



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  
1989

CJENA commissioner interviews and summaries,  
1988-1990.

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

---

quotes/10mn-w  
January 4, 1989

Box + ( 3py 10  
Fox

## Possible quotes to be included in the final report

### About the Commission

Rabbi Haskel Lookstein, letter of Aug. 8, 1988:

"Just the possibility of working together with so many fine minds and so many committed people of varied religious outlooks is extremely inspiring. We all have many common goals, and to think that we can sit down and work on them together, despite our philosophic differences, is something which ought to be quite obvious but which, unfortunately, in our Jewish world, is not."

Eli Evans, letter of Aug. 16, 1988:

"I always admire risk-taking in philanthropy and more than that, real leadership; they are both rare commodities these days. You [MLM] convened a wonderful meeting and I want to congratulate you for taking the chance on launching it for an adroit choice of members. It was refreshing to watch the professionals and the lay leadership listening to each other . . . ."

David Arnow, interview of Feb. 2, 1989:

"Wouldn't it be wonderful if things Jewish tasted more comfortable; if parents were interested in this whole business; if the outcome of the work of the Commission would lead to a situation where Jews did not regard "continuity or not" as the main question, but the content of Judaism were the main concern? Today we have to deal with both."

Sara Lee, interview of July 8, 1988:

"We have to address the "meta issues" of Jewish education. What is the Piaget of Jewish education? We must, once and for all, tell the truth about what we think could happen with formal education, informal education, camping, the Israel experience, etc. Only when everyone knows what is likely to happen in each of these institutions are we likely to introduce serious change."

Robert Loup, interview of July 18, 1988:

"There is no future for American Jewry without a sustained effort to reach the unaffiliated geared at offering young people positive reasons to choose to be Jewish in an open society."

Matthew Maryles,, interview of July 1, 1988:

"The problem of Jewish education is too large for any one group. Only through a partnership can we hope to legitimize the pluralism within and between Jewish communities. The partnership has to occur between the religious and the non-religious institutions and organizations that make up the national Jewish community."1

Same:

"Jewish values are being undermined by broader societal trends. Twenty years ago this would not have been as apparent. . . . there is a belief and apprehension among parents that Jewish children will choose a competing value system. . . . Jewish education has to be packaged appropriately to be used by all segments of the community. The challenge is to have parents perceive Jewish education as a real option. If parents don't participate, they have to believe they are cheating their children."1

### Personnel

Recruitment:

Rabbi Haskel Lookstein, interview of Aug. 3, 1988:

"Every time we loose a teacher I shudder, because it is impossible to find a good replacement. I don't know how to do it. Salaries do make a difference, but I don't know how to handle the problem of quality."

Training:

Rabbi Jack Bieler, letter of Oct. 16, 1988:

"The dichotomy made in most rabbinic schools between training for the pulpit Rabbinate and the area of Jewish education might need serious study, for this might lie at the seat of many of the problems regarding Jewish education within the affiliated community. . . . How to assure a constructive partnership rather than a continuing adversary relationship is an interesting dilemma that the Commission can ill-afford to overlook."

Profession Building:

Rabbi Haskel Lookstein, letter of Aug. 8, 1988:

"The worst thing is is to have excellent teachers feel that in order to get ahead financially they have to become adminisstrators.. Frequently,, the best teachers make poor aministrators.. But even if they turn out to be good,, we have lost an excellent teacher in the classroom."

Same:

"If we don't do the basic financial work,, however,, everything else is going to be less productive.. We simply will not have the people to train,, to improve,, to empower and to elevate."

Dr. Alvin Schiff,, letter of Aug. 5, 1988:

"Upgrading the workplace carries with it the need to increase possibilities for professional advancement and for career opportunities as well as more meningful professional experience."

## Community

### Leadership:

Rabbi Jack Bieler, letter of Oct. 16, 1988:

"Professional and lay leadership for the Jewish community can be expected to come at least in part if not primarily from those receiving more intensive Jewish educations.. If the teachers at the secondary school level are not equipped to offer the most challenging and sophisticated form of Jewish learning, and instead, as so often in the case, even discourage many of their students from taking Judaism and Jewish learning seriously, a crucial resