something we can only address within the context of what the people are. From one perspective we may be doing a better job than we think. That is the perspective of whether people who feel themselves Jewish are sending their kids to school. Only 20% go to synagogue or temple whereas in Christian groups it's much higher. What about the 80%. Obviously some of those 80% are candidates for this, but we really have to know all of this when we deliberate. We can improve the schools, but people have to want to come to them. We should make it better for the people who want to go. The question is how do we get these other people? Can we get them? Where can we get them? I raised the

25

question at an earlier meeting of the significance of the college population.. That's a captive audience.. It's the last time last time you can reach Jewish people who have no background.. And one of the things that happens in college,, and again I think the number is very small,, is Jewish kids who come out of totally non-Jewish backgrounds get picked up sometimes in college,, through Jewish studies courses or something.. But again, how many,, to what extent,, what is the significance of trying at that point versus other points.. All of this calls for basic research.. In a certain way I think that basic research is a preliminary.. It hasn't been done..

Rabbi Hirt:: The section of the report on lead communities is inspiring.. It really tries to say that we can look at certain settings and see how we want to develop.. I question whether lead communities should be restricted to geographic locals.. There might be some advantage to having lead communities by discipline,, because if people are to learn from each other there is a very small population currently involved in a given discipline,, how can we really be able to learn how to develop it, whether it's in camping or informal education or in basic education.. Should there not be a concept of lead community by discipline where there can be a greater sense of networking that has a research component to it, has involvement of personnel rather than doing a localized- even if you have 20 or 30 communities.. I think the sharing may be different because of local constituents.. I would suggest that in lead communities, while the geographic base works in communities of certain sizes, we might also wish to explore the idea of something by discipline.. I'm not saying that it's one of the 19 areas but I think it's- MLM-it's a different cut into it..

The same element is in that of recruitment.. Here to what I think is

done in recruitment ought to be looked at from the point of view of what incentives are necessary in order to bring people into the field, not what people will be brought in because they are already available within the market. We need a longer term element space sort of limiting. We've had 2, 3, 5, or 10 people in certain areas that might have an impact. I'm not sure unless we can look at things what might encourage people to enter the field, what kind of people we have to involve and give us that information. We might be able to recruit in a general sense by demographics and not necessarily by substance. Now we ought to take a look at that particularly with people who have had a greater impact upon people who have entered Jewish education. Somewhat of the celebratory endorsement element- a modest example of Auerbach who tells a kid in seventh grade what he ought to be doing, whether he should play basketball in NC and go on to the Celtics is a good example. I think there are people in the various movements and the universities that have great impact on people. Those are the people that have to be projected to be working with a mission to say that these are mottos that you can look at for the future.

John Colman: The report rests importantly on the function of involving more key community leaders in the work of the lead communities and the development of plan. I wonder whether the weakness of that office should be addressed at least partially in the report, namely the assessment of the Jewish capacity of the key community leadership. I wonder how many key community leaders would meet the standards that Rabbi Twersky has given to us. Clearly if community leaders are going to be involved in the choices and the innovation, they do not have to

Morton L. Mandel: Which comes first the chicken or the egg?

Charles Bronfman: First of all I'll just answer John partly.. I don't know whether this an answer...I remember when I was president of our local federation, I frankly didn't give a damn about Jewish education. I was the one under my presidency that got our federation deeply involved in Jewish education. It's not necessarily who the leaders of the community are. If people want it, somehow you've got to deliver it.

I was wondering about the Council and the necessity for a council.. It's going to be looked upon as another organization.. In the deliberations that lead to the idea of a council,, I'm sure that the thought of expanding JESNA's role was considered and I'd like to know how the council idea grew and not the enhancement of a body like JESNA..

Morton L. Mandel: Alot of time was spent and I'm going to suggest that we're going to get to that. Steve is going to make a major presentation this afternoon on that. I put the word major in. I'd like you to hold your question, if that's okay with you, until we do that..

Arthur Green: I am very supportive of the entire report and everything that is in it. I find Professor Twersky's mission statement particularly inspiring. As I read the mission statement and the report itself, I find a significant gap between them and it's that gap I really wanted to talk about, making two points, essentially. I am afraid when I read the mission statement I hear about a new commitment to Jewish education (here I would prefer Jewish learning rather than Jewish education) involved support in the community. When I go to the text of the report I see that we have again with day schools and supplementary schools. So many precentages of day and supplementary schools and that adult education, family education, everything else that something ought to happen about it. I'm afraid that we fall back

today, that has to be more than a short paragraph that says yes there are so and so many programs on Judaic studies on college campuses.

Alfred Gottschalk:: So much has been said here with which I agree.. I want to go back to Professor Twersky's mission statement and what I think it means to me. The question that was asked by Martin Buber and Franz Rosenzweig a generation ago.. What is Jewish education? Their answer was,, the purpose of Jewish education is to create a Jewish human being who is no less Jewish belonging to the universal family of man and no less universal by being Jewish. They were addressing the problems of the modern world as they saw it. As I read this very comprehensive and excellent report,, reflecting 2 years of very serious effort and work,, it is a remarkable undertaking.. We should say a prayer for having reached this day. You know, 2 years ago, the Berlin Wall was up, eastern Europe was relatively in tact, and people still thought that central planning was the answer or that a new 5 year plan could solve the weaknesses that haunted eastern European economies.. I have a feeling that, from the point of view of hindsight, our report is not related to what's happening in the world at large. In terms of the massive changes in society and the impact of those changes. I don't know how we could have been aware of them, but the fact of the matter is that we have to deal with that new reality. Therefore I would plead that we continue talking with one another. I think, as important as any written report, was the fact that we were able to sit together in a room. Under no other umbrella was that possible. That we continue this questioning, what is Jewish education, the purpose to create a Jewish human being, and what does that entail. Our report addresses the idiosyncratic nature of the Jewish community as highlighted by Walter Akerman's last paragraph. A rather remarkable paper you sent us,, which I'd like to remind us of.: The idea of centrally organized planning....

((the entire final paragraph of Akerman's paper")).. There I think lies the key to our report. It is in its genius in going back to the individual units which comprise this Mosaic of Jewish education, the Jewish religious movements, the non-religious movements and those devoted to Jewish education. The need to strengthen that which exists.. I think that Professor Lipset has put his finger on something very important.. We know who is here.. This is, we know who comes to our school - whose those children and their families are. We do not know who the people are out there whom we might appeal to. Therefore I would plead that we concentrate on those we have, raising the level of education, quality of education that we deal with role modeling. These are the people, when they go out and teach, who will have problems and bring them into the Jewish school. No proclamation, no report can change those realities.

Last point, and that is the coordination obviously is necessary. I think that Walter Akerman is correct that coordination and central planning are two separate functions and are respectable. One does not replace the other and certainly nothing is contemplated for this report that would go toward a central planning organization which would develop before that goes out to everyone. That this continuing body would assist others in developing that.

David Hirschhorn: I assume we are all here because of a common concern for Jewish continuity. We are also here because we think the Jewish Education has a role to play in it. I am concerned at the way the tone of this report is developing. It would appear to suggest whatever we can do in Jewish education is the answer to Jewish continuity. It has already been suggested by others that there are other major forces at work, societal changes that has taken place. There is the whole issue of the family, not just the Jewish

family but the family and its role. I think we may be overselling and that we leave ourselves in position of a report which suggests that if we improve Jewish education we have solved the problems of Jewish continuity. I know this section on the relationship of Jewish education to Jewish continuity remains to be written. I haven't seen it and I don't know what it says, but I have a concern if it suggests-- that is one and one equals two-- and I wonder whether or not we need to rethink the introductory section which oversimplifies the rationale for the creation of this commission in terms of the fact if we do a better job with Jewish education, Jewish continuity problems will be solved. We set that as an objective and if we don't necessarily improve Jewish continuity, you wouldn't say that we have failed, so we haven't set a realistic goal for ourselves.

Morton L. Mandel: Thank you David. I want to remind everyone that our process has been and certainly will be after this meeting, everything is being recorded and notes are being taken as well. All of these comments will be examined as carefully as we know how to examine them and will be filtered into any revisions which you will then see again, which is what we have done each of our prior 5 meetings.

Alvin Schiff: I must say that I continually am impressed with the of elegant reactions to the report and I wouldn't want to be in the staff position and have to digest them and make the amalgam that finally finally come out.

Why should the recommendation made by the successful businessman or successful real estate man - what do you owe your success to? He says 3 things: location, location, location. I think our goal at this meeting is focused, focused, focused. What are we going to focus on? I see coming out

of this remarkably well organized report, I see there are 2 separate thrusts and I think they have been touched upon somewhat. One has to do with outreach and the other has to do with inreach. I think the report essentially deals with the affiliated, the marginally affiliated, and the un-affiliated or under-affiliated Jews. I don't know right now if there is "enough gold in them thar hills" to deal with the total variety of un-affiliated, alienated Jews.- whether they are half of the Jewish population, a third, or 60%. I would like to concentrate on what I call inreach - people who have some kind of affiliation, are under-affiliated, send their kids to schools, may go on a trip to Israel, may have some relationship to a JCC, adult education, or have some relationship to the organized Jewish community. I call that inreach. I would like to suggest- we said we don't know about how much it costs us. Well in a sense, Jewish education big wheels have done alot of figuring on that. It's well over a billion dollars. I can provide you with figures that may be not so correct, but my figures are close to one billion two hundred million dollars. Big business. What can the Commission do relating to the expenditure over one billion dollars. Question I think the answer to that is leverage. How can best leverage a relatively small amount of money that will be available to do what is needed for this Jewish community? In American terms, it's small, whether it's 5 million or 8 million, but as far as Jews are concerned, spread all over the whole atlas or the continent of North America, it's a huge job. I guess there would be 2 overall roles for the Commission coming out of all our discussions and it's implied if not expressed in the report. One has to do with the continuing role of advocacy. When I look back at the Johnson era-sputnick that woke us up. In 1957 we were woken up by Sputnik. I think there was a 10 fold increase after that in government and foundation support of higher education. Look what's happening to us. Where did they come from?

they came from the self-realization that education can not be viewed as a consumer good any more. It has to be viewed as an investment in the future of America. All reports thereafter, including the Nation At Risk, feed on that and I think that has to be that continuous relationship. We're not going to solve it by saying we're looking at Jewish education now. During the next decade or 2 decades one of the things that the Commission had to do is turn the hearts of American Jews who care with the under-affiliated, marginally affiliated, and affiliated groups into considering Jewish education, whatever the dimensions are-informal, formal, adult, early childhood- turning that into a feeling of urgency and investment in the future rather than a consumer good. Even those who go on a trip to Israel might against something else- it costs me \$2,000, \$3,000- I'll take my family, I'll send my kid. It's still viewed by even those who are committed as a consumer good. I would suggest that this one of the roles.

The implementation role, to me, one of the things I learned from and that I loved in the report was that of changing the language of community site to lead community. I think it's not only semantic. Annette did it well and the report does it well. Let me embellish on that piece. When we talked about community sites, we spoke mostly about a mode or a mood of experimentation in the community see to what level we could bring the community. Lead community if not a difference in semantics. It's a very important, substantive difference. It's taking a community or a program within a community and showing how that can affect Jewish life/Jewish education. I would like to suggest that there are precedents in the American scene. These precedents come out of the elementary or secondary education act, post 1965, thereafter fleshed out by Title 4 and must say my experience was I was chairman of the Evaluation Committee of Title 4 and I must say that they develop a

methodology that I think may be useful to us. A key to that, which is different than community sites, the key to that is developing, transferring, success strategies. That's what the national network is all about. That's what all the dissemination efforts and I'd like to suggest we put our money on more ways to develop those leads. They don't necessarily have to be a total community. It can be a part of a community, a program community that could be exported for use elsewhere and that the Council could be effective in providing the leverage for the funding on two sides of the coin. The first area could be helping develop what already exists into something that is exportable, then validating it, because once you develop something and make it better we don't know how well we did it. There has to be a position, there has to be money and support made available to validate that. Once it's validated, that community that becomes a lead community has to be able to demonstrate to others that it can be done elsewhere. There has to be that bridge. Then the funding has to be given to that lead community to demonstrate to others that "look it works, the program works, it can be exported." Finally, the funding can go to the person who wants to adopt it. That's where the dissemination piece comes up. I must tell you when I read it, it turned me on in that respect. I see it as a 4 level activity. Whether it's a total community, and I don't think it can be done as a total community, whether it can be done as programs in a community and if possible a total community helping them develop, validate, demonstrate and disseminate it and I think if we do that within the inreach concept- outreach is another thing. I must say that outreach is absolutely important, but a lot of things we do as outreach are really inreach because we already touch and reach these people in some ways. I'd like to suggest that that is my contribution.

But having said that, I want to make something else- the Jewish Family. Our

research, the board of Jewish Education Research, we researched supplementary schools and the research was done- Seymour knows this and others know this - says to us that we are never going to be successful with the 60 or 70%, and I maintain that it's about 70% of the children somehow will be exposed, even though less than half or half are currently involved. During their lifetime, given the common trend of children in schools between age 5 and 18, about 70% are really exposed. The question is will that stick? What will happen to them? The largest majority of those kids are going to be turned off because their families are not with them. I just want to leave you on this note, ((some loss while tape was turned over)) We've never had administrators like this. Never. No sophisticated administrators.. What's wrong with our schools? Particularly in urban area.. The problem with our schools is that parents send us the wrong kids. We will always have the wrong kids if we don't invest -- in the families..

David Arnow - I have generally quite positive feelings about the report as a whole. I want to second a comment that Jack made initially about the place in the report for the concept of pluralism. It is recognized as a fact, not as a value. I have no problem with that. Related to that, I want to make a comment about the mission statement. I like the idea of a mission statement. This is not the longest document in the world, but it is nice to have a mission statement where we're headed. I have a problem with the process by which this statement was developed and therefore the contents as well. This is the first time I've seen the mission statement. I don't know if that's true for others.

MLM - That is not meant to be a mission statement. That is a commentary made by the rabbi that we thought highly of. It's not the mission of the Commission on Jewish Education and I don't believe that Rabbi Twersky meant it as such. He just sent us a statement that he believes deeply reflects his point of view, and we thought it was beautiful and we wanted to share it with you.

David Arnow - My question is, what is the future of this statement? Vis-a-vis the rest of the document?

MLM - There is no future of this statement. It's Isadore Twersky's commentary and I understand.

Twersky - I was asked to reformulate something that I had said at our very first meeting and I tried to reconstruct.. It in no way coordinated with the report.

MLM - We stuck it in here so that it would be easily available to all of you in the book. It is in on page 880 of the report. That's my fault for not being clear.

Arnow - I have no further comments..

Hirschhorn - Will the mission statement be included?

MLM - What statement? You mean a mission statement.. Right now there is no mission statement that we think of as part of the report..

David Dubin - Maybe the comments have dealt with family,, age groups,, program concepts and really details of implementation where for me that's at gimel and I'm still at aleph. What goes through my mind is I read this very well-constructed report, which I thought conceptually was very succinct and educationally repetitive -- what goes through my mind is something much more practical. I feel a little guilty about saying it after studying Rosensweig and Buber this summer and hearing all these wonderful educational, philosophical comments. It's a practical concern I have. There are many ideas in this report, many conceptual suggestions and the question I have is how do we make what we have here palatable to the people who are not here?

Because in order for this to be successful, it involves people who are not in this room. What can we do to create an environment of receptivity both in terms of the local as well as the continental strategies? All of these architectural designs, all of those educational people in the vineyards out there. And that's the piece that I don't know if it's missing or it's the next step in the process, because I think we need to find ways to diminish the erosion that always takes place between these wonderful ideas that we come out with, and here there's a whirlwind of ideas that would have to take place in these communities, and the actual implementation. Before we get to some of the specific concerns. And that's the whole piece of how do we transmit and network all of this in a way in which other people will be as enthusiastic as we are? Maybe this will be the work of Steve when he picks it up with the council of the initiatives. I think there needs to be a whole piece that's not in the report, and I don't know if it should be in the report, about the transmission process. Should Mort Mandel and Seymour Fox and Steve Hoffman and whoever else meet with the executive directors of federations and presidents of communities around the country who are either going to be or not in these communities, to share with them what this blueprint is all about. I think something like that may be in order. Shouldn't there be some mini-regional meetings involving the key quarterbacks who are going to have to really give leadership to all of these conceptual ideas to the communities. I have this fear that this wonderful material, and I think there are some creative ideas that are conceptually sound here, I thought it was wonderful. How do we articulate it in a way in which it makes sense from a practical point of view to the people who are not in this room?

Somewhere along the line, there are ideas and creative ideas,, perhaps PR people relate to that,, somewhere along the line,, before we get into families or Euber, we have to I think deal with that..

Norman Lamm - I'd like to share a few of my concerns,, and there are a variety of them.. First in our conversation I was discussing so far this morning, we've been meeting close to two years and I am disturbed by the tendency to start rethinking the whole thing from aleph.. We have had a certain basis of agreement,, some consensus has arisen.. It is reflected in an excellent report.. Now to start reinventing the whole Commission by discussing whether or not Jewish education is the answer to everything I don't think anyone thinks it's the answer to everything.. For introducing ideological notes,, and I'm against any mention of pluralism,, why do you want to muddy those waters again? That's not necessary.. That's not what we're here for.. If what we are doing is pluralism,, so be it.. Why bother with semantics.. We are getting ideological compounded and confounded here.. As I say, I am quite pleased with the report and I think we have to proceed.. But among other things that haven't been mentioned today are some very good complaints that we haven't been inclusive enough before that have been mentioned today.. We should have had family education,, advanced planning, cable TV, physical facilities,, subsidizing the cost of education-- and someone mentioned this, that parents simply find it impossible to pay the cost of a good Jewish education.. All kinds of things have been mentioned,, and here I would like to say that in general I think it is correct.. We have got a comprehensive view of what we want to achieve in the long run.. My fear

is that we are going to overburden ourselves. The Talmud says...if you know where you want to go and you grab for too much, you will achieve nothing. If you have a more limited goal, you possibly will attain. We have three major aspects of the work of this Commission that I can discern. Number one--I'll start with the bottom line--simply getting enough money to be able to do great things in Jewish education, that's what we're doing with the family foundations and federations, etc. The second is to act as a lobbyist, as an advocacy group for Jewish education amongst the Jewish communities throughout North America. The third is everything else, which comes to the substance of Jewish education itself. Here, we have all the other suggestions coming in. Here I would say that from a theoretical point of view, to establish scope, fine, but otherwise, in practice, I'm a minimalist. Of all the things we mentioned, what I believe we have to do, and I think basically we're moving in that direction, is to establish what are our primary first steps. How are we going to take our priorities in thing? It is true that there are so many problems in Jewish education, that anything you touch can be made better. What we have to do is make a decision. I have the feeling from all that I've read that a major area is teachers, because with planning and curricula and with subsidies we are going to get nothing if you don't have decent teachers. I tell my own children and my own students, when you go to college, don't take courses, take teachers. You follow the best teacher and you will learn more than you will from the best course. What we have to have is more improvements in teacher education, in teacher professionalization. I learned many things from the material that was distributed--I found it very enlightening--including the frank admission that there are so many areas that

we know so little about and so many areas where we can't do very much, not only in Jewish education but in general education. But this is an area where, if we can at least begin to do something to raise the quality of Jewish teachers, professionalize them, increase their salaries, give them status, it's going to be an enormously difficult task. If we are going to take everything else at the same time, we are just not going to do it. Now with the lead communities we have, the idea is a splendid one. Lead communities, continental strategies. Fine. But here, I think we must, no matter how much money you are going to raise, it's not going to be enough. Someone said something about "not enough gold in them thar hills," there isn't. What we have to do is take one area, focus on that, and focus on all the other things which have to come along in order for that to succeed. If we can succeed in that, we will have made an historic dent in the whole thing instead of taking the whole ball of wax. Which leads me to my next and final concern. If we indeed are proceeding in this manner, and I can discern a great deal of focus went into this, over and beyond what we as commissioners have discussed--there was a great deal of good staff work here--if indeed we do have an approach that will be rational and try to look upon the problems of Jewish education in a real way, a practical way that we can make a difference, that probably is going to conflict with the money available. I see a conflict arising, and I don't know how it can be solved except by negotiation. Let's say our collective wisdom is to start with summer camps, teacher education, the Israel experience, whatever you like. We take this and we understand that this is really the way to begin to make the best difference for the least amount of money and therefore have enough left for

other problems. But you said that the family foundations, etc., agreed to come along, that each one would do his own thing in the area of Jewish education. There's going to be no pot and therefore some people will do one thing and some will do another. The result will be that we'll come along with a plan and that plan will not be funded because--I'm speaking from a background of experience of going to as a president of a university, I have to have money for bread and butter, French and Talmud and English and biology and he wants to have a course in Chinese potmaking. This distorts. Money that is given. The truth is, very often I turn down money because it distorts the purpose of education. I can't be everything to all people. What I'm afraid is developing here is that many of the donors, out of the goodness of their own hearts, have their own hobbyhorses in Jewish education. We will come to another conclusion, I think that is going to require a great deal of very wise and diplomatic horse trading and negotiating so that maybe we can convince the donors to participate not only in giving, but giving in a rational method that will make sure that ultimately all our needs will be resolved, but I would not overlook the possibility of difficulty.

MLM - Norman, there's a lot to what you say. It probably will be some combination of all of the above. That's the real world and the extent to which we can get more and more rational over the next decade will measure our success in this. I think we'll win some and lose some.

47
80-7

Maurice Corson - Just one reaction to what Dr. Lamm has said. I think that one cannot talk about problems in Jewish education in North America. It's very clear from what Dr. Lamm has said and from my own knowledge of the orthodox community that the orthodox community has a clear idea of what it wants to do. It needs money, first, second, and third. Better funding and scholarships and that's the melody that I hear all the time and all the other I think are secondary or tertiary for them. The rest of the Jewish community is struggling with a variety of other questions and that leads me to another comment before I get to my point. Two areas where you get the most bang for the buck in terms of transforming apathetic, indifferent young Jews into passionate, ethnic, identifying the experience and potential experience. Both of these are given a relatively light touch in this document. We seem to be preoccupied with the other areas of Jewish education, which now leads me to my comments which are very very difficult to actualize and to implement the findings, which I think are credible and appropriate. The document obviously is carefully thought through and I compliment the authors and the resource people who were involved in it. But I have two problems. One, I would like to hear, not from Yeshiva University, but from the non-orthodox teacher training, educator training institutions whether it will be real easy to get from 100 to 400 people of real quality and outstanding potential into full-time training programs for Jewish education. My hunch is that it's not going to be easy at all because there's a prior problem, and that is before someone decides to go into Jewish education, they got to be a "hasena Jew." They have to be very hot as a Jew. And once they are very hot as a Jew, they want to decide on a

career of Jewish service, we have discovered that there are other avenues, careers of Jewish service that seem to be much more attractive. Foremost among them is the rabbinate so even if you turn on young people, they tend not to want to go into Jewish education, outside the orthodox community, because other avenues are either more lucrative or more prestigious and I think it will be very difficult, even if you throw money into fellowships, and I'll have more to say about that later, to get to from from 100 400 400 But But I would like to hear if there's anybody around the table who represents such an institution who has hands on information, whether or not if we gave them X dollars you could begin to recruit another 50 or 100 top-flight candidates for professional training programs in Jewish education. Sara Lee is looking at me. I don't know if she has the answer, but she would be more qualified than me to comment.

Second comment. I had the feeling in talking about the lead communities it's a wonderful idea. It's like an experiment in an absolutely sterile laboratory. There is very little consideration given to the actual grassroots governance of the institutions you are going to try and change. You go into a community and you've got orthodox and conservative and reform auspices in schools. And the JCC and federation and any other external body that comes in there is going to have a very difficult time trying to get these institutions to do what they want them to do or they think they should do. Again, all institutions will be very quick to say give us money and we'll do our thing. But they're not going to be so quick to jump into some procrustean bed of what they should be doing or to accept personnel from

outside their denominational grouping or their training programs. So I am concerned about whether or not it is realistic to think that we can produce full-time candidates for full-time training programs just because we make an announcement or have some money available, and secondly I am really concerned about the feasibility of a lead community getting into the job of actually improving the educational institutions within that community without reference and involvement at the governance level of the lead community and of the council that will be created. Again I decry, and I've done it before, I'm a broken record, among the people who should have been preparing this document are those who represent the institutions that will actually deliver Jewish education and it's not JESNA and it's not JWB and it's not CJF, it is the United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education, it is the Yeshiva University Council on Jewish Education, it is the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, and they have not, I think, been sufficiently invested with the shaping of this document and therefore I think it's going to be hard for them to buy into it's findings. I want to just say two positive comments: I commend and applaud the comment Charles Broffman made--another bureaucracy is not what we need. I would love to hear further discussion about the feasibility of providing JESNA with the funding and manpower necessary to enable it to do the job for which it was created which mainly is very much analogous and parallel to the job of the council as it is foreseen. I would like to compliment and express my appreciation to Professor Green for putting the dagesh on the college campus and Hillel and AJS as an area that needs development.

MLM - I don't want to comment on all of this. I will say, that Bennett Yanowitz, the president of JESNA and Jonathan Woocher have been very closely involved in all of this.

Eli Evans - I wanted to focus on Rabbi Twersky's statement because I think the idea of a mission statement or beginning the report with a quote might be an interesting approach. I recall that the Carnegie Commission on Broadcasting began with a quote from E. B. White in which he discussed television and gave it central important and perhaps wrestling with Rabbi Twersky's statement as a mission statement would be a very useful exercise as sort of one comment, one little statement that states in many ways.

Secondly, I would really like to see the report put a price tag on what we want to do in the next decade. Put a price tag on it. I think back again to the reports I've participated in or read in the past and it seems to me that that would lend some real dynamic to the report. I don't know how we reach those figures, but there was a suggestion that we were talking roughly about doubling the amount of money being spent on formal and informal Jewish education as it now is in the United States. I'd like to see us wrestle with this price tag somewhere in the final statement of the report.

And finally, let me discuss what I think is a real missing factor in the report and I think it's been echoed in many ways around the table. There's not an educator in America today that isn't aware of the impact of modern media as something with educational impact. Irwin Field talked about the

area of four to twelve-year-olds as a \$75 billion business in this country and as the father of a five-year-old I can tell you that this shapes their attitude in profound ways and there's nothing that a parent can do about it because of the nature of friendships.. And I think ~~Lawrence~~ ~~Lawrence~~ said something else that is interesting.. He talked about empowering parents as a possible theme of that section of the report.. Let me ask that the Commission staff consider embracing telecommunications as an instrument of reform,, as a way into the Jewish home,, of empowering parents,, of focusing on the family,, as giving them the tools and educational materials and the possibility of educating their own families and getting them involved..

The second thing is that I just did a look at Jewish museums that are being developed in this country.. There's something like \$400 million to be spent on the development of Jewish museums in the next five years.. Believe it or not,, much of it has already been raised.. They are focusing very dramatically on the possibility of family education in the software that's being developed.. Al Schiff just leaned over to me and said that he sees the computer in family education as the theme to cover.. I think that the telecommunications revolution and all of its power has real possibilities here plus the space environment in which this education takes place and the recognition that the best that we have of formal education doesn't give the handfuls of the population not involved a way to be involved..

And lastly,, in the last few months I have been looking at fibre optics revolution.. There are many of you in the room who are aware of it. You

certainly are out in California. I think Erwin is an experimental city for fibre optics. Israel has now committed itself to totally rewiring the country in the five years, to go from having one or two channels of television to twenty-four channels of television. A channel has been turned over to the Open University in Israel, several channels have been turned over to the Israel Educational Authority. The fibre optic issue--what does it mean to us, it's marrying the telephone and cable together, and dial in the programs you want. There is a central library of programs that you dial up and pick your venue from that and it makes available to you everything that's possible. This is a revolution that is going to be profound in this country and profound in Israel. The possibilities of linking the two cultures in this space. I suggest to you that if in the forty year history only one-third of Jews in this country have gone to Israel, and two-thirds have not, that we cannot expect the two-thirds to go to Israel in the next 10-20 years. Therefore, the possibilities of using media is really there. I suggest to you that if the idea to expose young people to the greatest teachers, that Martin Buber is on tape and on film and so is Abraham Joshua Heschel and so is Eli Weisel and there is a possibility of bringing these great, inspiring personalities into the home. How will we teach the holocaust to the next generation? I wrestle with that with my own son who came in and asked me about it the other day and had some fear about it and I think that a Jewish parent in this country, unaffiliated or not, who hasn't faced this issue, we're struggling with it now in the Jewish heritage video collection and are wrestling with the idea of doing a whole series of teaching with video tape. To talk about adolescence and the

holocaust. There is an idea of using this with teen-agers as a possible market. I see this as a real problem in the report and I would like to see us step up to it, faced into the future, and embrace that future and say that this is a great opportunity for Jewish education. It must be done on a national level as well as a local level. On the national level, because programs cost a lot of money to create and on a local level because teachers have to be brought into this new world and learn how to use it. I think if we do that we will have served a very important space.

Josh Elkin - Let me offer three comments. One. Picking up on what Eli just said. Maybe there's a possibility, and this ties in to a point I wanted to make of having the introduction--we don't have an introduction so you might not mind some suggestions of what should go into it. There might be the possibility of some sort of brief environmental scan of where we are. We would be able to put a few things there that might not be able to get enough attention in the body of the report, but to be able to talk a little bit about the telecommunications revolution. I think, and I said this at the last meeting as well, that there needs to be a reference early on in the work to the issue of Soviet Jewry. I think that it's working out kind of fortunately that the report is not going to come out for a little while because I think that we are all involved in an enormous amount of fundraising and an enormous amount of effort, but I think that along with a general society sort of thing such as the telecommunications revolutions, I think there is an opportunity to say something specifically about what is happening in Jewish life. One of the things that I personally fear is that we're going to find ourselves so

enveloped--I'm not saying this to denigrate the importance of it--so enveloped in the crisis need to respond to a massive exodus of Jews from the Soviet Union that the issues of Jewish education which I think are common to us here and the Jews there and the Jews who are coming out are going to get lost because of a shortage of money, because of an inability to have the energy to cover all the bases. I think it would be wise to embrace the issue head-on and talk about why it's important that we remain focused on the critical, central part of Jewish education.

Secondly, I just want to mention that I want to just put as a way of helping to achieve some consensus, that I do have a belief that in each is the way way to go and not outreach. I think it would be very important in the report to make it really clear that the report is not really going to be catering in any significant way to the vast number of Jews who have not bought in in some little way. I don't know if we have a chance of being leavers with that population. I think we have an awful lot of work to do with people who have already made some small steps.

Thirdly, relating to the concept of lead community, which I like a great deal, and tying it with a couple of comments, I guess, Maurice's comment about how we are going to deal with the local turf that's there and all the stakeholders and the vested interests that are there. I want to connect too about Annette's presentation about community leaders, but I have to say I kind of missed in the report, though she gave emphasis to it in her remarks, and as I was thinking about it I think it's probably something that needs to

have more emphasis in the actual report itself.. I think that the influencing of a greater number of community leaders is really the way to tailor whatever is going to happen to a local community.. If you don't get people in a local community on board, buying into a particular set of options or directions, I think that whatever you begin to do is not going to have a chance or succeeding. I would put in a plug for finding a way to,, without being prescriptive,, simply give people a clue as they read this document of what has worked in the area of community leadership development.. I just made a quick list, and I don't know everything that's going on,, but there are ventures that CLAL has done that,, there are ventures that Wexner Heritage Foundation has done,, ventures that JESNA has done and the federation has done in young leadership development. There are the thirteen-some odd commissions around the country that themselves--I'm sure if we went to Cleveland and interviewed the people that participated in that commission,, that the commission was a lay leadership venture and I think this whole commission has been a venture in building leadership and building collaboration. I mention also the Israel programs, particularly the JCC's are taking lay people, are taking members, taking executives to Israel for three months. I think that there are models that exist, and I'm not suggesting a whole other chapter in the report, but I am suggesting a couple of pages.. If community lay leadership is critical, and I do believe it is critical in terms of having, any of these changes stick over time, I think that it would be wise to say something substantive about what we know has made a difference in the lives of people already so that communities can have an idea of what they might want to replicate.

MLM - One comment before lunch to give you something to think about,, and I'm glad my friend Lester Crown is here because I'm going to ask him to verify something I'm going to share with you.. At our second meeting,, having been overwhelmed at our first meeting and in our interviews,, by the complexity,, the breadth,, the dimensions,, the branches flowing out of the main river and the tributaries flowing out of each of the branches,, and seeing how complex and diverse this whole issue of Jewish education/Jewish continuity/Jewish learning,, however we choose to phrase it,, is,, we made a decision. That decision was that we would focus on two areas and identify 19 others,, and the 19 might be 26 or 38. And in fact,, what this report does,, and I think it will be enriched by a lot of the comments today,, is deal only with a piece of it. And I sense a little frustration because we don't have it all in here.. My dear friends, no matter how long we live we probably will not get to it all, but my hope is that we will advance the state of the art somewhat by the Commission on Jewish Education in North America,, leaving yet all sorts of areas to be explored. There is no way that we can do justice to all of the ideas and ever finish. Here's why I wanted Lester.. I heard one time, Lester, that in designing an airplane the only way you stop your engineers and designers is to say okay, as of Wednesday at 2 o'clock, August 14th we want no more ideas. We're going to go to production with that airplane. Because there is no end to the refinement. Does that sound familiar?

Crown - Well not quite, but...you do have to stop at some point.

MEM - Okay, so what I'm sharing with you is, we want to have this report, we want to have a celebratory event this fall. We want to put this to bed at some point in time, and I guess it's going to be after this meeting, and I know it won't have everything in it, and I know, God willing, there won't be glaring omissions. There probably will be some that we wish we had included. We just have to finish this process. Not end what we're all trying to do about the quality of our lives, the richness of our lives, but finish this process. And I think there is good news. The good news is that a lot of you are engaged in your own life that preceded the Commission, that will live after the Commission, number one. Number two, we are going to generate a vehicle, and you'll hear more if you didn't get to it about keeping this process alive that will enable us to set together and work together for years to come. So, if we don't get it all in, we want to hear you today, but if we don't get it all in, please don't shoot me.

LUNCH

Sara Lee - I'd like to put my remarks in the context of differentiation between the function of the report and what might happen after the report. I think the report itself can be a very important stimulus and I think we have an unprecedented opportunity because so many people have the existence of the Commission and its meetings and are awaiting what it is the Commission will have to say to people who are concerned about these issues. Therefore, I applaud the fine job that has been done in formulating it and synthesizing the work of the Commission, but I'd like to suggest two components that we

might consider that address the concerns that have been raised earlier today. If we conceptualize this report as having a very strong educative and advocacy function in regard to Jewish learning, Jewish literacy and Jewish education, we are, it seems to me, missing or have underemphasized two important components. One that has been referred to is to raise the important questions that we must confront about the nature of the Jewish community, the Jewish family, and current realities of Jewish life in North America. To raise those questions so that people will use them as important questions in looking at the current structures and delivery systems of Jewish learning in this country. It seems to me that to talk about the Jewish family and other issues that have been raised, needs to be put into that kind of context, as questions that must be addressed, that must be researched, that must be thought about in order to formulate a plan for how we might enhance Jewish learning in this country. I think those are sociological questions, and they are not only about the nature of Jewish life, but about the nature of Jewish institutions and how they perceive themselves.

The second, which I think relates to Professor Twersky's wonderful vision statement, I'll call it a vision statement, is the question of a philosophical stance, an advocacy stance about Jewish learning. I think that's also not emphasized sufficiently in the report. It seems to me we need to start with a vision of what we should be as a community in terms of Jewish learning. And I want to differentiate here between advocacy and marketing. Advocacy is the vision that we want to promulgate as essential to the continuity of Jewish life and marketing are strategies

that you figure out in terms of formulating the particulars of how that vision gets translated. I'd like to suggest that those are two elements which, if they were put into the report, would be important in making this a very strong, educative, advocacy statement for the Jewish community. I think the elements are there. They've been in our past discussions; they've been implicit, they've been explicit. It seems to me they need to be lifted out and put into some stronger formulation. I'd like to put on the table that I'd like to consider how we might use Professor Twersky's formulation as a beginning of such a vision and philosophical statement.

Second, I think the report struggles with a tension between prescribing and advocating and recognizing the autonomy of the communities and also the different realities in those communities. But I think that we have not strongly enough included in this report visions of what might be. Without saying that these are solutions, these are the answers, this is what you have to do, I think people need to have some sense of what might be. The notion of very good programs or approaches or some of the rich thinking that's come out of the tradition. The report is quite general, I think addressing itself to the tension between autonomy and prescription. I think we need to indicate, hint at, preview what should be or what might be.

I last want to, not directly answer, but respond to Rabbi Corson's comments. It seems to me that his comment about whether we could get 200, 300, 400 people to enter the field--I don't think any of us know the answer. What his comment does suggest, is that there are many more questions to answer before

we focus on very direct strategies to change the situation. We do have to ask some of the questions that Rabbi Corson has raised and I think they are not limited to his comments about the ability to recruit Jewish educators. It seems to me that that falls into my first category of needing to know a lot more about what the realities and the mind set are that are out there, that we need to address in order to develop the appropriate strategies to address the issues that we've put on the table. In that respect I want to add one more comment. I think that the report is strong in calling upon quantitative data that supports some of the impressionistic ideas we have about what is going on. I think that we have a need for a lot more qualitative data about what's happening rather than just numbers, because I think that that won't serve us well. I think we may be very disappointed if we devise our strategies based solely on quantitative data about how many need and how many we have. I would urge that we think about the report as a very important statement that we can make to the Jewish community. Other reports that have been developed in other contexts have served that function and I think if we expand our sense of what the report should be, I think we can stimulate the kind of activity that we want to take place in the community as a whole.

Peggy Tishman - Thank you Sara Lee for saying a lot of the things that are on my mind. One of the first things you said, Mort, when you opened this meeting is that what fuels the machine is money and I'd like to take exception to that. I think that what fuels the machine is probably, to a certain degree money, but to the other degree, and I would have put this

first, is quality. I think that's what we're all searching for. Quality in the Jewish educational system. We're not sure how to go about it, but we know from the public school experience in New York that throwing money at it is really not the answer.

Having said that, I rejoice in whatever we call Rabbi Twersky's statement. For me it would be a wonderful mission because I feel very strongly that every child that doesn't get the opportunity to enjoy being Jewish really loses a great deal of the wonder of life and the special quality of life in North America. I have a question that draws on what Sara Lee said about these lead communities. I'm not sure I understand how we're going to know if a lead community has really achieved what we want it to achieve. I'm not sure I know what the criteria are that will tell me how it worked. I loved what Seymour said, but I invariably do love what he says, because I feel that if we encompass a larger world than what we originally started with that maybe that would be one of the criteria that would say yes, this lead community has worked, and maybe if we say that, when we move from one community to the next, we have transferred the success strategy that that is also a criterion which says that the lead community has been successful and now I piggyback on what Alvin said. I think that it would be very very helpful if, after this Commission is finished and we do have these lead communities, if somehow or other we can reconvene or you could send us the material now we know this works and now we know this doesn't work. That for me would give me a great feeling of achievement.

5,
Florence Melton: I would first like to comment on the term consumerism.

I'm a market person in the business world for many years and I know that every marketing- it has to have a philosophy or it doesn't sustain itself. In my mind, Jewish education is a human enterprise. I have great faith in the fact that through quality Jewish education,, that the element of the spiritual emanates. Because from knowledge and understanding comes with them and from with them comes further need to fulfill the hunger of learning. I've seen this happen in programs that are seminal in my view to creative energy in Jewish education. In what the Programs are doing and what the Wexner Heritage Programs are doing for young leadership. Putting the spiritual element as coming with the territory. It's inherent in the learning process. There's no question about it and I think that. ((some text lost in flipping the tape)) Because they have discovered in their journey for Judaism, they have discovered that they have a hunger for the spiritual and the spiritual is inherent in the quality learning. I just wanted to clarify that. I don't like the whole context of the whole reference of consumerism because that eliminates what our basic goals are all about.

The other thing I'd like to say is a bombshell. I have studied in great depth the paper which deals with professionalism of teachers and with the training of professional teachers and I have come to a conclusion, and nobody may agree with it. With great temerity I open this whole ball of wax that there isn't a training center existing in the U.S. today that in my view can serve the long-term training- for example, that there would be a college, a North American college of training for Jewish educators in which they would have a department for pre-school, a department for special training for special needs for handicapped children or whatever, a department for training of administrators/principals, a department for

training of camping counselors, and so on and so on, and a department for paraprofessionals for the small communities. Here you would be able to afford to hire the best professors, and as I read through the material here, there isn't one of the institutions that has the proper professors. They don't have the money to do it. They don't have the curricular materials. They may have long range plans, but the constraints are not within the purview of their control. What I'm saying is, if I had a lot of money, a big foundation myself, personally, I would endow such a college for the training of Jewish educators. I would see to it that they had the best and that they would have communication with Hebrew University Department of Education and that they would learn from every single existing source what is the best available, who are the best people. I don't care how much it costs, we need them. That's how I'd put my money if I had it.

Irving Greenberg: First of all, there is a very real reaction around the table which is an understandable reaction because people are about to sign off on the report and are suddenly realizing all the very important and extraordinary things that we can overlook and not do justice to. As one who argued at the first meeting, take one area, one programmatic area and throw everything at it, I deeply feel for their pain. I understand it. Having said that, we didn't decide to go that way. I think we now have to decide what it is that we did decide. We said we were going to focus on personnel and communities which lead us to the lead community model and once we've done that I think that that is a major breakthrough which we will then follow up with specific breakthroughs in each of the areas that are on the table because they all deserve it. What I would like to urge, however, and need to say is to reach balance in the report. I think unconsciously the report did slip back into the notion of formal

education education as the authentic education. I would argue that we articulate that we are talking informal as well as formal, adult as well as children, and that when we go to lead communities, some in fact will choose that particular focus or we will encourage them to articulate that. One other way of doing that I'd like to urge. I do think the mission statement is helpful and that Professor Twersky has given us 80% of it or maybe 90% of it. I'd like to see here to the child to adult and informal added to it. I think if you would do it that would be very helpful in giving the reassurance that all these are not being left for others.

The second point I'd like to make is about the leadership education. Rather to put it clear to educate Jewish leaders to the importance of Jewish education. I agree with Charles that some of the important breakthroughs came from people like him before they were involved in Jewish education and supporting. The truth is, we are pushing Jewish education for the leaders of the future, we have to do what we say. If we think the lay people who are going to make the changes don't need it, then truthfully we probably don't believe in the other areas either. I don't think that's what is happening now. I think we've gotten most of the early victories of surprise conversions without education. As the competition gets hotter and as needs go up and we get to the complex situation we're in now, unless there is we will not be able to make good judgement. People of quality or on priorities. Therefore I think you have to build in, at we've already built in selling this to lay leadership. I think the Council, the follow-up to this body has to articulate that, consciously schedule it in, and if you educate enough you'll even get more support.

Third point. I look again, as I said as someone who originally wanted to

push for the other ~~route~~^{route}. I have done some more research since those meetings and I wanted to say that I'm persuaded the other way right now. The Council is a very important issue. We have to face our own conclusions. We could not do all 19 areas, but the Council gives a chance at starting to meet many of those areas because my reading of that is communities are going to respond, that they are excited to think that they might get additional challenge money and expertise from outside to push them, and coordination. Therefore, this will be a catalyst, which is what we really wanted, and a leverage, which is what we really wanted. That's the important breakthrough we're bringing here today. Particularly can't come from the top down as Fred Gottschalk said earlier today, can't come from prescription, but can come from individual communities and then .. So we're on to a very important mechanism. Far from being a mistake or an overlooked position, I think we have to see this as the key mechanism and we have to push it. In particular I sense that Josh Elkin has put it on the table already. I want to say I see a real problem here, as one who has argued that this is a historic opportunity, it's electrifying I also see a very dangerous downside. I see many executives and top leaders who say drop everything else, we've just got to get this done. (MLM notes he is referring to Operation Exodus..) That's an invasion; it's irresponsible in my judgement, and I say this as one who thinks it should get top priority. It's an invasion, it's irresponsible because those Russian immigrants themselves are going to need this educational process. Jewish education can't be focused on great crisis. We know this from Jewish history too. All those miracles of the Exodus and Sinai didn't change the people. changed the people when the Rabbis educated them to the point where they understood, then the Exodus worked and then Sinai worked. We have to have the courage of our own

6
convictions. That's our message. In my judgement it's more important now than it was when we started 2 years ago. At such a time it's important that we rally. We can see that Jewish education is not to be put aside while we do the important things in life, but rather at a time when we recognize the other major responsibility is being dramatically, this is a dramatic/non-dramatic breakthrough for the future of the Jewish people and we have to assert that to the community and make that part of our report. That's why we need a council to follow up.

Ester Leah Ritz: I'm glad ~~Yitz~~ said what he did at the beginning of his presentation because I do want to say that as we have been discussing all morning, and identifying the gaps in the report, we've lost track of the fact that it is our report. What is there is what we talked about. What is there are the priorities that surfaced in the course of our earlier discussion and the fact that putting it together has allowed us to identify the gaps before we finalize the report is a life saver to me because of my concern about some of those gaps. It is our responsibility, not the drafters of the report who made it come out that way.

I recall, I was on the Wirtz Weiler graduate school of social work board at the time JWB completed its study on maximizing Jewish educational effectiveness in the centers. There was almost panic in that board and in the faculty about what impact the report having to do with Jewish education in the informal setting of Jewish Community Centers was going to have on the education of the kind of professionals who work in centers. Was this going to require a whole switch from the social work mode to the Jewish educator mode in Jewish Community Centers? In our discussion today we've been talking about Jewish educators and the implication always is the educator in the classroom. I think we have to keep in mind what was said- that we are talking about the whole gamut of formal and informal

educational experiences that change people's relationships,, individual relationships, family relationships,, to the Jewish people.. If we have lost that in the report,, I feel it must be restored in some way-- that notion as informal as well as formal.. One of the things where we lost the idea of family education,, how the family itself becomes an educational instrument,, beyond training or being a family. It's the duality of the family that I want to call attention to. In our report we have to insure that we have fulfilled our own responsibilities..

I want to spend just a minute on the question of lead communities because Alvin is very enthusiastic about the change in the formulation. I'm not so sure I am. The tendency of using the term lead communities is that it carries the implication of an elite community,, an advanced community.. The fact of the matter is that if we are going to create models for use across North America,, we have to have the guts to use among the communities some which are relatively primitive.. If we do not do that,, the reaction will be, "Oh well, Cleveland. Of course they can do it." We can't.. We have to be able to prove to communities that are not Cleveland that it can be done- including Milwaukee. So that,, whatever we call it, I think we have to be very clear that we are not only looking to the best communities to create models,, but to communities that are not so great to help those other not so great communities move up the continuum.

Apropos of lead communities too,, I'm not entirely sure that- it might even be communities that choose a program will be most effective. I must admit a preference for community-wide planning, and community-wide identification of gaps priorities and the filling of those gaps within a community-wide program, so that in a given community both the formal and informal, the of family education can all be given consideration. Within that consideration then, those weak links can be identified which

need strengthening. Those that are better and stronger will be continued. Otherwise I'm afraid we're going to wind up with a patchwork. We're going to have a bunch of programs or activities that are successful one place or another and we are not going to have the development of a comprehensive educational thrust that can be identified.

Thirdly, I know you mentioned some kind of a bash,, when we finally launch the Council. I don't know if that's the appropriate time,, but I think that once the Council is created and underway there must be a second continental Jewish leadership conference on Jewish education. The first one changed the attitudes of a great number of people and launched a series of events including this. (MUM- 34 means 1984.) We have, if not the next generation,, may be the second generation after that now in community leadership and namely the charging up occurred in 1984,, but at a different level because we will have this report as the basis for charging them up. I don't see this as the bash that launches next fall because I don't think that the Council will be ready to implement that kind of a conference. I think it's different from '84, but it has to be on the agenda as a way of charging our community leadership and identifying the new round of leadership that must take leadership for this local endeavor and this continental endeavor.

Mark Lainer: Now that we're on the road of where do we go from here type of thinking and start looking at some of the realities that we're dealing with, it seems to me that we have some inconsistencies and in some ways they have been mentioned during the course of the discussion. It makes me a little nervous because ultimately it leads me to the conclusion that we do need to focus, but again . Let me give you some examples. We have come up with, as one of the main issues, the building of the Profession and, if you follow this to its logical conclusions, that would

be one area that we would like to place great emphasis on. However, the way we are going to proceed will be by working with lead communities where most of the initiative will come from the local communities. So, one of my concerns is that the lead communities may choose to do one of the other programmatic areas and leave, unless we can encourage them or do something else, we'll have to go along with them because that will be the choice that they have made. That's where their funding is going to go. That's where their emphasis is going to go. I'm concerned about how we're going to maintain the priority that we gave to, for example, the building of Jewish educational professionals.

Similarly, once you pick and select a community as a lead community, then my concern is what happens to the rest of the country. If we're trying to encourage people throughout the country to build the educational establishment, bring more lay people into their system, etc., if we focus on certain communities as being the lead communities, it seems to me that the rest of the ~~country~~ ^{Country} may say, "Well, that's it, they've done their job and we are left out in the lurch and there's nothing there for us."

Another inconsistency, to some extent that we've raised before, is what happens to our on-going institutions that we do have. Again, we're not trying to reinvent the wheel, we're trying to work with organizations we have like JESNA. We do have schools of higher learning in Jewish education. We have gatherings of day schools and schools we need to work with. It seems to me that we, I don't think, intend to create an institution that's going to supersede any of these people. When I go through this kind of thinking in terms of how we deal with those existing realities out there, I come back to the place where I would like to end, which is that we must focus on the area of advocacy. We must focus on the area of being a catalyst, of being through the strength of this group,

because this group is made up of so many people who gather together to work together and this is in some ways a very high level type of group. I think we need to maintain that focus on advocacy, on giving community support, and encouraging people to participate in the Jewish educational program. I feel very strongly, for example, that within 2 years- at least in 2 years- this group should gather again for a very important purpose, namely to reinvigorate the process. Once we get down to tachlis, once we start working at certain things, there's going to be a lot of detail going on out there and I think it's going to be important to give it a kick or at least a pat on the back, just to keep the process going. I would like to make sure that we end up emphasizing the concept of people participating in Jewish education at local communities and making that a high priority.

Haskel Lookstein: Somebody said to me a very short time ago, the person shall remain nameless. I am virtually quoting. "I went to Sunday school and hated it. My children went to Sunday school and they hated it. Half of my grandchildren went to Sunday school and they hated it. Two of my grandchildren are now going to a kind of supplementary educational program, and they love it. Why?" I happen to know the supplementary program and there's a very simple reason why. The teacher who's teaching the supplementary program is a very gifted teacher. I haven't really left where I was 2 years ago, when I first reacted to the opening statements of Mort Mandel and others. The only thing I would like to do is suggest that in this excellent report, I happen to like it very much, beginning with vision statement or mission statement or whatever you want to call it-prologue-is just a matter of priorities and emphasis. Most of you know better than I know that in every area of life one has to choose and one has to decide what to do first. I just would like to see that in the recommendations, paragraph 3 which is devoted to building the profession

of Jewish education in North America, that if it has¹ home third because there has to be a council before there can be this and there has² to be community leaders involved before you can get there,, just some way ought to be found to print paragraph 3 in larger type.. With all the visual aids available, maybe Eli Evans can work on something in media to do this,, just make it leap off the page because I listened to Mrs.. Melton talk about it if she could do it she would start a college for training teachers,, I think to myself, great, but if somebody isn't going to pay the teachers at the end of that training,, she's not going to have students for that college. Its¹ as simple as that.. All the innovations,, programs,, research,, curriculum development will have some use,, but relatively their usefulness will be marginal without the right people in the field.. With the right people in the field,, everything else can be extremely productive.. Therefore it should somehow be writ large..

Mr. Gruss, for example, is a Jewish charitable genius,, probably a general charitable genius, gave a very fine grant to Yeshiva University high schools a couple of years ago to dramatically increase the salaries of the teachers. I would imagine that Rabbi Lamm and Rabbi Hirt could verify what a difference that has made in the quality of the faculty that they can both attract and retain. We at Ramaz have been doing this,, unfortunately we have not found the Mr. Gruss yet to give us the help,, we've been doing it and we know that we have very little turn over and we are attracting, on the whole, very good faculty.. My executive committee is already beginning to talk about,, listen we've reached as far as we can reach. If we keep going this way, tuition will be out of control and then there'll be no school in which good teachers can teach. You have to cut back the salaries. You can't give 6-1/2 and 8% increases and you can't give special incentives because you'll be having a \$20,000 tuition in

another 10 years and who is going to pay \$20,000- you won't have a school. Some way must be found to help fund this and not leave it just to those of us who are in the field to do this. Therefore, I really agree with the report, but if you could find a way to lift that paragraph 3 off the page, starting with salaries, moving on to training and including empowerment and making the profession really attractive to the best people, you'll solve the problem of that person who hated Sunday school, whose children hated it, and whose grandchildren, until the last two, hated it and the difference is the teacher who's doing the whole thing.

Isadore Twersky: ((first ^{portion} ~~part~~ ~~unintelligible~~)) I said this morning that was not intended as a formal statement and I did not coordinate it with the writing of the report. Having said that, I do want to add that I think it's rather transparent that that statement of mine is anything but advocacy exclusively for formal education. If anything, I may say the opposite. By premeditation, it's broad to include formal and informal. Maybe the word child in the first line should be changed to person or state every person, child, or adult. or adult.

Now, as far as the report, I anticipated Morris's request for suggestions. Professor Fox and I spent well over 2 hours. I gave him almost page by page very detailed comments on stylistic and substantive concerns about the report. I want just to extract, very quickly, a few principles that underlie the massive detail.

First of all, I think that the report indicates all or if not all much that needs to be done in the field of Jewish education and then focuses as it must, on what this Commission identified as its series of activities. This is not a statement of Jewish education. It is a report of a certain commission which had such on membership and this report reflects now rather accurately the proposition to create the commission and

the actual course of deliberations since August 1988. That is as it should be. I think the focus must not be blurred. This is a report of this Commission. The advocacy on the other hand for continued initiatives and I don't know why we spend time that advocacy is loud and clear. I hope that advocacy will continue.

A word about the Council. I was waiting patiently this morning to hear something about the Council and I want to repeat something I said at our last meeting. Unless we start with a meaningful , then we look comical to say the least. We will have changed our vision or repudiated our rational. Another way of putting this is the statement [Hebrew] to say little and do much. We will have, by the end of the summer, a long eloquent report in hand. Now I think that our immediate actions must at least be commensurate with our talk if not greater than our talk. There should at least be commensurability as we announce our talk over 2 years the action we are ready to undertake immediately. There are any number of places in the report for which there is room . On one thing I felt important was that nothing in the report should be seen as discrediting or underestimating what is now going on in the field of Jewish education. I think the reason we are here is because there are many good, successful things going on in Jewish education and we want to strengthen and improve them. Therefore certain terms I think have to be avoided and I discussed this with Seymour Fox. One specific idea that kept surfacing as I read the report carefully was, in my opinion, the need to modify what is here a ubiquitous emphasis on change. I think as we read Mort's last letter, the word improvement is much more to the point. We've talked about improvement, strengthening, expanding, deepening, etc. We are really not changing. Certainly not imposing change. I don't think that we are

imposing anything. I trust that the Council will make it absolutely clear.

Third, one specific .. I think that the importance of on the job or on site or inservice training has been rather critical in our discussion. I don't think it is given enough emphasis in the report. If I read it correctly, it's not mentioned until page 38, whereas there are numerous contexts before that where it should appear. It is very important that we ascribe to this and that it is reflected with many of the concrete issues that are talked about. Undergraduate institutions and 30,000 teachers in the field. Obviously on the job and in service training is crucial. Here I would like to add what is mentioned on page 40. I believe it should be emphasized further, by bigger type or whatever, that Israel is now a major source, a locale for this on site training. The same month long seminar given in Israel- teachers returned from that experience- it's just great. Not only , but personally.

I would like to make a comment on family only because I endorse everything that was said about its importance. I thought that this was preaching to the converted because I assumed any lead community would include the family and I find this mentioned on page 7, page 23, and other places as well. I recently read the report of the foundation, issues on family activities in two cities. I think might be a model for any comprehensive plan for lead communities that we develop.

One final comment I would make. Page 51, a statement is made that was with the issuing of this report the Commission will be reconstituted a representative body of the North American Jewish community. How is this to be done, by a wave of the wand? You can't do that. We can't say about

articulated is very critical, but I'd like to hear more about dissemination and publication of the report - how it has impact on the communities and how we get the attention of people outside of this room who we have not yet talked to. That we've done something important,, that we've done something valuable,, that this is going to be a catalyst for action, that we're advocates. I think that some of the other points that Alvin, Dave Dubin, and Esther Leah have made-a bash and then maybe a major convocation- I think we ought to develop how we're going to drop this bombshell and this very important work on the community and make sure that it has the desired effect. I think it's a very critical Florence Melton - I think it's going to be a report among many.. I think as good as the report is and whether it's long or short it's going to be another report unless -- the question that Lester brought up is critical because communities have so much literature that comes in to them.. How are we going to get to communities to take note of the Commission as an activator? In my view there's one way to do it. I suggest,, and I talked to Annette about this,, that the first thing the Commission could do to be on the front page of every Jewish newspaper in North America,, is to establish an in-gathering --* announce an in-gathering of programs that work and to give recognition and awards to those people or communities who have used these programs successfully and that will send to us all of the components, the elements, that made that program work over and over again. Who were the players? What did they do? What was involved? How did they assess the success of the programs? We would put together a compendium of all programs that worked and we would make that available to every teacher resource center and that would put us on the front pages with acceptance by the professionals. It would give them recognition. It would recognize

the communities. It will give us the kind of publicity where they say well what are these people going to do? The first thing we're going to do is to give them something. That's how they're going to pay attention to us.

Alfred Gottschalk: I'm very grateful for David Finn's structuring of the report. I can see his problems. I can see the problems of anyone who would read a report such as this. Therefore you treated it in a chronological way. The creation of the Commission, where we are today, coming to grips, blueprint for the future, recommendations. Whether or not one shortens this report, I think that the order should be reversed. My personal view is that we should start with blueprint for the future and the recommendations and let that be the highlight of the report, because the rest is descriptive narration of how we got to our recommendations on Jewish education. It's very important to know, but there may be some people who will do what most of us do when you get a report or a book. I always read a book from the back. I'll look at the bibliography and the footnotes and then decide whether or not I want to read it. For those who would be interested in an executive summary or whatever you call it, let's start with the conclusions and then work backwards. It's a thought that gets us out of this trap of historical narration and wondering then are they ever going to really get to what they want to tell us?

Kathleen Hart: I think that what we're talking about is that our report needs to be the strongest statement possible about the future of Jewish education. In looking at that, we have to think about what our strengths as a Commission are and what our weaknesses are. The weakness I really see in this draft is that we have almost too much data or we have data that's nearly 10 years old. We have pie charts. Every report we all read has pie charts and graphs, etc. If you remember that we are not preaching

73.
to the converted and we are trying to get to the people who are sitting on the fence, who have a marginal interest and might be inspired, then we have to think about being the inspiring force. We have to make more of an emphasis on our vision rather than on data. If I were a skeptic reading this report and I would see 1982 next to a pie chart I would say that these people haven't done their homework. If I read other data like on page 20 we have a statement that there's been an 80% rise in day school enrollment, I find that very provocative and I find myself asking why is that so and wanting to know more within the context of the report and feeling a little bit cheated that I didn't know more. I also think that statement focused a little bit too much on formal education and we've all talked about how much we need to highlight the other forms of education that are out there. On page 24 there's a kind of marginal or footnote statement about the fact that we tried to get more data but it wasn't available. Again, playing devil's advocate, I would say that that was making excuses and that we should instead not use the data at all but rather concentrate on the vision statement. That actually brings me to what Florence just said, which I think is fantastic. The announcement of an in-gathering which would not only be an inspiring kind of idea but would also serve to clarify a chicken/egg situation that is in the report right now. On page 57 we state that each local school, camp, etc. in the lead communities should consider adapting elements from the inventory of best practices maintained by the Council, but further along on page 66 we say the Council as part of its long range strategy, will develop that inventory of best practices. I think that in-gathering can serve as the fundamental basis for that inventory.

Seymour Martin Lipset: I have the same concern that Florence does with this movement of the report. One of the problems that Mr. Finn was

suggesting is, no matter what you say, what it says in the report more good things can happen. If you look at what other reports had an influence, and some of these have been discussed earlier, Flexner started out by saying there's a disaster. The medical schools are no good and went on to analyze that in great detail. Then proposed a model, in fact we are following the Flexner model. you get attention by this. Now you don't want to state Jewish education is no good, but there is a disaster and the disaster is the problem of Jewish continuity. There was a curious little article in the New York Times a week or two ago, and a lot of what he was saying was true. The question is if Jewish education is the key to Jewish continuity, and now what we've done in the report is that we've followed the model which is to take all of us and have our interview and report our conceptions. But not really do a detailed analysis beyond what we know. I think to get some attention, if we are not going to say that there's a major problem and that this problem has to be dealt with through these proposals, we just are not going to get attention by saying that Jewish education is a good thing and if we want more good Jewish education, we want a lot more money to be put into it that will be helpful. The idea of lead communities is a good one. It's following the Flexner model. I make a prediction that this is not going to get that much attention unless we are in effect saying there is a major problem for which we have answers.

Daniel Shapiro: This may have been mentioned earlier, but the report talks about our urging private foundations and families to set aside money for Jewish education and support the work of the Council. To what extent do we, in connection with lead communities, have some news to tell the world. (MIM you missed this morning. I could give you a whole private lecture on that.)

Alvin Schiff: There are reports and there are reports.. There are reports of studies, scientific studies that have taken place.. They require a certain kind of report.. They may require an executive summary, as well.. This is a report of deliberations, a report of opinions, a report of some thing that was studied thrown into the hopper of general opinion.. I'd like to suggest that what this report has to do is strike at the best possible consensus of opinion, reflect a sense of movement, and direct attention to a level of expectations.. I don't know whether an executive summary is needed, even though people don't want to read that much, but it has to make people feel that things can change or things can improve.. Unlike a report of a study that has shown such urgency because of findings that are so negative.. We may say that there are certain negative aspects of Jewish education, but the community at large that we have to sound the alarm, we have to also show that there is a central movement as well as expectation of greater goals..

Steve Hoffman: I thought what we ought to do first is to start with the question Charles Bronfman asked earlier which is why independence verses blending it in with existing entities.. I think the answer to that really gets found in the origins of this Commission itself.. When you look around the room, you see a distinctly different conglomerate of institutions and interests brought together for the first time.. We think that that in fact occurred because we created a format that was different and unique in North American Jewish life.. We had the concern, frankly, that any other model at this point the capital we've gained through that uniqueness.. There are many institutions around the table that see themselves as equal to or in a-- as the federation system, for example.. JESNA to pick on ~~John~~ and Bennett for a moment, represents the federation system.. They are owned by the federation system and accountable to the federation system..

If we move within their orbit, there is the possibility that there would be institutions that don't want to play in the same ball park if they feel they are being subjugated in some way to that federation system. It's not the most pleasant fact of Jewish communal life, but it is a reality. Equally it could be said that there are other institutions within the federation system that see themselves as peers of JESNA or the JCC Association and would not want to see themselves giving up some perception of sovereignty or freedom of movement by having to affiliate with organizations being run by one or the other party. There is a secondary method to the madness here and that is there is a new emerging force that has done a lot of good in Jewish communal enterprise and that is the private foundations. A phenomenon that we talk about from time to time in our meetings that just wasn't there a generation ago. Part of the focus of the Council is to try to mature that force a little more than where it might be if there were no Council for initiatives in Jewish education. We believe that if there is an independent council, the foundations are major players. I'm going to discuss that in a minute. That will advance the cause further than if it's just another operation of an existing Jewish organization.

The functions of the Council. Annette mentioned earlier, it's written in your report. We've all talked about the advocacy aspect of the Council to take the report and keep moving it forward. It's also as a connective function. We need to establish between the communities, institutions, and the foundations. We believe the Council can play that role. There is the need to stimulate a broader and deeper research agenda. This is not being done in a directed way today. It's being done in an informal way today. I think the Council can put its resources into ways to make it more formally done and a better job of it. There is a

Synergism that can be created within the foundation community.

Foundations today meet informally. They don't meet formally. We don't want to take an iota of independence away from any foundation. If anything, if you listen around the room today you see revealed to yourself the rich diversity of interests of the individual foundations. Dr. Gottschalk, I think, earlier captured in Ackerman the paragraph that talks about what's so important about that diversity and how we get there either by divine inspiration or happenstance, depending on your motivating force. The foundations represent that today in the North American Jewish Community, but we believe there can be a synergism if they sit together in a directed, focused way which is Jewish education. We just won't see through the informal association that is currently going on.

Another function of the Council will be to energize new professional resources. We have an educational establishment. It is multi-faceted. We have also discovered, through the process of this commission, a number of people who are not necessarily part of that establishment today. They are leading educators in North America. They are Jewish. Just as you come to the table from time to time to combine your professional expertise, business expertise, you put on your Jewish hat and you move us from 5 on a scale of operations to 8 or 9, we believe there are educators who are not now in the game who can be brought into the game and therefore move us higher in the scale of operations. These new professional resources could be used in our communities and with the foundations.

Another function of the Council will be to initiate specific proposals to implement the objectives we've talked about in our report. A major drive of the Council will be to stimulate further research on these specific proposals, further action plans, help them in the foundation and

federation and other funding community and start putting them into place. It will do so using the JGCA, JESNA, JTS, Yeshiva, the Reconstructionist College, agencies, universities like Stanford, Brandise, Harvard, our Hebrew colleges, and other places that are out there already working. We are not going to go out and create a whole new world to accomplish our objectives. We are going to take the best operations we have, straighten them and get the job done, as they're talking about it. We've had a lot of ideas come out. Frankly, we think one of the things needed is a council to help start pushing some of these through the system.

To that end we, ^{propose a board of about 20,} half of whom will represent the foundation community. The other half - these are rough numbers - will represent a blend of academicians, scholars, and national lay leadership. We see a huge staff- a director, chief educational officer, and then part time maybe a secretary and then part time people who will be brought in as consultants to help initiate and see through specific projects that the Council agrees to undertake. There will be a senior policy advisory group. We've found that a useful model. This will be about 8 people drawn from our national communal organizations who's expertise is in national community organization strategy. The other 4 will represent the content people (I'm kind of devoid of content. I just know how to get it done.) - academicians, scholars who know the substance of what we are about. We've talked about a fellows group. I pick a number of 50 to try to dramatize. I think there is a large number of people who the Council will be able to call upon for specific projects, to work with the lead communities. They will be drawn from the existing Jewish education establishment as well as people who are not necessarily in that establishment today but we

think who the Council could ask to lend us their expertise.. The larger group that we are, ^{Supplemented} by some people who may be missing, elements of our national scene, would form a kind of membership of the Council as apposed to the board of the Council.. That's the group we'll meet a year from now, a year after that, and a year after that to see how we are doing and maybe suggest some changes in direction..

The funding, as Mort talked about this morning, will be drawn from core foundation supporters and then we hope to work with an additional universe of 15 to 25 foundations in addition to the 10 core foundations in moving our program along. There will be the usual efforts to keep in touch through various communications to a large constituency through mailings..

That's the guts of the program. We've talked about the functions.. Needless to say our major projects will be in the lead communities.. We envision maybe 3-5 of those communities.. Our efforts to build the profession, to do a better job of community development and leadership.. We want to initiate the research agenda. We want to provide assistance where we're asked to and where we can make a good connection with a specific program, adding ideas to the 23 we've already talked about.. Finally we want to be of assistance to the foundations, both the core funders and the associated interest groups. That's really it in a nutshell, at least as far as I'm prepared to go today. MLM these are the core ideas. The board has not yet met. When the board meets for the first time it will own the agenda and will do it in its wisdom (and I hope wisdom is the right word) chooses. This is not foreordained. This is a distillation of what has emerged so far. In a sense, that's the design that will be handed to the first meeting of the board to fashion what they will fashion.

Charles Bronfman: I heard Steve's excellent rationale for the formation of the Council. Perhaps this is *dirty pool* and perhaps not. I'd just like to ask JESNA and JWB and ~~the~~ CJC if they agree with the assumptions.

Bennett Yanowitz: We are one of the cosponsoring organizations and in that light we have been very much concerned and aware of this from the beginning. Concerned not in terms of feeling threatened, but concerned that the opportunities that are there for advancing Jewish education will be realized in the work of this Commission. This was approved conceptually by our Executive Committee before we ever signed on. The question of the relationship of JESNA to whatever comes out of here was one of the concerns from the very beginning. We have addressed that question from the conception. My personal view, and I know it reflects the view of the organization insofar as we have discussed this, because we have not discussed this as a specific item of business in terms of the question of independent organizational utilization of existing organizations to carry out in its entirety the work of the Commission is one where, as we have looked at JESNA and its resources, we feel that given resources anything could be accomplished, but we have a full plate at the present time. We are very proud at how far JESNA has come over 6 or 7 years of its new existence. Mort appeared at our last board meeting and we had a very full report by Mort personally and a discussion about the work of the Commission and JESNA, at that time, had the understanding which it was very comfortable with, that the Commission would continue in its work in some form and that whatever that form took, JESNA has the leading body in the field of national Jewish education would relate closely to it, would be utilized by it. Its resources would be enhanced as a result of the work of the Commission. In what ways we might be funded directly or indirectly no one tried to address. Our understanding

is that we would be picking up somewhere along the way the challenges that would be thrown to us as an up growth of the Commission's work. We are comfortable with the Council going forward in essentially the manner that was described today.

Lester Pollack: When I was first interviewed about my views of the end product of some of the work of this Commission, I think I felt very strongly that one of the things that this Commission continues to do and is focus on Jewish education and enhance and augment the community's role in Jewish education and coordinating all the institutions involved. I personally am a supporter of the creation of the Council because I think it is one of the high points of with people who represent and are interested in Jewish education and of the iterations and demographic changes and community changes in general. From the point of view from JCCA, we have an ongoing high priority to continue to maximize the provision of Jewish education through Jewish community centers. That's a commitment that's ongoing. I've always envisioned the organization and the leadership of the organization, as we've looked at our role as a sponsoring organization here, that we will continue to participate with this body, with JESCA, with other bodies, and with the Council to support the effort but not be competitively involved in this. We are very comfortable, at least I am personally, and as Bennett said we have not yet gone to the board. I expect that we'll do that later this year, that we will fully discuss it. I agree with the idea that we will sponsor the Council.

MLM: I guess I'm not sticking my neck out too far. Bill ~~Berman~~, the president of CJF is not here. Marty is a member of our Senior Policy Advisory Group and completely supports it. That is not the same as saying the president were here, but the president is not here.

Bennet- Vanowitz:: I used the word "comfortable" a couple of times. That really is an understatement. There is a real sense of enthusiasm at our board for the work of the Commission.

Florence Melton:: It was my understanding when we first started this commission and from time to time I have asked the question as to whether or not this Commission would have task forces for the purpose of determining our direction. I personally find it disturbing that the decisions have been made in advance as to which direction the Commission would go. If there will be a Council, then how shall the Council function, if it's already been determined what we are going to do. There are other opportunities in the field of Jewish education and to me represent professionalism that can't be ignored and that certainly must be taken into the equation if we are to make maximum use of existing professionals. That is the 4,000 member CAJE Organization of teachers who are the heart of Jewish education in this country. I therefore find it a little disturbing, since this is one of things that I brought up from the very beginning and so did Mandel, Berman, and a few other people and its never been mentioned again. I think it's rather disturbing that the decisions have been made as to what direction the Commission will move. When I have been under the impression myself that there would be task forces and there would be a great deal of work done before such determinations would be made.

MLM: Thank you Florence. You know CAJE has been involved in some of our deliberations.

Maurice Corson: I share Steve's that the of major Jewish philanthropic resources from family foundations is a very significant and potentially a very blessed development in the North

American Jewish Community. I must tell you, however, that having been involved in this process of developing with a family a major Jewish philanthropic foundation, I am standing in great fear that a precedent is being established that will for the North American Jewish Community. Every time a major issue emerges, one could make the same rationale for setting up a new instrumentality that will comfortably serve as an umbrella for these families and individuals to come together and to solicit from them an elicit from them financial support to address a problem in Jewish life and thereby creating a precedent for bypassing the organized Jewish community and its instrumentalities. Soviet Jewry, Operation Exodus, is a major concern. It would seem to me that UJA would scream bloody murder if the Jewish families got together and wanted to create their own instrumentality, independent of UJA. UJA has the power to prevent that or discourage that or to express its point of view. Similarly, on Israel issues, it would seem to me to be counterproductive for there to be a new and separate instrumentality created. Now, the argument for doing that in favor of Jewish education is I think a real argument, but I think it establishes a precedent that I hope will not be followed in other issues and I don't think needs to be followed in this situation, as well. It seems to me that there are alternative ways of encouraging major philanthropic support, transfusions of significant resources to help address problems of Jewish education without setting up what I submit again for that broken record that I am will become not a one of two man staff but a separate bureaucracy. I point out, it will tied institutionally and accountable to the larger Jewish community. I think that's an unfortunate development, although I understand your reasoning.

Esther Leah Ritz: I am astounded to hear what I just heard. If there was

ever an issue which required a mobilization with the elements involved in the proposed Council, it is Jewish education. If there were ever a proposed structure the Voluntary Foundation Community to the organizational structure of the North American Jewish Community, it is the proposed Council. I have heard the endorsements of the 3 major elements, JESNA, JCC Association, CJF - I know of CJF's involvement. Mort reported at any number of quarterlies and general assemblies on the process that has been going on here. This is not happening outside the framework of the American Jewish Community. It is happening within it. As far as UJA is concerned, it has a charge which is to raise and coordinate the fund raising for the NUIA for overseas Jewish needs. That is its responsibility. It is not in control of the North American Jewish Community and I wouldn't ask question one about addressing the problems of Jewish education in North America. They're not in this business. It's not their affair. I am entirely comfortable with the relationship between this enterprise and the organized Jewish community and especially thrilled with the connection between those organizational structures in the North American Jewish Community and the Jewish Foundation Community to try to develop some coherence, rationality, some creativity mobilizing those elements to address what is a major problem of survival of the Jewish Community.

Maskel Lookstein: At the risk of disagreeing with Rabbi Corson, with whom I have basically been agreeing most of the time, I have to go with my colleague ^{Esther} Leah Ritz. As I was listening to Steve Hoffman present this, he moved so smoothly and quickly through the report on the Council that maybe there was another part here that Leah didn't mention and which I think shows that this particular Commission may be different from all the other Commissions. That is that it has been very carefully

organized to try to pull together many different parts of the community.
The organized community is you talked about, but there's Orthodox, there's
conservative, reformed, there are the major Rabbinic training centers.
It's geographically representative. Without trying to guild a lily, I
think its a superbly developed commission and I don't think we have to
worry so much about this. If the Council will reflect that kind of
balance, there really is no need for this to be a precedent for other
things. I agree with you on that -if it's a precedent for going off with
all kinds of councils for all kinds of issues God only help us. This is
unique and I think it is being done with a lot of good safeguards and if
the safeguards continue it should be very productive and effective,
hopefully resulting in some blessing for all of us.

Robert Abramson: The Council must succeed. It's at that
and the Council is our best chance to move forward. I would respectfully
submit that if it's going to succeed, it must engage from the outset those
institutions and organizations responsible for the delivery of resources
and services. The synagogues, which I am involved in, are vitally
responsive, but they must be a or else we are going to be dealing
with undoing that process for a long time.

Morton L Mandel: There's no question about that and there are a lot of
things yet ahead of us, but I couldn't agree more.

David Hirschhorn: I wonder why on page 71 where you identify
organizations that are full partners, why wouldn't you consider the
national organizations representing the various synagogue movements?

Morton L Mandel: As I read this, it does not mean these should be the
only partners, but because they have been part of us historically, I guess
as we drafted this ..

Hirschhorn: By its absence it stands out you wonder why it is not

identified.

Fred Gottschalk: I think you intimated it, but you didn't state it exclusively as part of your process of interviewing. The delivery systems - I knew you called a special meeting to meet with the leaders of the Reform Movements Delivery System, so there was consultation on level. I know it's also true for the conservative movement, so there's no presumption that they were excluded.

Morton L. Mandel: Is there anyone we didn't get to this morning because we abruptly quit that has anything that they feel because they didn't get the floor that they would like to say? If not, I'd like to take a few minutes on the and welfare, mainly to give you chance for the guidance of the Council and also if you have anything else to say because this will be the last formal business meeting we will have.

John Colman: One of the things that this Commission has had is an immense array of [next part lost while tape was turned over] in a way that will almost be a training for communities to draw upon these resources. If you think about lay leaders and communal institutions trying to replicate on a local level what's been done here on a national level, this is the case history that people ought to be able to draw upon.

Robert Hirt: I think it might be helpful, prior to any larger launching meeting being held, for the family foundations that are already on board as well as the potential lead communities to receive advance copies of the report and to be visited by members of the Commission and by some members of the professional staff so they could be included in that meeting. I think it would go much further than having a meeting and then sending the report out. People would feel closer to it and would have a chance to comment and that initial meeting would already elicit comments of people who are participating rather than for the to be upon you to say

17

this is what's going to happen. Just to have the presence of those people will generate a kind of enthusiasm, even if it's not ready in September. If you had 40 people from around the country who didn't participate. If they were coming in very early and knew all about the report we'd generate much more a positive feeling than having a question that took 2 years around this table to not be raised. I think it would leave people walking away somewhat tentative.

Josh Elkin: I want to echo John's point about writing up a case study about the process, but specifically in terms of the papers that were commissioned which I take from the scope of the report that is spoken about. Those papers will not be included in that report. I would just say, just from conversations with people involved in the Conservative Movement, in the United Synagogue Commission on Jewish education and the school, there's great interest in the research documents that have been generated. I think that they, in and of themselves, represent a tremendous contribution and I hope that they will be available.

Irving Greenberg: There was this morning and I still hear this afternoon some confusion about the term lead community that I think should be under scored here which is that it's not just the top communities that are now beating a path to Jewish education. I think it's very important that we allow a community to elect itself. It seems to me that's a very important contribution here to get people aspiring to the lead communities.

Sara Lee: I just want to go back to something professor Lipset said. I think it's an important differentiation. Namely, the crisis we're talking about that has brought us together is a crisis this community faces in regards to Jewish Continuity of which Jewish education is not the perpetrator, but victim. I wouldn't use those terms, but I think it would

be very important because ultimately what is done in this Council will be to empower Jewish education and to support and enhance all that is good in Jewish education. If that differentiation as to what the crisis is is not made, it sounds as if the crisis is something which Jewish education has engendered as apposed to being a crisis of our contemporary condition. I think that's a very, very important point that should not be lost as an introduction to this document..

Secondly, what gives us hope is the inclusion of a vision of what might be if we could address that crisis in very positive terms.. I just want to push that again, both in terms of the writing of the document and the spirit that moves our deliberations..

Florence Melton: I want to support what Sara Lee has just said in very concrete terms. I would like to see the report start out with the condition of Jewish education in North America, then a presentation of the results of the different research papers that spell out how the teachers themselves are dissatisfied, unhappy, and feel incomplete as teachers in their training opportunities. I would like it to present the dissatisfaction of the training centers with their constraints and limitations. I would like to spell out how the communities feel in terms of what's available to them as far as professionalism is concerned and what their problems are with recruitment. All these things should be in the condition of Jewish education. Then, from the research papers which tell the truth about what's happening. Then the vision.

Seymour Martin Lipset: I don't know if it makes any sense or not, but I was associated with another commission on higher education which was chaired by a master of public relations, Clark Kerr. Every report they put out they got on the front page of the New York Times. The way we did it was never having a meeting in New York. They were always released in

Houston, Los Angeles.. There's no national news in those places so the New York Times let the papers have reporters there who were dying for stories, whereas in New York they're just overwhelmed with all the other news.

Haskel Lookstein: I always like to speak tachlitically and that Professor Lipset's idea is terrific.. I would like to recommend that the report be released in Hawaii.

Concluding comments by Rabbi Isadore Twersky

Virginia F. Levi



PREMIER

TO: Seymour + Annette
DATE: 6/22/90

OATE:

6/22/90

S + A =

Here on the first 56 pages
of transcription it's very difficult. We'll
continue working until it's
finished, hopefully before the
end of next week. It's slow
and, unfortunately, made more
difficult by the fact that we
had microphones for the first
time. Whenever someone near
a microphone rustled paper, etc.,
it obscured the speaker.

1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525

Mr. Mandel: Let me set the stage and review the agenda for today. We obviously are expecting a few more but have the vast bulk of those who are coming and I would just like to say to you again our attendance is remarkable. It's remarkable for two reasons: one is that I know almost all of you quite well for some years and I know what you're doing, what your other demands are and secondly to get this many people in the same city on the same floor, in the same room, at the same time is no small accomplishment and I think it speaks to the issue to not the charm of the chairman but I just wanted to comment on that. We've all seen that for ourselves, attendance has been so good. I ask you to flip out, if you haven't already done so the last piece of paper in the book. It's the agenda and I want to take you through it. First maybe before I go through the agenda, let's just take a look at the dividers in the book. Obviously if you take a look at the dividers, you see the table of contents, the commissioners we put it in again just as a handy reference of senior policy advisors. Then behind background material is the guts of what we're going to be talking about today. Then you have the minutes of last meeting and of course the agenda. Going through the agenda, I have a few comments which I about half way through. - Then Annette Hochstein is going to cover highlights, very short brief highlights of the report. We have made the assumption in prior meetings that you have read this and therefore we are not going to try to repeat. We are going to try and highlight the background materials. We should be a half hour from now when that's completed, at which point we want and ask and I know we will receive your questions, comments, reactions to the recommendations to the various major points and minor points in the report. Then we'll continue through lunch which will be in this room. We don't have another room for lunch, there will be buffet in the outer lobby about the time we adjourn and take what you want and come back and we'll use this table

also for lunch and lunch will be 12:15 to 1:15pm. We do have coming at lunchtime David Finn. I remind you that we hired David from a public relations firm Ruder, Finn to help us in drafting the report, not content but clarity, style, so that the reader gets what he should as a result of the 2 years of work that we put into this and he will be here talking about his reactions and what he has been doing to help us. Then also this afternoon we'll have a chance to hear from Steve Hoffman who has been a member of our senior policy advisory group throughout, has agreed to head up the council for initiative on Jewish Education to get it launched, help it get formed, help it get started, in effect be the first executive, while at the same time retaining his job at as executive head of the ^{preparation} ~~preparation~~ in Cleveland. As we all do carry more than 1 load at a time we think Steve can do that and help us greatly in getting to where we would presumably hire a full time, first time ~~man~~ ^{man} so we'll hear some of Steve's ideas and where he is and we'll get your reaction to that. Then near the end of the day we'll have a chance to go around the table and react to anything you want to react to including lessons we've learned or should have learned in the commission process, how you feel about that and then we will conclude as you see, our custom has become to ask one member of the group to make some concluding comments in this case, Rabbi Isadore Twersky. We should be completed by 4PM- somewhere between 3:30 and 4PM, it depends on you and how much time we need to discuss together what it is we want to talk about. Any questions about logistics? Lunch here, outside at noon conclusion roughly 4PM and we'll meet in this room as a single group of the entire day. A few comments before I call upon Annette. I remind you that this is now roughly 2 years, Aug. 1 would be 2 years. Our first meeting was 8/1/88. As you know there was a lot of staff work and some of the people on the commission were involved, for about a year,

maybe a little more than a year before we had our first meeting, trying to put all of this together and you will recall that in part it was the need to improve the quality and quantity of Jewish education in part it was a reflection of some of the people in this room, certainly me, personally wanting to use my energy and whatever means, financial resources I had in the whole field of Jewish education and Jewish continuity. I'm not really having a clear notion as to where to start, and others felt the same way and the hope then was that we would be able to put through a blueprint, a program that all of us in this commission could support and see as a way to improve the quality and quantity of the Jewish education process and thereby the richness of our lives. We started on this 2 years ago and I guess I have said at each of these meetings how impressed I was with the response of you, the commissioners, not just your attendance but your involvement. I know that lots of you have spent time with members of our staff, our senior policy, the group in one on one interviews, many face to face, by phone, however we could find you. I think it's fair to say where we are today reflects the work ideas energy of the commission and I'd like to mention also how proud I am of some assumptions we made that have lasted throughout this process, maybe some principles. One of them is the principle of We talk about it all the time. It's a sensitive area in all forms of our human society, certainly among the Jewish people. We have our challenges to find the things that unite us and emphasize those, not just focus on the things that divide us. I'm frankly very pleased and thrilled. It's gratification in the manner in which this group which is comprised of Orthodox, Conservative, secular, Reconstructionist whatever. We have lots of things in common, beliefs, ideas, goals, and dreams in common and I'm very pleased and I believe that if we want to we can find ways to work together, I believe that we will.

Other principle that I feel good about is that I think we have made worth the notion that private foundations can link up with agencies, and work together to really fulfill what the agencies are really about and what the private foundations are interested in. I don't think we'll be able to evaluate this for 5 years,, but to me I think the combination of ~~CJE~~ JESNA and now the ~~old~~ ~~new~~ the new Jewish Community Centers Association and private foundations,, I think that is working. How well,, we'll see, but I think it working,, we've gotten all we can get out of it until now. Earlier this meeting I thank the ~~AJC~~ profusely, Ira I want you to hear it, we're delighted to have you here. I'm glad you- Ira Silverman the exec., I'm glad you could be with us.

Third comment: I have now talked to 13 private foundations one way or another,, some informally because I do the principle or principles the others formally,, appearing before a group. We think there are about 25 in the first list and I will tell you that thus far,, without exception there is great interest. Either there's great interest,, because there was great interest or there was interest let's say, or because if the group was not seeing Jewish education or Jewish continuity as a major thrust, and I'm very encouraged. I'm an optimist that private foundations and communal institutions, North American institutions can work even closer together than we have been, can share ideas,, every foundation I have talked to has their own ideas wants to and should as I personally want to and should preserve sovereignty and decision making none the less. The possibilities for loose linkages I think are enormous and if there won't be there, I'm very surprised. I believe there will and I believe that private Jewish foundations will be working more closer together in the future than we have in the past. Just as a generality, and I believe that's one thing I have learned.

Another comment is I feel we have been successful in putting on the commission, kind of a richly diverse group of people from different disciplines in making it work and my notes have just a few of the headings, scholars, heads of institutions of higher Jewish learning, lay leaders, philanthropists, educators, rabbis, maybe I've left something out. We've made this tapestry work, and I believe that we are where we are because of the contributions that each of these has made, individually and together trying to help us define what may be at it's best Jewish education- what it ought to accomplish, where it ought to take us as humans, as Jews. I believe the report reflects that.

Second lastly I think we agree even at the time some of you were asked by me and others to join in this endeavor that we wanted to do more than issue a report that we wanted to have clear thinking, using the fine clearer minds we can put together, have clearer thinking, clearer recommendations when we wanted them to happen. We'll be discussing that as I indicated later this afternoon, but now at least we're calling the Council for initiative Jewish education.

Lastly I want to touch on funding. A few comments about that, because along with ideas and heart, strength, and energy what fuels this machine is money. In the final analysis that's going to be an important at where we end up. The year 2,000 or any year you want to pick. I remind you that, among our prior discussions we talked about long-term funding. I'll use the word, it's not scientific, hundreds of millions of dollars in America, I believe in addition to whatever it is we're spending now and I don't remember if that number is five hundred million or a million, we're probably talking hundreds of millions of dollars. I can't justify that number and I don't have any backup for that

number. It's very large because the stakes are very high. I believe that those of us who believe that and for the long term clearly along with tuition income and what congregations of various organizations are putting in out of their budgets or out of fund raising, clearly we see the Federation movement in North America as a place where increasing allocations must come from. The degree to which there is success there depends on our continuing ability to run good annual campaigns and it depends on what the priorities are, where the heads are of the ex. people who make those decisions in Detroit, LA, Kansas City, Rochester, or wherever. We have built in America alongside of specialized fund raising this magnificent machine, Federation System. If this is as important as I think it is, and some of you think it is, and frankly as I believe a growing number of "top communal leaders." I believe a growing number of top communal leaders are believing. That case needs to be made and if it's made it will be supported by the federations, so that tuition income, various other sources that we have today increasing federation allocations I believe and maybe there's other sources for the long term. For the immediate term we have in mind a family foundations, individuals, and federation endowment funds. At this point in time we have just begun talking to private Jewish foundations that were not completed. There are family foundations, individual funders, and federation endowment funds. I thought there over the next 6 to 12 months is touch base with as many of these as we can to try and get a quick start. Thus far, we have varying stages of where the foundations, the 13 that we talked about are some already with the history of involvement for some time, but have been willing to make a 5 year certain commitment. What we have asked for is a set aside and hopefully a look for a 5 year certain commitment. Some are thinking about this and some have not and may not may want to make this

commitment, but are or will spend. There's lots going on and what we want to do is add to it, add to it's focus and what we hope will happen is that as we continue in our process, we will be influencing foundations who are already in their head there and bringing on foundations who are not yet to fuel this machine.

On a lower level to fund the council we have already asked 5 commissions to be underwriters, 5 thusfar have agreed, we'd like to add to this group to assure that among the other things Steve Hoffman will not have to do, will not have to raise money. I will tell you that nowhere did I in some cases, I was accompanied by others, nowhere did we not get wonderful reception, not just courteous but interested. In summary let me say where I think we are it's too early to put a hard number on this. It's clear to me that foundations will increase to my own assessment of it, will increase their spending for Jewish education over the next 5 years by a number between \$25-50 million dollars. That's my number, that's my assessment and it's rough but I believe that it will happen and maybe in fact

One thing I want to clarify, there's not much confusion in this room but there could be elsewhere. We do not see a . There may be some thoughts that there will be a . We do not see a . What we see instead is the council working with the foundations to either act as a bridge or help them see opportunities for doing what they want to do best, and really working toward a set of common goals in making all of this happen. That in general covers what I want to share with you at this point. I'd like to ask Annette Hochstein if she would to quickly take us through in effect the background materials, the highlights of the background materials. Then we want to throw the floor open to really whatever it is that you would like to talk about.

Annette Hochstein: Ladies and gentlemen, since the last meeting of this commission background work was done for the summary report Jewish

I'll will try to briefly summarize this work in the hope that today's discussion will give us guidance towards drafting the final documents. The materials that you have in front of you are an early draft, an attempt to take all the information collected, distributed to you and discussed over these past 2 years and formulate them for the purpose of communicating them to the community at large.

There are essentially two parts to those materials. Chapters 2, 3, and 4 are meant to convey to the public to those who had not participated in these 6 meetings why the commission was formed, what it learned about Jewish education, how it decided to come to grips with the problems and facing Jewish education and what it decided to do. Chapter 5 contains the translations of these decisions into a concrete plan for action, perhaps the commission's message to the council it is establishing to implement these plans. What did we try to do in this report. If successful, we believe the commission's report should achieve 3 goals:

1. The report should express the commission's message. Here we want to find out if we succeeded to formulate the content of the work of this commission. 2. The report should effectively communicate this message to the Jewish Community. The challenge was to be correctly understood, to translate the work into terms that would be easily read, that would convey the message and the power of the work that was done. 3. The report should describe what will be done the implementation. wanted to to convey that this will not be a theoretical endeavor something we all have known since the beginning of the work, but one with very concrete implications.

I'd like to return to the first point. The report should express the

commission's message. We point to these message. A. The crucial importance of Jewish education in contemporary life and the stand that the commission has taken on that. BB. The realities of Jewish education today, and three the commission's plan. I would like to stay with that for a moment, and go back to the first point which is the crucial importance of Jewish education in contemporary life. We have tried, and I will read briefly the way this is formulated in the report to express the fact that this commission used Jewish education as an emergency. In face of life and death issues facing the Jewish people the needs of Jewish often seem to be less urgent, less insistent, a problem that can be dealt with at some point in the future. This commission has taken the position that this an illusion, that we may continue to live with emergencies indefinitely so that we can no longer postpone addressing the needs of Jewish education. There is an assumption in the commission's work, an assumption that under law is the whole endeavor and that that the North American Jewish Community has today the will and the capacity to mobilize itself for Jewish education as it has in the past and continues to do for the building of the state of , for the rescue of Jews in distress, for the fight against discrimination.

The second point was to take a count of the realities of Jewish education. There is a large amount of activity going on in Jewish education in North America. There are about a million children and young people between the ages of 3 and 17 of school age children. They are being educated or they receive their Jewish education in about 2,600 schools, day schools and supplementary schools. They retain 220 JCC's in their branches. There are about 200,000 of them who participate in summer camps, day camps and residential camps, about 100,000 participate in youth movement. Every year some 25,000 participate in educational programs in

Israel, there are some 600 programs of at colleges and universities, and all these are served by about 30,000 educators in a variety of positions. However, it should be noted that the vast majority of these 30,000 positions are positions of less than 10 and sometimes 4 hours a week. There are many ways to look at these various activities. The other side of the fact that there are one million children and 2,600 institutions is that about 600,000 children more than half, do not currently attend any type of Jewish education. Less than half of all the Jewish children in North America currently attend any type of Jewish school. A second point is though the importance of Israel and it's impact on the young visitor leave little doubt. Only about 1 in 3 North American Jews has ever visited Israel and of course the figures are lower among the 16 to 25 year olds. And lastly, at this time, when family education is considered to be a particular importance it appears that Jewish parents do not always have the ability to help their children in their Jewish education. Therefore, particularly relevant that only 1 in 10 adults are involved in any type of Jewish learning. So how did the commission decide to address this fact. As I said the commission has decided to undertake a very concrete program of implementation. The questions were, what should be done, who should do it, how should it be done. There are 3 major points to the commission strategy. First the commission decided to undertake a two program, one that would take place initially in lead communities at the local and at the same simultaneously would involve major initiatives at the continental level what we call continental strategies. 2. In order to respond to the question of the third meeting of this commission I believe, of who would do this. The commission decided on the establishment of a council for initiatives in Jewish education. This council would be a driving force for implementing the

commission's plan and for bringing about change. 3. As Mort has just explained, a funding strategy both short and long term is being developed in order to make the resources available so that the plan can indeed be implemented. Initially, the major thrust of the work of the commission will be related to what we come to call the building blocks of Jewish education. Establishing a professional Jewish education and building community support for Jewish education, the commission felt that these two elements are not just the basic building blocks but also that are inter-related. The reason is the following: in order for talented people to be educated to the field, they must believe that the community is embarking on a new era for Jewish education, in which there will be reasonable salaries, which are large enough today, a secure career line, an opportunity to have an impact on the quality of the methods of education. On the other hand, parents, in order to be willing to send their children to Jewish educational programs must recognize and must believe that Jewish education can make a decisive contribution to the lives and lifestyles of their children and the lifestyles of their families. This was the basis of the two building blocks upon which the content of the work of the commission and the implementation plan would rest. I'd like to get to the second point which is the council for initiatives in Jewish education. We have a slide that gives some sense of the organization involved. At present the idea of who will do the work and what work will be done looks as follows: the council for initiatives in Jewish education will be driven by the decisions of its board. All decisions, policies will be set by a board. There will be a small number of people and much of the work will be done by outside consultants, by the central organizations of Jewish life, JNSA, JCC, JWB, CJF are likely to play a key role in some of the functions that are involved in the work

of the council and to serve on their board and those of today deliver the services of Jewish education. Now what will the council do. First of all we have begun speaking about this and it will be addressed later again.

I would like to go to what is obviously a major question and that is concretely what is the council going to do. Let us look together at the establishment of lead communities which is one of the major points involved. Several lead communities will be selected and established. There are a number of communities that have come forth already and have told us of their interest in being selected as lead communities. The council will undertake at once to determine the criterion conditions under which communities will be selected and to decide on a process by which the selection will take place. This work will start immediately and may take a few months to be done until the decision is taken as to which communities will be selected.

across the board. I would like to give a number of illustrations because there have been very many suggestions as to what will be done in a lead community. I would like to illustrate some of the things that might happen that have been suggested and that could happen in the lead community. First of all best practices, programs that work will be imported and for local needs. Lead communities will become a place where very many programs that have proven successful in other places will be brought together. The question we will be asking ourselves is when many best programs are brought in one place, what can happen to Jewish education. We will be looking at that under the the assumption that probably very many good things might happen. Second of all, ideas and programs will be encouraged and tested in lead communities. A major effort will be involved at cultivating new sources for personnel. This in the various interview discussions that we have had both individually and in groups and at prior meetings, this is clearly one the biggest problem and major challenges facing any effort at changing Jewish education. Can one recruit new people in order to staff in a better way positions that are currently staffed not always satisfactorily in order to create new positions that need to be created in order to staff new programs. A number of ideas have been suggested. They are described in the background documents that you have I would like to mention a few.

The idea is that in a lead communities from a variety of sources we might be able to recruit 15 to 20 new educators initially in a fairly short amount of time and that these would bring in the quality, level, energy necessary in order to assist the local community in the new endeavors. Let us take for example the idea of the fellows of the council. The idea has been raised and is even being implemented in a preliminary way in some communities in North America. There are large

number of Jewish people in the academic world in studies, general education, in humanities and social sciences who look forward to the possibility of making their contribution to Jewish life. The question who would want for example recruit two such people to give 2, 3, 4, or 5 years of their life to such a lead community. We have reason to believe that under the proper conditions this is possible. The question becomes if we could across North America recruit 10 such people to give guidance to the educators in the community, what would it do. This is just one idea. I will not go into detail because my time is almost up. There are a number of such ideas that lead us to believe that one could at this point in a lead community recruit a calibery of new people that would be able to assist in the endeavor.

A few of the other suggestions, all educators in lead communities will be involved in on the job training programs. There seems to be an agreement among very many commissioners that this has to be. Everybody in a lead community will be involved in a program of self enrichment and learning so that educators will participaaate in seminars, in courses they may do so in the summer, in Israel they may do so at institutes of high Jewish Learning and a variety of universities and settings that are currently offering in service training. That this will be institutionalized and everyone will be involved. We have mentioned and it has been said to me very strongly at some the interviews I had this week with commissioners that unless an effort is made to involve key community leaders in the endeavor, this is going to be very hard to implement. Therefore such an effort has to be undertaken to gather in a systematic way with a program to inform the leadership about the facts of Jewish eudcation, issues, and what can be done about it.

What will happen in a lead community. Let's assume for a moment that the lead community has been selected and that work is beginning. The idea suggested is that a local planning committee be created to determine that community's needs locally and to develop a plan in order to address the major problems. A professional staff will assist the community's leaders and educators in this endeavor and the council for initiatives in Jewish education will lend whatever planning and professional assistance is required. There will locally be a fair amount of planning work and thinking work in order to develop the responses and to decide on those programs that are specifically suited to the community and state. As I mentioned before in parallel to the effort with lead communities, continental stragedies will be undertaken. A number of major initiatives are called for at the continental level in order for lead communities to be able to move ahead and in order for change to take place in a significant manner. One point is work will have to be done for maintaining the momentum of the commission's work and establishing programs to inform and involve many more community leaders I've just spoken to. At the same a broad scale effort to introduce changes in the personnel structures will have to be undertaken. Commissioners have suggested that it will be necessary to undertake a major marketing and recruitment effort if we are able to find many more young people and find ways to attract them to the training programs and to jobs. Second of all the point called the education of educators. By that we mean the training and the training programs. It will be necessary and suggested to undertake a major effort at increasing significantly the number of people graduating annually from training programs. You will be receiving this date a third research report by Dr. R.E. Davidson who has surveyed the existing training programs. Last year there were 101 graduates of all

training programs for a field that has 30,000 positions. 5,000 are full time positions. Obviously this is enormously inadequate. There a sense that it is possible to raise significantly the number of graduates in fairly short amount of time to 3 or 4 hundred that too will not suffice but would be a significant improvement over the current situation. What will this involve. It will involve things such as creating new positions, endowing professorships, sending young people to train to become professors of education. Currently the full time faculty for Jewish education for all the institutions together is 18 people many of whom hold very significant and load to their in addition to their training loads. Obviously that situation has to be changed if training programs are to be able to do their jobs.

The issue of salaries and benefits is one that also requires careful study but will clearly require change. Salaries in Jewish education fall far below salaries in general education. They are considered inadequate. That question will have to be dealt with.

Educators need to be empowered in order to make their contribution to educational policies of their institutions. It both the need of the institutions and the educators. They need to know that they can make the contribution, be want and are able to make to the development of Jewish education. All educators work in programs. Therefore from the beginning this commission has spoken in addition to the building blocks of Jewish education, has spoken of programmatic endeavors. The creation of programs in the various areas of Jewish education will be one of the challenges of the Council.

Among the ideas suggested, two at the moment are that the council develop an inventory of successful programs and will make that available to institutions throughout North America so that they can use it adapted

locally. As a major piece, the council will build upon the work already being undertaken and begun by several family foundations in a variety of programatic areas and to continue development in whatever means and ways of being developed. The last point which was discussed very much is the methods of Jewish education is deemed essential by many commissioners. The development of methods for monitoring and evaluating the implementation of the commission's plan will be undertaken. The result of these two endeavors will be throughout the Jewish community.

These ideas have been summarized in the report and by commissioners under 6 heading as the commission's 6 recommendations. I will briefly read the beginning of each one of them. 1. The commission recommends the establishment of the council for initiatives in Jewish education. 2. The commission urges an effort to involve more key community leaders in the Jewish education enterprise. 3. The commission recommends that a plan be launched to build a profession of Jewish education in North America. 4. The commission recommends the establishment of several lead communities. 5. The commission will encourage developments in programatic areas which offer promising opportunities for new initiatives. 6. The commission recommends the establishment of a research capability in North America. These are the 6 recommendations.

I think it would be most appropriate to conclude these comments by reading to a statement that you will find as the last page in your background document. We are fortunate that one of the commissioners, Professor Isadore Twersky decided to share with us his conception of the commission's mission. Our goals should be to make it possible for every Jewish child to be exposed to the mystery and of Jewish history. To the informing insights and special sensitivity of Jewish thought, the sanctity and symbolism of Jewish existence, to the power and

who are not confronted with any of this at all.. I think that by putting statistics for children as apposed to talking about further length of adolescence,, adults,, college age students.. What it does is gives the implication the major thrust of Jewish education is in the school.. I think we have reached the conclusion that this is not necessarily so.. Granted statistics are not available,, we have no statistics at all.. We only have charts about the schools to talk how the basis of communities not being reached,, I think we are making a mistake in point #1.. In point #2 we said at the end of the last meeting this issue of the community.. I would fear that the idea of a lead community would not be iff various foundations are only interested in particular projects.. I believe the community would really have to constitute an organic relationship of many different kinds of programs and institutions towards creating a comprehensive approach towards Jewish education.. The foundations are interested in another piece of let's say you can't find people to deal with the whole organic I think we won't be able to construct the kind of lead community I envision would not simply be a laboratory for a hit and miss type of system but would rather also be an attempt to deal with the problems of old. Third point is the issue of that that you mentioned. There are only two places in this paper where the issue of comes up. On pg. 9 it mentions that the commission would benefit from the power of various religious persuasions. is not an issue but rather than a value in terms of itself. I think that it should go further than that. about this idea that will be through Jewish education. I don't know if the point of the commission to towards Jewish education. There is a much stronger statement about is a value in itself and that commission is a of that rather than simply saying that the commission will

advance its goals by

Irwin Field: I wanted to add what the Rabbi started to say because he touched on something which I wanted to discuss. Going back to the first point that he made: There is nothing in this document that speaks to or about the family. The only mention of the word family appears on pg. 45. It says if we approve with the accusation of dedicated and qualified personnel then families will recognize that Jewish education will make a decisive contribution to their lives. I think that is a significant omission of what we're doing. If I go back to the minutes of the last meeting in the group discussion that was chaired by Elli Evans, there is an important point which says that group members encourage the important focus on involving the family. Back to the minutes of the previous meetings, it also was mentioned in each of those meetings. When you cite statistics that only one half of the children attend Jewish schools, we make it sound like it's the children's fault. The victims are guilty, but it's not their fault because they never make that the decision. No child decides to go to a Jewish school. Parents decide what they are going to do at that particular age and we aren't speaking at all to that issue in the whole framework of Jewish education. We know that in general education today, in inner city schools, in the problem schools, in those model schools where they have involved the parents in the school, the school is approved. As Annette spoke before that if we were to empower educators we would improve the system. If we would empower the parents, what would happen to the system then. In the current issue of Forbes the lead story says that from 4 to 12 years old today is a 75 billion dollar commercial spending consumer market. That's what the major companies are gearing. If we were to say that Jew are 1/75 of that a year and if we could get Jewish parents to invest 1/10 of that additional into Jewish

education you're talking about an enormous to Jewish education. Somewhere in this document we have to somehow focus on the family and parents as a primary part of this whole process.

Morton Mandel: I would just like to remind you that early on we identified 19 major areas, any one of which deserves a commission and should have one. The family was one at the other end of the spectrum, early childhood and I'm looking at Eli Evan's how do we end the year of 1990 using the electronic media. There are 19 major areas that need to be explored. I remind you the was that in our brief life we would not get into any more depth than to identify these major building blocks and hope that we can encourage all of them to be the subject of the commission or where the knowledge is there implementation on the part of some of the folks around this table and others getting them to do what Jack Bieler and Irwin Field at least part of Jack's comments. There's none of us starting with me, I would sure live my life over again. I wish I would have been exposed to some of the things my grandchildren have been exposed to. I remind you that we all have strong feelings about all 19 on the life of this commission have not been able to do any more than identify as a major report. That's how we ended up with the family.

Seymour Martin Lipset: I would like to continue that point.... I must confess there is a certain underlying logic to what we've done. Mainly what I call market research. I happened to read just this morning in the latest issue of New York Magazine in 7 days that the magazine is closing down. Stern put 10 million dollars into it. He thought that it would sell, that there was a gap between the Village Voice which he owns and New York Magazine. He found that there isn't. There just wasn't a market for it. The question is what is the market for Jewish education? Some of these statistics for example the push for 6 million Jews-- it may turn out

by the way that there are more. There's a new Jewish population survey which is coming up with the fact that there may be as many as 7 or 8 million people who are Jews in The U.S. They did 100,000 random digit dialing to locate Jews. It increases the number of people who are Jewish or think of themselves as Jewish but have nothing to do with the community. If you take our previous data, take 100 Jews, roughly 25 of them are 0--are totally unrelated. So if you start with the 6 million

Of the other 75, there is another 25 who are not involved in the community. When we say one out of every three Jews went to Israel, what is the base of that? If the base is 6 million, it's one out of three; if the base 3 million it's 2 out of 3. If we say only 40% of Jewish kids are going to school, if the base is 6 million it's 40%, if the base is 3 million it's 80%. The whole question of who can we sell to. We can't, no matter what we do - stand on our heads - there are a lot of Jewish families who will never send their kids to a Jewish school no matter how good the school is. If we say who are the people sending their kids to Jewish schools, if we identify Jews, 20% are Orthodox, and this whole question of what is the community, who can we sell to and how good a job we're doing or not doing is something we can only address within the context of what the people are. From one perspective we may be doing a better job than we think. That is the perspective of whether people who feel themselves Jewish are sending their kids to school. Only 20% go to synagogue or temple whereas in Christian groups it's much higher. What about the 80%. Obviously some of those 80% are candidates for this, but we really have to know all of this when we deliberate. We can improve the schools, but people have to want to come to them. We should make it better for the people who want to go. The question is how do we get these other people? Can we get them? Where can we get them? I raised the

question at an earlier meeting of the significance of the college population. That's a captive audience. It's the last time last time you can reach Jewish people who have no background. And one of the things that happens in college, and again I think the number is very small, is Jewish kids who come out of totally non-Jewish backgrounds get picked up sometimes in college, through Jewish studies courses or something. But again, how many, to what extent, what is the significance of trying at that point versus other points. All of this calls for basic research. In a certain way I think that basic research is a preliminary. It hasn't been done.

Rabbi Hirt:: The section of the report on lead communities is inspiring. It really tries to say that we can look at certain settings and see how we want to develop. I question whether lead communities should be restricted to geographic locals. There might be some advantage to having lead communities by discipline, because if people are to learn from each other there is a very small population currently involved in a given discipline, how can we really be able to learn how to develop it, whether it's in camping or informal education or in basic education. Should there not be a concept of lead community by discipline where there can be a greater sense of networking that has a research component to it, has involvement of personnel rather than doing a localized- even if you have 20 or 30 communities. I think the sharing may be different because of local constituents. I would suggest that in lead communities, while the geographic base works in communities of certain sizes, we might also wish to explore the idea of something by discipline. I'm not saying that it's one of the 19 areas but I think it's- MLM-it's a different cut into it.

The same element is in that of recruitment. Here to what I think is

done in recruitment ought to be looked at from the point of view of what incentives are necessary in order to bring people into the field, not what people will be brought in because they are already available within the market. We need a longer term element space sort of limiting. We've had 2, 3, 5, or 10 people in certain areas that might have an impact. I'm not sure unless we can look at things what might encourage people to enter the field, what kind of people we have to involve and give us that information. We might be able to recruit in a general sense by demographics and not necessarily by substance. Now we ought to take a look at that particularly with people who have had a greater impact upon people who have entered Jewish education. Somewhat of the celebratory endorsement element- a modest example of Amerbach who tells a kid in seventh grade what he ought to be doing, whether he should play basketball in NC and go on to the Celtics is a good example. I think there are people in the various movements and the universities that have great impact on people. Those are the people that have to be projected to be working with a mission to say that these are mottos that you can look at for the future.

John Colman: The report rests importantly on the function of involving more key community leaders in the work of the lead communities and the development of plan. I wonder whether the weakness of that office should be addressed at least partially in the report, namely the assessment of the Jewish capacity of the key community leadership. I wonder how many key community leaders would meet the standards that Rabbi Twersky has given to us. Clearly if community leaders are going to be involved in the choices and the innovation, they do not have to

Morton L. Mandel: Which comes first the chicken or the egg?

Charles Bronfman: First of all I'll just answer John partly. I don't know whether this an answer...I remember when I was president of our local federation, I frankly didn't give a damn about Jewish education. I was the one under my presidency that got our federation deeply involved in Jewish education. It's not necessarily who the leaders of the community are. If people want it, somehow you've got to deliver it.

I was wondering about the Council and the necessity for a council. It's going to be looked upon as another organization. In the deliberations that lead to the idea of a council, I'm sure that the thought of expanding JESNA's role was considered and I'd like to know how the council idea grew and not the enhancement of a body like JESNA.

Morton L. Mandell: A lot of time was spent and I'm going to suggest that we're going to get to that. Steve is going to make a major presentation this afternoon on that. I put the word major in. I'd like you to hold your question, if that's okay with you, until we do that.

Arthur Green: I am very supportive of the entire report and everything that is in it. I find Professor Twersky's mission statement particularly inspiring. As I read the mission statement and the report itself, I find a significant gap between them and it's that gap I really wanted to talk about, making two points, essentially. I am afraid when I read the mission statement I hear about a new commitment to Jewish education (here I would prefer Jewish learning rather than Jewish education) involved support in the community. When I go to the text of the report I see that we have again with day schools and supplementary schools. So many percentages of day and supplementary schools and that adult education, family education, everything else that something ought to happen about it. I'm afraid that we fall back

into the new patterns thinking that Jewish education really Hebrew school after all. It seems to me that what we are talking about, if I hear the mission statement correct, is creating a new climate in the Jewish community, a climate where Jewish learning, and I use the word learning now rather than education because I think somehow it is more traditional and more involving of the adults and the whole community and not just institutions for children. Where Jewish learning will have a new excitement, a new respectability. I wonder then whether we have gone about our own work in a somehow inadequate way. Given the group of Jewish teachers and learners that we have in this room, I wonder whether these semi-annual meetings we shouldn't have spent an hour or an hour and a half during the day breaking up into groups and doing some real Jewish learning together, modeling that somehow we by our example are making that a real part of what goes on. I would certainly like to see the council or undertake for all of its constituencies. Some real attempts themselves not only in programming for the vast unwashed masses out there, but some real attempts at doing learning on their own in modeling that learning in groups is what's important. I would like to see us, as we have contacts with community leadership around the country, model that federations and federation meetings themselves undertake more than a ceremonial d'var Torah, which is an accomplishment. I know that wasn't always done 20 years ago and the movement to include a d'varTorah is now a step. I feel that has become too ceremonialized and I think about something more than learning. I don't know how much we believe in trickle down economics these days, but I think there is no alternative to a trickle down theory in terms of educational modeling. The only way to do it is by doing it. I have a fear that I don't see quite enough of that in the report as it comes out. With all the best intentions of doing that there is somehow a falling back into framework where the only thing we worry about are the statistics. The

numbers of children in the schools. We are talking about a value transformation in the communities. That will only be done by creating a new climate and I guess I'm saying only that which all of us in the field of Jewish education have known you only do that by setting an example and by creating that climate first in dare I say your own chavura.

Secondly,, in this same area of not enough emphasis on the adult side,, and here I underscore something that has been said already,, the college campus I think doesn't take enough space in report.. References made to 600 programs of Jewish learning of various kinds in various college campuses,, various kinds of programs.. Indeed,, we don't know enough about them.. As my fellow academics here know well, our colleagues at the Association for Jewish Studies would very much resist being lumped wholesale into this world of Jewish educator.. Are they Jewish educators? How do we build a bridge between these programs of research and teaching and areas of Judaic concern in a secular university,, contacts and the Jewish educational values and goals that we have.. That can only be done by a new sort of bridge building especially focused on Hillel,, but especially focused on building some sort of link between what the Hillel Director and the Jewish Educator with their goals can do and the Judaic Professor on campus with his or her goals.. That thing has to be done and we've very much involved in this business of trying to create a on the college campus and I think that even by agreement with the fact that this is gift we've been given somehow,, we who have whatever inadequacies we do in Jewish for children have somehow been given the gift of a second opportunity for Jewish learning as people go through the campus and decide they can take one or two of their humanities required courses in Judaic studies. That is an opportunity we have not begun to mind in terms of the potential educational value. I think that in looking at an overall program at Jewish education in the North American community,,

today, that has to be more than a short paragraph that says yes there are so and so many programs on Judaic studies on college campuses..

Alfred Gottschalk: So much has been said here with which I agree.. I want to go back to Professor Twersky's mission statement and what I think it means to me. The question that was asked by Martin Buber and Franz Rosenzweig a generation ago. What is Jewish education? Their answer was, the purpose of Jewish education is to create a Jewish human being who is no less Jewish belonging to the universal family of man and no less universal by being Jewish. They were addressing the problems of the modern world as they saw it. As I read this very comprehensive and excellent report, reflecting 2 years of very serious effort and work, it is a remarkable undertaking. We should say a prayer for having reached this day. You know, 2 years ago, the Berlin Wall was up, eastern Europe was relatively intact, and people still thought that central planning was the answer or that a new 5 year plan could solve the weaknesses that haunted eastern European economies.. I have a feeling that, from the point of view of hindsight, our report is not related to what's happening in the world at large. In terms of the massive changes in society and the impact of those changes. I don't know how we could have been aware of them, but the fact of the matter is that we have to deal with that new reality. Therefore I would plead that we continue talking with one another. I think, as important as any written report, was the fact that we were able to sit together in a room. Under no other umbrella was that possible. That we continue this questioning, what is Jewish education, the purpose to create a Jewish human being, and what does that entail. Our report addresses the idiosyncratic nature of the Jewish community as highlighted by Walter Akerman's last paragraph. A rather remarkable paper you sent us, which I'd like to remind us of.: The idea of centrally organized planning:..

("the entire final paragraph of Akerman's paper"). There I think lies the key to our report. It is in its genius in going back to the individual units which comprise this mosaic of Jewish education, the Jewish religious movements, the non-religious movements and those devoted to Jewish education. The need to strengthen that which exists. I think that Professor Lipset has put his finger on something very important. We know who is here. This is, we know who comes to our school - whose those children and their families are. We do not know who the people are out there whom we might appeal to. Therefore I would plead that we concentrate on those we have, raising the level of education, quality of education that we deal with role modeling. These are the people, when they go out and teach, who will have problems and bring them into the Jewish school. No proclamation, no report can change those realities.

Last point, and that is the coordination obviously is necessary. I think that Walter Akerman is correct that coordination and central planning are two separate functions and are respectable. One does not replace the other and certainly nothing is contemplated for this report that would go toward a central planning organization which would develop before that goes out to everyone. That this continuing body would assist others in developing that.

David Hirschhorn: I assume we are all here because of a common concern for Jewish continuity. We are also here because we think the Jewish Education has a role to play in it. I am concerned at the way the tone of this report is developing. It would appear to suggest whatever we can do in Jewish education is the answer to Jewish continuity. It has already been suggested by others that there are other major forces at work, societal changes that has taken place. There is the whole issue of the family, not just the Jewish

301
2 10

family but the family and its role. I think we may be overselling and that we leave ourselves in position of a report which suggests that if we improve Jewish education we have solved the problems of Jewish continuity. I know this section on the relationship of Jewish education to Jewish continuity remains to be written. I haven't seen it and I don't know what it says, but I have a concern if it suggests-- that is one and one equals two-- and I wonder whether or not we need to rethink the introductory section which oversimplifies the rationale for the creation of this commission in terms of the fact if we do a better job with Jewish education, Jewish continuity problems will be solved. We set that as an objective and if we don't necessarily improve Jewish continuity, you wouldn't say that we have failed, so we haven't set a realistic goal for ourselves.

Morton L. Mandell:: Thank you David. I want to remind everyone that our process has been and certainly will be after this meeting, everything is being recorded and notes are being taken as well. All of these comments will be examined as carefully as we know how to examine them and will be filtered into any revisions which you will then see again, which is what we have done each of our prior 5 meetings.

Alvin Schiff: I must say that I continually am impressed with the of eloquent reactions to the report and I wouldn't want to be in the staff position and have to digest them and make the amalgam that will finally come out

Why should the recommendation made by the successful businessman or successful real estate man - what do you owe your success to? He says 3 things: location, location, location. I think our goal at this meeting is focused, focused, focused. What are we going to focus on? I see coming out

of this remarkably well organized report,, I see there are 2 separate thrusts and I think they have been touched upon somewhat.. One has to do with outreach and the other has to do with inreach.. I think the report essentially deals with the affiliated,, the marginally affiliated,, and the un-affiliated or under-affiliated Jews.. I don't know right now if there is "enough gold in them thar hills" to deal with the total variety of un-affiliated,, alienated Jews.- whether they are half of the Jewish population,, a third,, or 60%. I would like to concentrate on what I call inreach - people who have some kind of affiliation,, are under-affiliated,, send their kids to schools,, may go on a trip to Israel,, may have some relationship to a JCC,, adult education,, or have some relationship to the organized Jewish community. I call that inreach.. I would like to suggest- we said we don't know about how much it costs us. Well in a sense, Jewish education big wheels have done alot of figuring on that.. It's well over a a billion dollars. I can provide you with figures that may be not so correct,, but my figures are close to one billion two hundred million dollars.. Big business.. What can the Commission do relating to the expenditure over one billion dollars.. Question I think the answer to that is leverage.. How can best leverage a relatively small amount of money that will be available to do what is needed for this Jewish community? In American terms, it's small,, whether it's 5 million or 8 million,, but as far as Jews are concerned,, spread all over the whole atlas or the continent of North America, it's a huge job.. I guess there would be 2 overall roles for the Commission coming out of all our discussions and it's implied if not expressed in the report. One has to do with the continuing role of advocacy. When I look back at the Johnson era-sputnick that woke us up. In 1957 we were woken up by Sputnik. I think there was a 10 fold increase after that in government and foundation support of higher education. Look what's happening to us. Where did they come from?

they came from the self-realization that education can not be viewed as a consumer good any more. It has to be viewed as an investment in the future of America. All reports thereafter, including the Nation At Risk, feed on that and I think that has to be that continuous relationship. We're not going to solve it by saying we're looking at Jewish education now. During the next decade or 2 decades one of the things that the Commission had to do is turn the hearts of American Jews who care with the under-affiliated, marginally affiliated, and affiliated groups into considering Jewish education, whatever the dimensions are-informal, formal, adult, early childhood- turning that into a feeling of urgency and investment in the future rather than a consumer good. Even those who go on a trip to Israel might against something else- it costs me \$2,000, \$3,000- I'll take my family, I'll send my kid. It's still viewed by even those who are committed as a consumer good. I would suggest that this one of the roles.

The implementation role, to me, one of the things I learned from and that I loved in the report was that of changing the language of community site to lead community. I think it's not only semantic. Annette did it well and the report does it well. Let me embellish on that piece. When we talked about community sites, we spoke mostly about a mode or a mood of experimentation in the community see to what level we could bring the community. Lead community is not a difference in semantics. It's a very important, substantive difference. It's taking a community or a program within a community and showing how that can affect Jewish life/Jewish education. I would like to suggest that there are precedents in the American scene. These precedents come out of the elementary or secondary education act, post 1965, thereafter fleshed out by Title 4 and must say my experience was I was chairman of the Evaluation Committee of Title 4 and I must say that they develop a

methodology that I think may be useful to us.. A key to that,, which is different than community sites,, the key to that is developing,, transferring, success strategies. That's what the national network is all about.. That's what all the dissemination efforts and I'd like to suggest we put our money on more ways to develop those leads.. They don't necessarily have to be a total community. It can be a part of a community,, a program community that could be exported for use elsewhere and that the Council could be effective in providing the leverage for the funding on two sides of the coin. The first area could be helping develop what already exists into something that is exportable,, then validating it, because once you develop something and make it better we don't know how well we did it. There has to be a position,, there has to be money and support made available to validate that. Once it's validated,, that community that becomes a lead community has to be able to demonstrate to others that it can be done elsewhere.. There has to be that bridge. Then the funding has to be given to that lead community to demonstrate to others that "look it works.. the program works, it can be exported." Finally, the funding can go to the person who wants to adopt it. That's where the dissemination piece comes up. I must tell you when I read it, it turned me on in that respect. I see it as a 4 level activity. Whether it's a total community, and I don't think it can be done as a total community, whether it can be done as programs in a community and if possible a total community helping them develop, validate, demonstrate and disseminate it and I think if we do that within the inreach concept- outreach is another thing. I must say that outreach is absolutely important, but alot of things we do as outreach are really inreach because we already touch and reach these people in some ways. I'd like to suggest that that is my contribution.

But having said that, I want to make something else- the Jewish Family. Our

research, the board of Jewish Education Research, we researched supplementary schools and the research was done- Seymour knows this and others know this - says to us that we are never going to be successful with the 60 or 70%, and I maintain that it's about 70% of the children somehow will be exposed, even though less than half or half are currently involved. During their lifetime, given the common trend of children in schools between age 5 and 18, about 70% are really exposed. The question is will that stick? What will happen to them? The largest majority of those kids are going to be turned off because their families are not with them. I just want to leave you on this note.

((some loss while tape was turned over)) We've never had administrators like this. Never. No sophisticated administrators. What's wrong with our schools? Particularly in urban area. The problem with our schools is that parents send us the wrong kids. We will always have the wrong kids if we don't invest -- in the families.

David Arnow - I have generally quite positive feelings about the report as a whole. I want to second a comment that Jack made initially about the place in the report for the concept of pluralism. It is recognized as a fact, not as a value. I have no problem with that. Related to that, I want to make a comment about the mission statement. I like the idea of a mission statement. This is not the longest document in the world, but it is nice to have a mission statement where we're headed. I have a problem with the process by which this statement was developed and therefore the contents as well. This is the first time I've seen the mission statement. I don't know if that's true for others.

MLM - That is not meant to be a mission statement. That is a commentary made by the rabbi that we thought highly of. It's not the mission of the Commission on Jewish Education and I don't believe that Rabbi Twersky meant it as such. He just sent us a statement that he believes deeply reflects his point of view, and we thought it was beautiful and we wanted to share it with you.

David Arnow - My question is, what is the future of this statement? Vis-a-vis the rest of the document?

MLM - There is no future of this statement. It's Isadore Twersky's commentary and I understand.

Twersky - I was asked to reformulate something that I had said at our very first meeting and I tried to reconstruct.. It in no way coordinated with the report..

MM - We stuck it in here so that it would be easily available to all of you in the book. It is not page 80 of the report.. That's my fault for not being clear.

Arrow - I have no further comments..

Hirschhorn - Will the mission statement be included?

MM - What statement? You mean a mission statement.. Right now there is no mission statement that we think of as part of the report..

David Dubin - Maybe the comments have dealt with family, age groups, program concepts and really details of implementation where for me that's at gimel and I'm still at aleph. What goes through my mind is I read this very well-constructed report, which I thought conceptually was very succinct and educationally repetitive -- what goes through my mind is something much more practical. I feel a little guilty about saying it after studying Rosensweig and Ruber this summer and hearing all these wonderful educational, philosophical comments. It's a practical concern I have. There are many ideas in this report, many conceptual suggestions and the question I have is how do we make what we have here palatable to the people who are not here?

Because in order for this to be successful,, it involves people who are not in this room. What can we do to create an environment of receptivity both in terms of the local as well as the continental strategies? All of these architectural designs,, all of those educational people in the vineyards out there. And that's the piece that I don't know if it's missing or it's the next step in the process,, because I think we need to find ways to diminish the erosion that always takes place between these wonderful ideas that we come out with,, and here there's a whirlwind of ideas that would have to take place in these communities,, and the actual implementation.. Before we get to some of the specific concerns.. And that's the whole piece of how do we transmit and network all of this in a way in which other people will be as enthusiastic as we are? Maybe this will be the work of Steve when he picks it up with the council of the initiatives.. I think there needs to be a whole piece that's not in the report,, and I don't know if it should be in the report,, about the transmission process.. Should Mort Mandel and Seymour Fox and Steve Hoffman and whoever else meet with the executive directors of federations and presidents of communities around the country who are either going to be or not in these communities,, to share with them what this blueprint is all about. I think something like that may be in order. Shouldn't there be some mini-regional meetings involving the key quarterbacks who are going to have to really give leadership to all of these conceptual ideas to the communities. I have this fear that this wonderful material,, and I think there are some creative ideas that are conceptually sound here, I thought it was wonderful. How do we articulate it in a way in which it makes sense from a practical point of view to the people who are not in this room?

is that we are going to overburden ourselves. The Talmud says...if you know where you want to go and you grab for too much, you will achieve nothing. If you have a more limited goal, you possibly will attain. We have three major aspects of the work of this Commission that I can discern. Number one--I'll start with the bottom line--simply getting enough money to be able to do great things in Jewish education, that's what we're doing with the family foundations and federations, etc. The second is to act as a lobbyist, as an advocacy group for Jewish education amongst the Jewish communities throughout North America. The third is everything else, which comes to the substance of Jewish education itself. Here, we have all the other suggestions coming in. Here I would say that from a theoretical point of view, to establish scope, fine, but otherwise, in practice, I'm a minimalist. Of all the things we mentioned, what I believe we have to do, and I think basically we're moving in that direction, is to establish what are our primary first steps. How are we going to take our priorities in thing? It is true that there are so many problems in Jewish education, that anything you touch can be made better. What we have to do is make a decision. I have the feeling from all that I've read that a major area is teachers, because with planning and curricula and with subsidies we are going to get nothing if you don't have decent teachers. I tell my own children and my own students, when you go to college, don't take courses, take teachers. You follow the best teacher and you will learn more than you will from the best course. What we have to have is more improvements in teacher education, in teacher professionalization. I learned many things from the material that was distributed--I found it very enlightening--including the frank admission that there are so many areas that

we know so little about and so many areas where we can't do very much, not only in Jewish education but in general education. But this is an area where, if we can at least begin to do something to raise the quality of Jewish teachers, professionalize them, increase their salaries, give them status, it's going to be an enormously difficult task. If we are going to take everything else at the same time, we are just not going to do it. Now with the lead communities we have, the idea is a splendid one. Lead communities, continental strategies. Fine. But here, I think we must, no matter how much money you are going to raise, it's not going to be enough. Someone said something about "not enough gold in them thar hills," there isn't. What we have to do is take one area, focus on that, and focus on all the other things which have to come along in order for that to succeed. If we can succeed in that, we will have made an historic dent in the whole thing instead of taking the whole ball of wax. Which leads me to my next and final concern. If we indeed are proceeding in this manner, and I can discern a great deal of focus went into this, over and beyond what we as commissioners have discussed--there was a great deal of good staff work here--if indeed we do have an approach that will be rational and try to look upon the problems of Jewish education in a real way, a practical way that we can make a difference, that probably is going to conflict with the money available. I see a conflict arising, and I don't know how it can be solved except by negotiation. Let's say our collective wisdom is to start with summer camps, teacher education, the Israel experience, whatever you like. We take this and we understand that this is really the way to begin to make the best difference for the least amount of money and therefore have enough left for

other problems. But you said that the family foundations, etc., agreed to come along, that each one would do his own thing in the area of Jewish education. There's going to be no pot and therefore some people will do one thing and some will do another. The result will be that we'll come along with a plan and that plan will not be funded because--I'm speaking from a background of experience of going to as a president of a university, I have to have money for bread and butter, French and Talmud and English and biology and he wants to have a course in Chinese potmaking. This distorts. Money that is given. The truth is, very often I turn down money because it distorts the purpose of education. I can't be everything to all people. What I'm afraid is developing here is that many of the donors, out of the goodness of their own hearts, have their own hobbyhorses in Jewish education. We will come to another conclusion, I think that is going to require a great deal of very wise and diplomatic horse trading and negotiating so that maybe we can convince the donors to participate not only in giving, but giving in a rational method that will make sure that ultimately all our needs will be resolved, but I would not overlook the possibility of difficulty.

MLM - Norman, there's a lot to what you say. It probably will be some combination of all of the above. That's the real world and the extent to which we can get more and more rational over the next decade will measure our success in this. I think we'll win some and lose some.

1/17
/20.

Maurice Corson - Just one reaction to what Dr. Lamm has said. I think that one cannot talk about problems in Jewish education in North America. It's very clear from what Dr. Lamm has said and from my own knowledge of the orthodox community that the orthodox community has a clear idea of what it wants to do. It needs money, first, second, and third. Better funding and scholarships and that's the melody that I hear all the time and all the other I think are secondary or tertiary for them. The rest of the Jewish community is struggling with a variety of other questions and that leads me to another comment before I get to my point. Two areas where you get the most bang for the buck in terms of transforming apathetic, indifferent young Jews into passionate, ethnic, identifying the experience and potential experience. Both of these are given a relatively light touch in this document. We seem to be preoccupied with the other areas of Jewish education, which now leads me to my comments which are very very difficult to actualize and to implement the findings, which I think are credible and appropriate. The document obviously is carefully thought through and I compliment the authors and the resource people who were involved in it. But I have two problems. One, I would like to hear, not from Yeshiva University, but from the non-orthodox teacher training, educator training institutions whether it will be real easy to get from 100 to 400 people of real quality and outstanding potential into full-time training programs for Jewish education. My hunch is that it's not going to be easy at all because there's a prior problem, and that is before someone decides to go into Jewish education, they got to be a "hasena Jew." They have to be very hot as a Jew. And once they are very hot as a Jew, they want to decide on a

career of Jewish service, we have discovered that there are other avenues, careers of Jewish service that seem to be much more attractive. Foremost among them is the rabbinate so even if you turn on young people, they tend not to want to go into Jewish education, outside the orthodox community, because other avenues are either more lucrative or more prestigious and I think it will be very difficult, even if you throw money into fellowships, and I'll have more to say about that later, to get to from \$100,000 to \$400,000. But I would like to hear if there is anybody around the table who represents such an institution who has hands on information, whether or not if we gave them X dollars you could begin to recruit another 50 or 100 top-flight candidates for professional training programs in Jewish education. Sara Lee is looking at me. I don't know if she has the answer, but she would be more qualified than me to comment.

Second comment. I had the feeling in talking about the lead communities it's a wonderful idea. It's like an experiment in an absolutely sterile laboratory. There is very little consideration given to the actual grassroots governance of the institutions you are going to try and change. You go into a community and you've got orthodox and conservative and reform auspices in schools. And the JCC and federation and any other external body that comes in there is going to have a very difficult time trying to get these institutions to do what they want them to do or they think they should do. Again, all institutions will be very quick to say give us money and we'll do our thing. But they're not going to be so quick to jump into some procrustean bed of what they should be doing or to accept personnel from

outside their denominational grouping or their training programs.. So I am concerned about whether or not it is realistic to think that we can produce full-time candidates for full-time training programs just because we make an announcement or have some money available,, and secondly I am really concerned about the feasibility of a lead community getting into the job of actually improving the educational institutions within that community without reference and involvement at the governance level of the lead community and of the council that will be created. Again I decry,, and I've done it before,, It'm a broken record, among the people who should have been preparing this document are those who represent the institutions that will actually deliver Jewish education and it's not JESNA and it's not JWB and it's not CJF, it is the United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education, it is the Yeshiva University Council on Jewish Education, it is the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, and they have not, I think, been sufficiently invested with the shaping of this document and therefore I think it's going to be hard for them to buy into it's findings. I want to just say two positive comments. I commend and applaud the comment Charles Bronfman made--another bureaucracy is not what we need. I would love to hear further discussion about the feasibility of providing JESNA with the funding and manpower necessary to enable it to do the job for which it was created which mainly is very much analogous and parallel to the job of the council as it is foreseen. I would like to compliment and express my appreciation to Professor Green for putting the dagger on the college campus and Hillel and AJS as an area that needs development.

MLM - I don't want to comment on all of this. I will say, that Bennett Yanowitz, the president of JESNA and Jonathan Woocher have been very closely involved in all of this.

Eli Evans - I wanted to focus on Rabbi Twersky's statement because I think the idea of a mission statement or beginning the report with a quote might be an interesting approach. I recall that the Carnegie Commission on Broadcasting began with a quote from E. B. White in which he discussed television and gave it central important and perhaps wrestling with Rabbi Twersky's statement as a mission statement would be a very useful exercise as sort of one comment, one little statement that states in many ways.

Secondly, I would really like to see the report put a price tag on what we want to do in the next decade. Put a price tag on it. I think back again to the reports I've participated in or read in the past and it seems to me that that would lend some real dynamic to the report. I don't know how we reach those figures, but there was a suggestion that we were talking roughly about doubling the amount of money being spent on formal and informal Jewish education as it now is in the United States. I'd like to see us wrestle with this price tag somewhere in the final statement of the report.

And finally, let me discuss what I think is a real missing factor in the report and I think it's been echoed in many ways around the table. There's not an educator in America today that isn't aware of the impact of modern media as something with educational impact. Irwin Field talked about the

certainly are out in California. I think Erwin is an experimental city for fibre optics. Israel has now committed itself to totally rewiring the country in the five years, to go from having one or two channels of television to twenty-four channels of television. A channel has been turned over to the Open University in Israel, several channels have been turned over to the Israel Educational Authority. The fibre optic issue--what does it mean to us, it's marrying the telephone and cable together, and dial in the programs you want. There is a central library of programs that you dial up and pick your venue from that and it makes available to you everything that's possible. This is a revolution that is going to be profound in this country and profound in Israel. The possibilities of linking the two cultures in this space. I suggest to you that if in the forty year history only one-third of Jews in this country have gone to Israel, and two-thirds have not, that we cannot expect the two-thirds to go to Israel in the next 10-20 years. Therefore, the possibilities of using media is really there. I suggest to you that if the idea to expose young people to the greatest teachers, that Martin Buber is on tape and on film and so is Abraham Joshua Heschel and so is Eli Weisel and there is a possibility of bringing these great, inspiring personalities into the home. How will we teach the holocaust to the next generation? I wrestle with that with my own son who came in and asked me about it the other day and had some fear about it and I think that a Jewish parent in this country, unaffiliated or not, who hasn't faced this issue, we're struggling with it now in the Jewish heritage video collection and are wrestling with the idea of doing a whole series of teaching with video tape. To talk about adolescence and the

holocaust. There is an idea of using this with teen-agers as a possible market. I see this as a real problem in the report and I would like to see us step up to it, faced into the future, and embrace that future and say that this is a great opportunity for Jewish education. It must be done on a national level as well as a local level. On the national level, because programs cost a lot of money to create and on a local level because teachers have to be brought into this new world and learn how to use it. I think if we do that we will have served a very important space.

Josh Elkin - Let me offer three comments. One. Picking up on what Eli just said. Maybe there's a possibility, and this ties in to a point I wanted to make of Having the introduction--we don't have an introduction so you might not mind some suggestions of what should go into it. There might be the possibility of some sort of brief environmental scan of where we are. We would be able to put a few things there that might not be able to get enough attention in the body of the report, but to be able to talk a little bit about the telecommunications revolution. I think, and I said this at the last meeting as well, that there needs to be a reference early on in the work to the issue of Soviet Jewry. I think that it's working out kind of fortunately that the report is not going to come out for a little while because I think that we are all involved in an enormous amount of fundraising and an enormous amount of effort, but I think that along with a general society sort of thing such as the telecommunications revolutions, I think there is an opportunity to say something specifically about what is happening in Jewish life. One of the things that I personally fear is that we're going to find ourselves so

enveloped--I'm not saying this to denigrate the importance of it--so enveloped in the crisis need to respond to a massive exodus of Jews from the Soviet Union that the issues of Jewish education, which I think are common to us here and the Jews there and the Jews who are coming out are going to get lost because of a shortage of money, because of an inability to have the energy to cover all the bases. I think it would be wise to embrace the issue head-on and talk about why it's important that we remain focused on the critical, central part of Jewish education.

Secondly, I just want to mention that I want to just put as a way of helping to achieve some consensus, that I too am a believer that inreach is the way to go and not outreach. I think it would be very important in the report to make it really clear that the report is not really going to be catering in any significant way to the vast number of Jews who have not bought in in some little way. I don't know if we have a chance of being able to reach that population. I think we have a awful lot of work to do with people who have already made some small steps.

Thirdly, relating to the concept of lead community, which I like a great deal, and tying it with a couple of comments, I guess, Maurice's comment about how we are going to deal with the local turf that's there and all the stakeholders and the vested interests that are there. I want to connect too about Annette's presentation about community leaders, but I have to say I kind of missed in the report, though she gave emphasis to it in her remarks, and as I was thinking about it I think it's probably something that needs to

have more emphasis in the actual report itself. I think that the influencing of a greater number of community leaders is really the way to tailor whatever is going to happen to a local community. If you don't get people in a local community on board, buying into a particular set of options or directions, I think that whatever you begin to do is not going to have a chance or succeeding. I would put in a plug for finding a way to, without being prescriptive, simply give people a clue as they read this document of what has worked in the area of community leadership development. I just made a quick list, and I don't know everything that's going on, but there are ventures that CIAL has done that, there are ventures that Wexner Heritage Foundation has done, ventures that JESNA has done and the federation has done in young leadership development. There are the thirteen-some odd commissions around the country that themselves--I'm sure if we went to Cleveland and interviewed the people that participated in that commission, that the commission was a lay leadership venture and I think this whole commission has been a venture in building leadership and building collaboration. I mention also the Israel programs, particularly the JCC's are taking lay people, are taking members, taking executives to Israel for three months. I think that there are models that exist, and I'm not suggesting a whole other chapter in the report, but I am suggesting a couple of pages. If community lay leadership is critical, and I do believe it is critical in terms of having any of these changes stick over time, I think that it would be wise to say something substantive about what we know has made a difference in the lives of people already so that communities can have an idea of what they might want to replicate.

MM - One comment before lunch to give you something to think about, and I'm glad my friend Lester Crown is here because I'm going to ask him to verify something I'm going to share with you. At our second meeting, having been overwhelmed at our first meeting and in our interviews, by the complexity, the breadth, the dimensions, the branches flowing out of the main river and the tributaries flowing out of each of the branches, and seeing how complex and diverse this whole issue of Jewish education/Jewish continuity/Jewish learning, however we choose to phrase it, is, we made a decision. That decision was that we would focus on two areas and identify 19 others, and the 19 might be 26 or 38. And in fact, what this report does, and I think it will be enriched by a lot of the comments today, is deal only with a piece of it. And I sense a little frustration because we don't have it all in here. My dear friends, no matter how long we live we probably will not get to it all, but my hope is that we will advance the state of the art somewhat by the Commission on Jewish Education in North America, leaving yet all sorts of areas to be explored. There is no way that we can do justice to all of the ideas and ever finish. Here's why I wanted Lester. I heard one time, Lester, that in designing an airplane the only way you stop your engineers and designers is to say okay, as of Wednesday at 2 o'clock, August 14th we want no more ideas. We're going to go to production with that airplane. Because there is no end to the refinement. Does that sound familiar?

Crown - Well not quite, but:::you do have to stop at some point.

MLM - Okay, so what I'm sharing with you is, we want to have this report, we want to have a celebratory event this fall. We want to put this to bed at some point in time, and I guess it's going to be after this meeting, and I know it won't have everything in it, and I know, God willing, there won't be glaring omissions. There probably will be some that we wish we had included. We just have to finish this process. Not end what we're all trying to do about the quality of our lives, the richness of our lives, but finish this process. And I think there is good news. The good news is that a lot of you are engaged in your own life that preceded the Commission, that will live after the Commission, number one. Number two, we are going to generate a vehicle, and you'll hear more if you didn't get to it about keeping this process alive that will enable us to set together and work together for years to come. So, if we don't get it all in, we want to hear you today, but if we don't get it all in, please don't shoot me.

LUNCH

Sara Lee - I'd like to put my remarks in the context of differentiation between the function of the report and what might happen after the report. I think the report itself can be a very important stimulus and I think we have an unprecedented opportunity because so many people have the existence of the Commission and its meetings and are awaiting what it is the Commission will have to say to people who are concerned about these issues. Therefore, I applaud the fine job that has been done in formulating it and synthesizing the work of the Commission, but I'd like to suggest two components that we

might consider that address the concerns that have been raised earlier today. If we conceptualize this report as having a very strong educative and advocacy function in regard to Jewish learning, Jewish literacy and Jewish education, we are, it seems to me, missing or have underemphasized two important components. One that has been referred to is to raise the important questions that we must confront about the nature of the Jewish community, the Jewish family, and current realities of Jewish life in North America. To raise those questions so that people will use them as important questions in looking at the current structures and delivery systems of Jewish learning in this country. It seems to me that to talk about the Jewish family and other issues that have been raised, needs to be put into that kind of context, as questions that must be addressed, that must be researched, that must be thought about in order to formulate a plan for how we might enhance Jewish learning in this country. I think those are sociological questions, and they are not only about the nature of Jewish life, but about the nature of Jewish institutions and how they perceive themselves.

The second, which I think relates to Professor Twersky's wonderful vision statement, I'll call it a vision statement, is the question of a philosophical stance, an advocacy stance about Jewish learning. I think that's also not emphasized sufficiently in the report. It seems to me we need to start with a vision of what we should be as a community in terms of Jewish learning. And I want to differentiate here between advocacy and marketing. Advocacy is the vision that we want to promulgate as essential to the continuity of Jewish life and marketing are strategies

that you figure out in terms of formulating the particulars of how that vision gets translated. I'd like to suggest that those are two elements which, if they were put into the report, would be important in making this a very strong, educative, advocacy statement for the Jewish community. I think the elements are there. They've been in our past discussions; they've been implicit, they've been explicit. It seems to me they need to be lifted out and put into some stronger formulation. I'd like to put on the table that I'd like to consider how we might use Professor Twersky's formulation as a beginning of such a vision and philosophical statement.

Second, I think the report struggles with a tension between prescribing and advocating and recognizing the autonomy of the communities and also the different realities in those communities. But I think that we have not strongly enough included in this report visions of what might be. Without saying that these are solutions, these are the answers, this is what you have to do, I think people need to have some sense of what might be. The notion of very good programs or approaches or some of the rich thinking that's come out of the tradition. The report is quite general, I think addressing itself to the tension between autonomy and prescription. I think we need to indicate, hint at, preview what should be or what might be.

I last want to, not directly answer, but respond to Rabbi Corson's comments. It seems to me that his comment about whether we could get 200, 300, 400 people to enter the field--I don't think any of us know the answer. What his comment does suggest, is that there are many more questions to answer before

we focus on very direct strategies to change the situation. We do have to ask some of the questions that Rabbi Corson has raised and I think they are not limited to his comments about the ability to recruit Jewish educators. It seems to me that that falls into my first category of needing to know a lot more about what the realities and the mind set are that are out there, that we need to address in order to develop the appropriate strategies to address the issues that we've put on the table. In that respect I want to add one more comment. I think that the report is strong in calling upon quantitative data that supports some of the impressionistic ideas we have about what is going on. I think that we have a need for a lot more qualitative data about what's happening rather than just numbers, because I think that that won't serve us well. I think we may be very disappointed if we devise our strategies based solely on quantitative data about how many need and how many we have. I would urge that we think about the report as a very important statement that we can make to the Jewish community. Other reports that have been developed in other contexts have served that function and I think if we expand our sense of what the report should be, I think we can stimulate the kind of activity that we want to take place in the community as a whole.


Peggy Tifelman - Thank you Sara Lee for saying a lot of the things that are on my mind. One of the first things you said, Mort, when you opened this meeting is that what fuels the machine is money and I'd like to take exception to that. I think that what fuels the machine is probably, to a certain degree money, but to the other degree, and I would have put this

first, is quality. I think that's what we're all searching for. Quality in the Jewish educational system. We're not sure how to go about it, but we know from the public school experience in New York that throwing money at it is really not the answer.

Having said that, I rejoice in whatever we call Rabbi Twersky's statement. For me it would be a wonderful mission because I feel very strongly that every child that doesn't get the opportunity to enjoy being Jewish really misses a great deal of the wonder of life and the special quality of life in North America. I have a question that draws on what Sara Lee said about these lead communities. I'm not sure I understand how we're going to know if a lead community has really achieved what we want it to achieve. I'm not sure I know what the criteria are that will tell me how it worked. I loved what Seymour said, but I invariably do love what he says, because I feel that if we encompass a larger world than what we originally started with that maybe that would be one of the criteria that would say yes, this lead community has worked, and maybe if we say that, when we move from one community to the next, we have transferred the success strategy that that is also a criterion which says that the lead community has been successful and now I piggyback on what Alvin said. I think that it would be very very helpful if, after this Commission is finished and we do have these lead communities, if somehow or other we can reconvene or you could send us the material now we know this works and now we know this doesn't work. That for me would give me a great feeling of achievement.

Virginia E. Levi



 Seymour * Bonnette
DATE 6/11/10

Dear Ed A,

Here's the rest of the transcript
of little marketing .. I hope it's
helpful. Am sending a copy
to David Finn.

Genny

Florence Melton: I would first like to comment on the term consumerism. I'm a market person in the business world for many years and I know that every marketing- it has to have a philosophy or it doesn't sustain itself. In my mind, Jewish education is a human enterprise. I have great faith in the fact that through quality Jewish education, that the element of the spiritual emanates. Because from knowledge and understanding comes with them and from with them comes further need to fulfill the hunger of learning. I've seen this happen in programs that are seminal in my view to creative energy in Jewish education. In what the Programs are doing and what the Wexner Heritage Programs are doing for young leadership. Putting the spiritual element as coming with the territory. It's inherent in the learning process. There's no question about it and I think that. ((some text lost in flipping the tape)) Because they have discovered in their journey for Judaism, they have discovered that they have a hunger for the spiritual and the spiritual is inherent in the quality learning. I just wanted to clarify that. I don't like the whole context or the whole reference of consumerism because that eliminates what our basic goals are all about.

The other thing I'd like to say is a bombshell. I have studied in great depth the paper which deals with professionalism of teachers and with the training of professional teachers and I have come to a conclusion, and nobody may agree with it. With great temerity I open this whole ball of wax that there isn't a training center existing in the U.S. today that in my view can serve the long-term training- for example, that there would be a college, a North American college of training for Jewish educators in which they would have a department for preschool, a department for special training for special needs for handicapped children or whatever, a department for training of administrators/principals, a department for

training of camping counselors, and so on and so on,, and a department for paraprofessionals for the small communities.. Here you would be able to afford to hire the best professors, and as I read through the material here, there isn't one of the institutions that has the proper professors.. They don't have the money to do it. They don't have the curricular materials. They may have long range plans,, but the constraints are not within the purview of their control. What I'm saying is, if I had a lot of money, a big foundation myself, personally, I would endow such a college for the training of Jewish educators. I would see to it that they had the best and that they would have communication with Hebrew University Department of Education and that they would learn from every single existing source what is the best available,, who are the best people.. I don't care how much it costs,, we need them. That's how I'd put my money if I had it.

Irving Greenberg: First of all, there is a very real reaction around the table which is an understandable reaction because people are about to sign off on the report and are suddenly realizing all the very important and extraordinary things that we can overlook and not do justice to. As one who argued at the first meeting, take one area, one programmatic area and throw everything at it, I deeply feel for their pain. I understand it. Having said that, we didn't decide to go that way. I think we now have to decide what it is that we did decide. We said we were going to focus on personnel and communities which lead us to the lead community model and once we've done that I think that that is a major breakthrough which we will then follow up with specific breakthroughs in each of the areas that are on the table because they all deserve it. What I would like to urge, however, and need to say is to reach balance in the report. I think unconsciously the report did slip back into the notion of formal

education education as the authentic education. I would argue that we articulate that we are talking informal as well as formal, adult as well as children, and that when we go to lead communities, some in fact will choose that particular focus or we will encourage them to articulate that. One other way of doing that I'd like to urge. I do think the mission statement is helpful and that Professor Twersky has given us 80% of it or maybe 90% of it. I'd like to see here to the child to adult and informal added to it. I think if you would do it that would be very helpful in giving the reassurance that all these are not being left for others.

The second point I'd like to make is about the leadership education. Rather to put it clear to educate Jewish leaders to the importance of Jewish education. I agree with Charles that some of the important breakthroughs came from people like him before they were involved in Jewish education and supporting. The truth is, we are pushing Jewish education for the leaders of the future, we have to do what we say. If we think the lay people who are going to make the changes don't need it, then truthfully we probably don't believe in the other areas either. I don't think that's what is happening now. I think we've gotten most of the early victories of surprise conversions without education. As the competition gets hotter and as needs go up and we get to the complex situation we're in now, unless there is we will not be able to make good judgement. People of quality or on priorities. Therefore I think you have to build in, at we've already built in selling this to lay leadership. I think the Council, the follow-up to this body has to articulate that, consciously schedule it in, and if you educate enough you'll even get more support.

Third point. I look again, as I said as someone who originally wanted to

push for the other ^{result} ~~result~~. I have done some more research since those meetings and I wanted to say that I'm persuaded the other way right now. The Council is a very important issue. We have to face our own conclusions. We could not do all 19 areas, but the Council gives a chance at starting to meet many of those areas because my reading of that is communities are going to respond, that they are excited to think that they might get additional challenge money and expertise from outside to push them, and coordination. Therefore, this will be a catalyst, which is what we really wanted, and a leverage, which is what we really wanted. That's the important breakthrough we're bringing here today. Particularly can't come from the top down as Fred Gottschalk said earlier today, can't come from prescription, but can come from individual communities and then .. So we're on to a very important mechanism. Far from being a mistake or an overlooked position, I think we have to see this as the key mechanism and we have to push it. In particular I sense that Josh Elkin has put it on the table already. I want to say I see a real problem here, as one who has argued that this is a historic opportunity, it's electrifying I also see a very dangerous downside. I see many executives and top leaders who say drop everything else, we've just got to get this done. (MLM notes he is referring to Operation Exodus.) That's an invasion; it's irresponsible in my judgement, and I say this as one who thinks it should get top priority. It's an invasion, it's irresponsible because those Russian immigrants themselves are going to need this educational process. Jewish education can't be focused on great crisis. We know this from Jewish history too. All those miracles of the Exodus and Sinai didn't change the people. changed the people when the Rabbis educated them to the point where they understood, then the Exodus worked and then Sinai worked. We have to have the courage of our own

convictions. That's our message. In my judgement it's more important now than it was when we started 2 years ago. At such a time it's important that we rally. We can see that Jewish education is not to be put aside while we do the important things in life, but rather at a time when we recognize the other major responsibility is being dramatically, this is a dramatic/non-dramatic breakthrough for the future of the Jewish people and we have to assert that to the community and make that part of our report. That's why we need a council to follow up..

Esther Leah Ritz: I'm glad ~~Yitz~~ said what he did at the beginning of his presentation because I do want to say that as we have been discussing all morning, and identifying the gaps in the report, we've lost track of the fact that it is our report. What is there is what we talked about.. What is there are the priorities that surfaced in the course of our earlier discussion and the fact that putting it together has allowed us to identify the gaps before we finalize the report is a life saver to me because of my concern about some of those gaps. It is our responsibility, not the drafters of the report who made it come out that way..

I recall, I was on the Wirtz Weiler graduate school of social work board at the time JWB completed its study on maximizing Jewish educational effectiveness in the centers. There was almost panic in that board and in the faculty about what impact the report having to do with Jewish education in the informal setting of Jewish Community Centers was going to have on the education of the kind of professionals who work in centers. Was this going to require a whole switch from the social work mode to the Jewish educator mode in Jewish Community Centers? In our discussion today we've been talking about Jewish educators and the implication always is the educator in the classroom. I think we have to keep in mind what was said- that we are talking about the whole gamut of formal and informal

educational experiences that change people's relationships,, individual relationships, family relationships, to the Jewish people.. If we have lost that in the report,, I feel it must be restored in some way-- that notion as informal as well as formal. One of the things where we lost the idea of family education,, how the family itself becomes an educational instrument,, beyond training or being a family. It's the duality of the family that I want to call attention to. In our report we have to insure that we have fulfilled our own responsibilities..

I want to spend just a minute on the question of lead communities because Alvin is very enthusiastic about the change in the formulation. I'm not so sure I am. The tendency of using the term lead communities is that it carries the implication of an elite community,, an advanced community. The fact of the matter is that if we are going to create models for use across North America,, we have to have the guts to use among the communities some which are relatively primitive. If we do not do that,, the reaction will be, "Oh well, Cleveland. Of course they can do it." We can't. We have to be able to prove to communities that are not Cleveland that it can be done- including Milwaukee. So that, whatever we call it, I think we have to be very clear that we are not only looking to the best communities to create models, but to communities that are not so great to help those other not so great communities move up the continuum.

Apropos of lead communities too, I'm not entirely sure that- it might even be communities that choose a program will be most effective. I must admit a preference for community-wide planning, and community-wide identification of gaps priorities and the filling of those gaps within a community-wide program, so that in a given community both the formal and informal, the of family education can all be given consideration. Within that consideration then, those weak links can be identified which

need strengthening. Those that are better and stronger will be continued. Otherwise I'm afraid we're going to wind up with a patchwork. We're going to have a bunch of programs or activities that are successful one place or another and we are not going to have the development of a comprehensive educational thrust that can be identified.

Thirdly, I know you mentioned some kind of a bash, when we finally launch the Council. I don't know if that's the appropriate time, but I think that once the Council is created and underway there must be a second continental Jewish leadership conference on Jewish education. The first one changed the attitudes of a great number of people and launched a series of events including this, (MEM- 54* means 1984.) We have, if not the next generation, may be the second generation after that now in community leadership and namely the charging up occurred in 1984, but at a different level because we will have this report as the basis for charging them up. I don't see this as the bash that launches next fall because I don't think that the Council will be ready to implement that kind of a conference. I think it's different from '84, but it has to be on the agenda as a way of charging our community leadership and identifying the new round of leadership that must take leadership for this local endeavor and this continental endeavor.

Mark Lainer: Now that we're on the road of where do we go from here type of thinking and start looking at some of the realities that we're dealing with, it seems to me that we have some inconsistencies and in some ways they have been mentioned during the course of the discussion. It makes me a little nervous because ultimately it leads me to the conclusion that we do need to focus, but again . Let me give you some examples. We have come up with, as one of the main issues, the building of the Profession and, if you follow this to its logical conclusions, that would

be one area that we would like to place great emphasis on. However,, the way we are going to proceed will be by working with lead communities where most of the initiative will come from the local communities.. So,, one of my concerns is that the lead communities may choose to do one of the other programmatic areas and leave,, unless we can encourage them or do something else,, we'll have to go along with them because that will be the choice that they have made. That's where their funding is going to go. That's where their emphasis is going to go. I'm concerned about how we're going to maintain the priority that we gave to,, for example,, the building of Jewish educational professionals..

Similarly, once you pick and select a community as a lead community,, then my concern is what happens to the rest of the country.. If we're trying to encourage people throughout the country to build the educational establishment,, bring more lay people into their system,, etc.,, if we focus on certain communities as being the lead communities,, it seems to me that the rest of the ~~country~~^{country} may say, "well, that's it,, they've done their job and we are left out in the lurch and there's nothing there for us."

Another inconsistency, to some extent that we've raised before,, is what happens to our on-going institutions that we do have. Again,, we're not trying to reinvent the wheel,, we're trying to work with organizations we have like JESNA. We do have schools of higher learning in Jewish education. We have gatherings of day schools and schools we need to work with. It seems to me that we,, I don't think,, intend to create an institution that's going to supersede any of these people. When I go through this kind of thinking in terms of how we deal with those existing realities out there, I come back to the place where I would like to end,, which is that we must focus on the area of advocacy. We must focus on the area of being a catalyst, of being through the strength of this group,

because this group is made up of so many people who gather together to work together and this is in some ways a very high level type of group. I think we need to maintain that focus on advocacy, on giving community support, and encouraging people to participate in the Jewish educational program. I feel very strongly, for example, that within 2 years- at least in 2 years- this group should gather again for a very important purpose, namely to reinvigorate the process. Once we get down to tachlis, once we start working at certain things, there's going to be a lot of detail going on out there and I think it's going to be important to give it a kick or at least a pat on the back, just to keep the process going. I would like to make sure that we end up emphasizing the concept of people participating in Jewish education at local communities and making that a high priority.

Haskel Lookstein: Somebody said to me a very short time ago, the person shall remain nameless. I am virtually quoting. "I went to Sunday school and hated it. My children went to Sunday school and they hated it. Half of my grandchildren went to Sunday school and they hated it. Two of my grandchildren are now going to a kind of supplementary educational program, and they love it. Why?" I happen to know the supplementary program and there's a very simple reason why. The teacher who's teaching the supplementary program is a very gifted teacher. I haven't really left where I was 2 years ago, when I first reacted to the opening statements of Mort Mandel and others. The only thing I would like to do ~~if~~ suggest that in this excellent report, I happen to like it very much, beginning with vision statement or mission statement or whatever you want to call it-prologue-is just a matter of priorities and emphasis. Most of you know better than I know that in every area of life one has to choose and one has to decide what do you do first. I just would like to see that in the recommendations, paragraph 3 which is devoted to building the profession

of Jewish education in North America, that if it has¹ come third because there has to be a council before there can be this and there has² to be community leaders involved before you can get there, just some way ought to be found to print paragraph 3 in larger type. With all the visual aids available, maybe Eli Evans can work on something in media to do this, just make it leap off the page because I listened to Mrs. Melton talk about it if she could do it she would start a college for training teachers, I think to myself, great, but if somebody isn't going to pay the teachers at the end of that training, she's not going to have students for that college. It's as simple as that. All the innovations, programs, research, curriculum development will have some use, but relatively their usefulness will be marginal without the right people in the field. With the right people in the field, everything else can be extremely productive. Therefore it should somehow be writ large.

Mr. Gruss, for example, is a Jewish charitable genius, probably a general charitable genius, gave a very fine grant to Yeshiva University high schools a couple of years ago to dramatically increase the salaries of the teachers. I would imagine that Rabbi Lamm and Rabbi Hirt could verify what a difference that has made in the quality of the faculty that they can both attract and retain. We at Ramaz have been doing this, unfortunately we have not found the Mr. Gruss yet to give us the help, we've been doing it and we know that we have very little turn over and we are attracting, on the whole, very good faculty. My executive committee is already beginning to talk about, listen we've reached as far as we can reach. If we keep going this way, tuition will be out of control and then there'll be no school in which good teachers can teach. You have to cut back the salaries. You can't give 6-1/2 and 8% increases and you can't give special incentives because you'll be having a \$20,000 tuition in

another 10 years and who is going to pay \$20,000- you won't have a school.. Some way must be found to help fund this and not leave it just to those of us who are in the field to do this. Therefore, I really agree with the report, but if you could find a way to lift that paragraph 3 off the page, starting with salaries, moving on to training and including empowerment and making the profession really attractive to the best people, you'll solve the problem of that person who hated Sunday school, whose children hated it, and whose grandchildren, until the last two, hated it and the difference is the teacher who's doing the whole thing.

Isadore Twersky: ((first ^{portion} ~~portion~~ unintelligible)) I said this morning that was not intended as a formal statement and I did not coordinate it with the writing of the report. Having said that, I do want to add that I think it's rather transparent that that statement of mine is anything but advocacy exclusively for formal education. If anything, I may say the opposite. By premeditation, it's broad to include formal and informal. Maybe the word child in the first line should be changed to person or state every person, child, or adult.

Now, as far as the report, I anticipated Mort's request for suggestions. Professor Fox and I spent well over 2 hours. I gave him almost page by page very detailed comments on stylistic and substantive concerns about the report. I want just to extract, very quickly, a few principles that underlie the massive detail.

First of all, I think that the report indicates all or if not all much that needs to be done in the field of Jewish education and then focuses as it must, on what this Commission identified as its series of activities. This is not a statement of Jewish education. It is a report of a certain commission which had such on membership and this report reflects now rather accurately the proposition to create the commission and

the actual course of deliberations since August 1988.. That is as it should be. I think the focus must not be blurred.. This is a report of this Commission. The advocacy on the other hand for continued initiatives and I don't know why we spend time that advocacy is loud and clear. I hope that advocacy will continue..

A word about the Council. I was waiting patiently this morning to hear something about the Council and I want to repeat something I said at our last meeting. Unless we start with a meaningful , then we look comical to say the least. We will have changed our vision or repudiated our rational. Another way of putting this is the statement [Hebrew] to say little and do much. We will have, by the end of the summer, a long eloquent report in hand. Now I think that our immediate actions must at least be commensurate with our talk if not greater than our talk. There should at least be commensurability as we announce our talk over 2 years the action we are ready to undertake immediately. There are any number of places in the report for which there is room . One thing I felt important was that nothing in the report should be seen as discrediting or underestimating what is now going on in the field of Jewish education. I think the reason we are here is because there are many good, successful things going on in Jewish education and we want to strengthen and improve them. Therefore certain terms I think have to be avoided and I discussed this with Seymour Fox. One specific idea that kept surfacing as I read the report carefully was, in my opinion, the need to modify what is here a ubiquitous emphasis on change. I think as we read Mort's last letter, the word improvement is much more to the point. We've talked about improvement, strengthening, expanding, deepening, etc. We are really not changing. Certainly not imposing change. I don't think that we are

imposing anything. I trust that the Council will make it absolutely clear.

Third, one specific .. I think that the importance of on the job or on site or inservice training has been rather critical in our discussion. I don't think it is given enough emphasis in the report.. If I read it correctly,, it's not mentioned until page 38,, whereas there are numerous contexts before that where it should appear.. It is very important that we ascribe to this and that it is reflected with many of the concrete issues that are talked about.. Undergraduate institutions and 30,000 teachers in the field. Obviously on the job and in service training is crucial. Here I would like to add what is mentioned on page 40. I believe it should be emphasized further,, by bigger type or whatever,, that Israel is now a major source,, a locale for this on site training. The same month long seminar given in Israel- teachers returned from that experience- it's just great. Not only , but personally.

I would like to make a comment on family only because I endorse everything that was said about its importance. I thought that this was preaching to the converted because I assumed any lead community would include the family and I find this mentioned on page 7, page 23,, and other places as well. I recently read the report of the foundation. issues on family activities in two cities. I think might be a model for any comprehensive plan for lead communities that we develop.

One final comment I would make. Page 51, a statement is made that was with the issuing of this report the Commission will be reconstituted a representative body of the North American Jewish community.. How is this to be done, by a wave of the wand? You can't do that. We can't say about

ourselves that we are the representative body. We're all in agreement, as I understand it, that we¹ like to meet once a year, but nobody has given us this mandate. The commission, which is a rather representative body(MDM-that's really the intent. I see it doesn't say that. If I may on that point, this is meant to be responsive to what you have said either today or to me or to others privately, that the Commission and possibly one or two others ought to be added, possibly some of those folks who could never make a single meeting ought not to be retained, and we ought to meet again once a year or something like that. That is what this is meant to be and the word "a representative body" or even worse, ~~the~~, which ~~is difficult~~ say, is not intended by this.)

[MDM introduces David Finn who explains the process of preparing the report]

Irwin Field: I would make a suggestion from practical experience. One thing is to write something and another is to have people read it. Anything that's 100 pages, I would strongly urge that there be a 5 page executive summary because we want people to have an appetizer and maybe they'll take the whole meal. If they're looking at 100 pages, there are not too many people who are going to read it. [David Finn] If you read a very important book that could change the world, it will have an introduction and a conclusion, but it may not have an executive summary. Maybe there should be a guide or something but I'm not sure there should be an executive summary.] Isadore Twersky: As an alternative to what Irwin Field has said, I share the same concern. I think another idea might be to make it less than 100 pages. I think there are parts of this that are a bit repetitious and might be tightened up.

Lester Pollack: I think the packaging of the report that David just

articulated is very critical,, but I'd like to hear more about dissemination and publication of the report - how it has impact on the communities and how we get the attention of people outside of this room who we have not yet talked to. That we've done something importantt, that we've done something valuable,, that this is going to be a catalyst for action,, that we're advocates.. I think that some of the other points that Alvin,, Dave Dubin,, and Esther Leah have made-a bash and then maybe a major convocation- I think we ought to develop how we're going to drop this bombshell and this very important work on the community and make sure that it has the desired effect.. I think it's a very critical Florence Melton - I think it's going to be a report among many. I think as good as the report is and whether it's long or short it's going to be another report unless -- the question that Lester brought up is critical because communities have so much literature that comes in to them. How are we going to get to communities to take note of the Commission as an activator? In my view there's one way to do it. I suggest, and I talked to Annette about this, that the first thing the Commission could do to be on the front page of every Jewish newspaper in North America, is to establish an in-gathering -- announce an in-gathering of programs that work and to give recognition and awards to those people or communities who have used these programs successfully and that will send to us all of the components,, the elements,, that made that program work over and over again. Who were the players? What did they do? What was involved? How did they assess the success of the programs? We would put together a compendium of all programs that worked and we would make that available to every teacher resource center and that would put us on the front pages with acceptance by the professionals. It would give them recognition. It would recognize

the communities. It will give us the kind of publicity where they say well what are these people going to do? The first thing we're going to do is to give them something.. That's how they're going to pay attention to us.

Alfred Gottschalk: I'm very grateful for David Finn's structuring of the report. I can see his problems. I can see the problems of anyone who would read a report such as this. Therefore you treated it in a chronological way. The creation of the Commission, where we are today, coming to grips, blueprint for the future, recommendations.. Whether or not one shortens this report, I think that the order should be reversed. My personal view is that we should start with blueprint for the future and the recommendations and let that be the highlight of the report,, because the rest is descriptive narration of how we got to our recommendations on Jewish education. It's very important to know, but there may be some people who will do what most of us do when you get a report or a book. I always read a book from the back. I'll look at the bibliography and the footnotes and then decide whether or not I want to read it. For those who would be interested in an executive summary or whatever you call it, let's start with the conclusions and then work backwards. It's a thought that gets us out of this trap of historical narration and wondering then are they ever going to really get to what they want to tell us?

Kathleen Hat: I think that what we're talking about is that our report needs to be the strongest statement possible about the future of Jewish education. In looking at that, we have to think about what our strengths as a Commission are and what our weaknesses are. The weakness I really see in this draft is that we have almost too much data or we have data that's nearly 10 years old. We have pie charts. Every report we all read has pie charts and graphs, etc. If you remember that we are not preaching

to the converted and we are trying to get to the people who are sitting on the fence, who have a marginal interest and might be inspired, then we have to think about being the inspiring force. We have to make more of an emphasis on our vision rather than on data. If I were a skeptic reading this report and I would see 1982 next to a pie chart I would say that these people haven't done their homework. If I read other data like on page 20 we have a statement that there's been an 80% rise in day school enrollment, I find that very provocative and I find myself asking why is that so and wanting to know more within the context of the report and feeling a little bit cheated that I didn't know more. I also think that statement focused a little bit too much on formal education and we've all talked about how much we need to highlight the other forms of education that are out there. On page 24 there's a kind of marginal or footnote statement about the fact that we tried to get more data but it wasn't available. Again, playing devil's advocate, I would say that that was making excuses and that we should instead not use the data at all but rather concentrate on the vision statement. That actually brings me to what Florence just said, which I think is fantastic. The announcement of an in-gathering which would not only be an inspiring kind of idea but would also serve to clarify a chicken/egg situation that is in the report right now. On page 57 we state that each local school, camp, etc. in the lead communities should consider adapting elements from the inventory of best practices maintained by the Council, but further along on page 66 we say the Council as part of its long range strategy, will develop that inventory of best practices. I think that in-gathering can serve as the fundamental basis for that inventory.

Seymour Martin Lipset: I have the same concern that Florence does with this movement of the report. One of the problems that Mr. Finn was

suggesting is, no matter what you say, what it says in the report more good things can happen. If you look at what other reports had an influence, and some of these have been discussed earlier, Flexner started out by saying there's a disaster. The medical schools are no good and went on to analyze that in great detail. Then proposed a model, in fact we are following the Flexner model. you get attention by this.

Now you don't want to state Jewish education is no good, but there is a disaster and the disaster is the problem of Jewish continuity. There was a curious little article in the New York Times a week or two ago, and a lot of what he was saying was true. The question is if Jewish education is the key to Jewish continuity, and now what we've done in the report is that we've followed the model which is to take all of us and have our interview and report our conceptions. But not really do a detailed analysis beyond what we know. I think to get some attention, if we are not going to say that there's a major problem and that this problem has to be dealt with through these proposals, we just are not going to get attention by saying that Jewish education is a good thing and if we want more good Jewish education, we want a lot more money to be put into it that will be helpful. The idea of lead communities is a good one. It's following the Flexner model. I make a prediction that this is not going to get that much attention unless we are in effect saying there is a major problem for which we have answers.

Daniel Shapiro:: This may have been mentioned earlier, but the report talks about our urging private foundations and families to set aside money for Jewish education and support the work of the Council. To what extent do we, in connection with lead communities, have some news to tell the world. (MLM you missed this morning. I could give you a whole private lecture on that.)

Alvin Schiff: There are reports and there are reports.. There are reports of studies, scientific studies that have taken place.. They require a certain kind of report. They may require an executive summary,, as well.. This is a report of deliberations,, a report of opinions,, a report of some thing that was studied thrown into the hopper of general opinion. I'd like to suggest that what this report has to do is strike at the best possible consensus of opinion,, reflect a sense of movement,, and direct attention to a level of expectations. I don't know whether an executive summary is needed, even though people don't want to read that much, but it has to make people feel that things can change or things can improve. Unlike a report of a study that has shown such urgency because of findings that are so negative. We may that there are certain negative aspects of Jewish education, but the community at large that we have to sound the alarm, we have to also show that there is a central movement as well as expectation of greater goals.

Steve Hoffman: I thought what we ought to do first is to start with the question Charles Bronfman asked earlier which is why independence verses blending it in with existing entities. I think the answer to that really gets found in the origins of this Commission itself. When you look around the room, you see a distinctly different conglomerate of institutions and interests brought together for the first time. We think that that in fact occurred because we created a format that was different and unique in North American Jewish life. We had the concern, frankly, that any other model at this point the capital we've gained through that uniqueness. There are many institutions around the table that see themselves as equal to or in a-- as the federation system, for example. JESNA to pick on Jo/n and Bennett for a moment, represents the federation system. They are owned by the federation system and accountable to the federation system.

If we move within their orbit, there is the possibility that there would be institutions that don't want to play in the same ball park if they feel they are being subjugated in some way to that federation system. It's not the most pleasant fact of Jewish communal life, but it is a reality. Equally it could be said that there are other institutions within the federation system that see themselves as peers of JESNA or the JCC Association and would not want to see themselves giving up some perception of sovereignty or freedom of movement by having to affiliate with organizations being run by one or the other party. There is a secondary method to the madness here, and that is there is a new emerging force that has done a lot of good in Jewish communal enterprise and that is the private foundations. A phenomenon that we talk about from time to time in our meetings that just wasn't there a generation ago. Part of the focus of the Council is to try to mature that force a little more than where it might be if there were no Council for initiatives in Jewish education. We believe that if there is an independent council, the foundations are major players. I'm going to discuss that in a minute. That will advance the cause further than if it's just another operation of an existing Jewish organization.

The functions of the Council. Annette mentioned earlier, it's written in your report. We've all talked about the advocacy aspect of the Council to take the report and keep moving it forward. It's also as a connective function. We need to establish between the communities, institutions, and the foundations. We believe the Council can play that role. There is the need to stimulate a broader and deeper research agenda. This is not being done in a directed way today. It's being done in an informal way today. I think the Council can put its resources into ways to make it more formally done and a better job of it. There is a

~~Synergism~~ synergism that can be created within the foundation community..

Foundations today meet informally. They don't meet formally.. We don't want to take an iota of independence away from any foundation.. If anything,, if you listen around the room today you see revealed to yourself the rich diversity of interests of the individual foundations.. Dr. Gottschalk, I think, earlier captured in Ackerman the paragraph that talks about what's so important about that diversity and how we get there either by divine inspiration or happenstance,, depending on your motivating force.. The foundations represent that today in the North American Jewish Community,, but we believe there can be a synergism if they sit together in a directed,, focused way which is Jewish education.. We just won't see through the informal association that is currently going on..

Another function of the Council will be to energize new professional resources. We have an educational establishment.. It is multi-faceted.. We have also discovered,, through the process of this commission, a number of people who are not necessarily part of that establishment today.. They are leading educators in North America. They are Jewish.. Just as you come to the table from time to time to combine your professional expertise,, business expertise,, you put on your Jewish hat and you move us from 5 on a scale of operations to 8 or 9, we believe there are educators who are not now in the game who can be brought into the game and therefore move us higher in the scale of operations.. These new professional resources could be used in our communities and with the foundations..

Another function of the Council will be to initiate specific proposals to implement the objectives we've talked about in our report.. A major drive of the Council will be to stimulate further research on these specific proposals,, further action plans,, help them in the foundation and

federation and other funding community and start putting them into place. It will do so using the JCCA, JESNA, JTS, Yeshiva, the Reconstructionist College, agencies, universities like Stanford, Brandise, Harvard, our Hebrew colleges, and other places that are out there already working. We are not going to go out and create a whole new world to accomplish our objectives. We are going to take the best operations we have, straighten them and get the job done, as they're talking about it. We've had a lot of ideas come out. Frankly, we think one of the things needed is a council to help start pushing some of these through the system.

To that end we ^{propose a board of about 20,} half of whom will represent the foundation community. The other half - these are rough numbers - will represent a blend of academicians, scholars, and national lay leadership. We see a huge staff- a director, chief educational officer, and then part time maybe a secretary and then part time people who will be brought in as consultants to help initiate and see through specific projects that the Council agrees to undertake. There will be a senior policy advisory group. We've found that a useful model. This will be about 8 people drawn from our national communal organizations who's expertise is in national community organization strategy. The other 4 will represent the content people (I'm kind of devoid of content. I just know how to get it done.) - academicians, scholars who know the substance of what we are about. We've talked about a fellows group. I pick a number of 50 to try to dramatize. I think there is a large number of people who the Council will be able to call upon for specific projects, to work with the lead communities. They will be drawn from the existing Jewish education establishment as well as people who are not necessarily in that establishment today but we

think who the Council could ask to lend us their expertise. The larger group that we are, ^{supplemented} by some people who may be missing, elements of our national scene, would form a kind of membership of the Council as apposed to the board of the Council. That's the group we'll meet a year from now, a year after that, and a year after that to see how we are doing and maybe suggest some changes in direction.

The funding, as Mort talked about this morning, will be drawn from core foundation supporters and then we hope to work with an additional universe of 15 to 25 foundations in addition to the 10 core foundations in moving our program along. There will be the usual efforts to keep in touch through various communications to a large constituency through mailings.

That's the guts of the program. We've talked about the functions. Needless to say our major projects will be in the lead communities. We envision maybe 3-5 of those communities. Our efforts to build the profession, to do a better job of community development and leadership. We want to initiate the research agenda. We want to provide assistance where we're asked to and where we can make a good connection with a specific program, adding ideas to the 23 we've already talked about. Finally we want to be of assistance to the foundations, both the core funders and the associated interest groups. That's really it in a nutshell, at least as far as I'm prepared to go today. MLM these are the core ideas. The board has not yet met. When the board meets for the first time it will own the agenda and will do it in its wisdom (and I hope wisdom is the right word) chooses. This is not foreordained. This is a distillation of what has emerged so far. In a sense, that's the design that will be handed to the first meeting of the board to fashion what they will fashion.

Charles Bronfman: I heard Steve's excellent rationale for the formation of the Council. Perhaps this is *dirty pool* and perhaps not. I'd just like to ask JESNA and JWB and ~~and~~ if they agree with the assumptions.

Bennett Yanowitz: We are one of the cosponsoring organizations and in that light we have been very much concerned and aware of this from the beginning. Concerned not in terms of feeling threatened, but concerned that the opportunities that are there for advancing Jewish education will be realized in the work of this Commission. This was approved conceptually by our Executive Committee before we ever signed on. The question of the relationship of JESNA to whatever comes out of here was one of the concerns from the very beginning. We have addressed that question from the conception. My personal view, and I know it reflects the view of the organization insofar as we have discussed this, because we have not discussed this as a specific item of business in terms of the question of independent organizational utilization of existing organizations to carry out in its entirety the work of the Commission is one where, as we have looked at JESNA and its resources, we feel that given resources anything could be accomplished, but we have a full plate at the present time. We are very proud at how far JESNA has come over 6 or 7 years of its new existence. Mort appeared at our last board meeting and we had a very full report by Mort personally and a discussion about the work of the Commission and JESNA, at that time, had the understanding which it was very comfortable with, that the Commission would continue in its work in some form and that whatever that form took, JESNA has the leading body in the field of national Jewish education would relate closely to it, would be utilized by it. Its resources would be enhanced as a result of the work of the Commission. In what ways we might be funded directly or indirectly no one tried to address. Our understanding

is that we would be picking up somewhere along the way the challenges that would be thrown to us as an up growth of the Commission's work. We are comfortable with the Council going forward in essentially the manner that was described today.

Lester Pollack:: When I was first interviewed about my views of the end product of some of the work of this Commission, I think I felt very strongly that one of the things that this Commission continues to do and is focus on Jewish education and enhance and augment the community's role in Jewish education and coordinating all the institutions involved. I personally am a supporter of the creation of the Council because I think it is one of the high points of with people who represent and are interested in Jewish education and of the iterations and demographic changes and community changes in general. From the point of view from JCCA, we have an ongoing high priority to continue to maximize the provision of Jewish education through Jewish community centers. That's a commitment that's ongoing. I've always envisioned the organization and the leadership of the organization, as we've looked at our role as a sponsoring organization here, that we will continue to participate with this body, with JESNA, with other bodies, and with the Council to support the effort but not be competitively involved in this. We are very comfortable, at least I am personally, and as Bennett said we have not yet gone to the board. I expect that we'll do that later this year, that we will fully discuss it. I agree with the idea that we will sponsor the Council.

MLM: I guess I'm not sticking my neck out too far. Bill Borman, the president of CJF is not here. Marty is a member of our Senior Policy Advisory Group and completely supports it. That is not the same as saying the president were here, but the president is not here.

Bennett Yanowitz: I used the word "comfortable" a couple of times.. That really is an understatement.. There is a real sense of enthusiasm at our board for the work of the Commission..

Florence Melton: It was my understanding when we first started this commission and from time to time I have asked the question as to whether or not this Commission would have task forces for the purpose of determining our direction. I personally find it disturbing that the decisions have been made in advance as to which direction the Commission would go. If there will be a Council, then how shall the Council function, if it's already been determined what we are going to do. There are other opportunities in the field of Jewish education and to me represent professionalism that can't be ignored and that certainly must be taken into the equation if we are to make maximum use of existing professionals. That is the 4,000 member CAJE Organization of teachers who are the heart of Jewish education in this country. I therefore find it a little disturbing, since this is one of things that I brought up from the very beginning and so did Mandel, Berman, and a few other people and its never been mentioned again. I think it's rather disturbing that the decisions have been made as to what direction the Commission will move. When I have been under the impression myself that there would be task forces and there would be a great deal of work done before such determinations would be made.

MUM: Thank you Florence. You know CAJE has been involved in some of our deliberations.

Maurice Corson: I share Steve's that the of major Jewish philanthropic resources from family foundations is a very significant and potentially a very blessed development in the North

American Jewish Community. I must tell you, however, that having been involved in this process of developing with a family a major Jewish philanthropic foundation, I am standing in great fear that a precedent is being established that will for the North American Jewish Community. Every time a major issue emerges, one could make the same rationale for setting up a new instrumentality that will comfortably serve as an umbrella for those families and individuals to come together and to solicit from them and elicit from them financial support to address a problem in Jewish life and thereby creating a precedent for bypassing the organized Jewish community and its instrumentalities. Soviet Jury, Operation Exodus, is a major concern. It would seem to me that UJA would scream bloody murder if the Jewish families got together and wanted to create their own instrumentality, independent of UJA. UJA has the power to prevent that or discourage that or to express its point of view. Similarly, on Israel issues, it would seem to me to be counterproductive for there to be a new and separate instrumentality created. Now, the argument for doing that in favor of Jewish education is I think a real argument, but I think it establishes a precedent that I hope will not be followed in other issues and I don't think needs to be followed in this situation, as well. It seems to me that there are alternative ways of encouraging major philanthropic support, transfusions of significant resources to help address problems of Jewish education without setting up what I submit again for that broken record that I am will become not a one of two man staff but a separate bureaucracy. I point out, it will be tied institutionally and accountable to the larger Jewish community. I think that's an unfortunate development, although I understand your reasoning.

Esther Leah Ritz: I am astounded to hear what I just heard. If there was

ever an issue which required a mobilization with the elements involved in the proposed Council, it is Jewish education. If there were ever a proposed structure the Voluntary Foundation Community to the organizational structure of the North American Jewish Community, it is the proposed Council. I have heard the endorsements of the 3 major elements, JESNA, JCC Association, CJF - I know of CJF's involvement. Mort reported at any number of quarterlies and general assemblies on the process that has been going on here. This is not happening outside the framework of the American Jewish Community. It is happening within it. As far as UJA is concerned, it has a charge which is to raise and coordinate the fund raising for the NUJA for overseas Jewish needs. That is its responsibility. It is not in control of the North American Jewish Community and I wouldn't ask question one about addressing the problems of Jewish education in North America. They're not in this business. It's not their affair. I am entirely comfortable with the relationship between this enterprise and the organized Jewish community and especially thrilled with the connection between those organizational structures in the North American Jewish Community and the Jewish Foundation Community to try to develop some coherence, rationality, some creativity mobilizing those elements to address what is a major problem of survival of the Jewish Community.

Haskel Lookstein: At the risk of disagreeing with Rabbi Corson, with whom I have basically been agreeing most of the time, I have to go with my colleague ^{Esther} Leah Ritz. As I was listening to Steve Hoffman present this, he moved so smoothly and quickly through the report on the Council that maybe there was another part here that Leah didn't mention and which I think shows that this particular Commission may be different from all the other Commissions. That is that it has been very carefully

organized to try to pull together many different parts of the community.. The organized community is you talked about, but there's Orthodox, there's conservative, reformed, there are the major Rabbinic training centers.. It's geographically representative.. Without trying to guild a lily, I think its a superbly developed commission and I don't think we have to worry so much about this. If the Council will reflect that kind of balance, there really is no need for this to be a precedent for other things. I agree with you on that - iff it's a precedent for going off with all kinds of councils for all kinds off issues God only help us.. This is unique and I think it is being done with a lot off good safeguards and if the safeguards continue it should be very productive and effective, hopefully resulting in some blessing for all of us.

Robert Abramson:: The Council must succeed. It's at that and the Council is our best chance to move forward. I would respectfully submit that if it's going to succeed, it must engage from the outset those institutions and organizations responsible for the delivery of resources and services. The synagogues, which I am involved in, are vitally responsive, but they must be a or else we are going to be dealing with undoing that process for a long time.

Morton L Mandell:: There's no question about that and there are a lot of things yet ahead of us, but I couldn't agree more.

David Hirschhorn: I wonder why on page 71 where you identify organizations that are full partners, why wouldn't you consider the national organizations representing the various synagogue movements?

Morton L Mandell:: As I read this, it does not mean these should be the only partners, but because they have been part of us historically, I guess as we drafted this ...

Hirschhorn: By its absence it stands out you wonder why it is not

identified.

Fred Gottschalk: I think you intimated it, but you didn't state it exclusively as part of your process of interviewing. The delivery systems -- I know you called a special meeting to meet with the leaders of the Reform Movements Delivery System, so there was consultation on level. I know it's also true for the conservative movement, so there's no presumption that they were excluded.

Morton L. Mandel:: Is there anyone we didn't get to this morning because we abruptly quit that has anything that they feel because they didn't get the floor that they would like to say? If not, I'd like to take a few minutes on the and welfare, mainly to give you chance for the guidance of the Council and also if you have anything else to say because this will be the last formal business meeting we will have.

John Colman: One of the things that this Commission has had is an immense array of [next part lost while tape was turned over] in a way that will almost be a training for communities to draw upon these resources. If you think about lay leaders and communal institutions trying to replicate on a local level what's been done here on a national level, this is the case history that people ought to be able to draw upon.

Robert Hirt: I think it might be helpful, prior to any larger launching meeting being held, for the family foundations that are already on board as well as the potential lead communities to receive advance copies of the report and to be visited by members of the Commission and by some members of the professional staff so they could be included in that meeting. I think it would go much further than having a meeting and then sending the report out. People would feel closer to it and would have a chance to comment and that initial meeting would already elicit comments of people who are participating rather than for the to be upon you to say

this is what's going to happen. Just to have the presence of those people will generate a kind of enthusiasm, even if it's not ready in September. If you had 40 people from around the country who didn't participate. If they were coming in very early and knew all about the report we'd generate much more a positive feeling than having a question that took 2 years around this table to not be raised. I think it would leave people walking away somewhat tentative.

Josh Elkkin: I want to echo John's point about writing up a case study about the process, but specifically in terms of the papers that were commissioned which I take from the scope of the report that is spoken about. Those papers will not be included in that report. I would just say, just from conversations with people involved in the Conservative Movement, in the United Synagogue Commission on Jewish education and the school, there's great interest in the research documents that have been generated. I think that they, in and of themselves, represent a tremendous contribution and I hope that they will be available.

Irving Greenberg: There was this morning and I still hear this afternoon some confusion about the term lead community that I think should be underscored here which is that it's not just the top communities that are now beating a path to Jewish education. I think it's very important that we allow a community to elect itself. It seems to me that's a very important contribution here to get people aspiring to the lead communities.

Sara Lee: I just want to go back to something professor Lipset said. I think it's an important differentiation. Namely, the crisis we're talking about that has brought us together is a crisis this community faces in regards to Jewish Continuity of which Jewish education is not the perpetrator, but victim. I wouldn't use those terms, but I think it would

be very important because ultimately what is done in this Council will be to empower Jewish education and to support and enhance all that is good in Jewish education. If that differentiation as to what the crisis is is not made, it sounds as if the crisis is something which Jewish education has engendered as apposed to being a crisis of our contemporary condition. I think that's a very, very important point that should not be lost as an introduction to this document.

Secondly, what gives us hope is the inclusion of a vision of what might be if we could address that crisis in very positive terms. I just want to push that again, both in terms of the writing of the document and the spirit that moves our deliberations.

Florence Melton:: I want to support what Sara Lee has just said in very concrete terms. I would like to see the report start out with the condition of Jewish education in North America, then a presentation of the results of the different research papers that spell out how the teachers themselves are dissatisfied, unhappy, and feel incomplete as teachers in their training opportunities. I would like it to present the dissatisfaction of the training centers with their constraints and limitations. I would like to spell out how the communities feel in terms of what's available to them as far as professionalism is concerned and what their problems are with recruitment. All these things should be in the condition of Jewish education. Then, from the research papers which tell the truth about what's happening. Then the vision.

Seymour Martin Lipset:: I don't know if it makes any sense or not, but I was associated with another commission on higher education which was chaired by a master of public relations, Clark Kerr. Every report they put out they got on the front page of the New York Times. The way we did it was never having a meeting in New York. They were always released in

Houston, Los Angeles. There's no national news in those places so the New York Times let the papers have reporters there who were dying for stories, whereas in New York they're just overwhelmed with all the other news.

Haskel Lookstein: I always like to speak tachlitically and that Professor Lipset's idea is terrific. I would like to recommend that the report be released in Hawaii.

Concluding comments by Rabbi Isadore Twersky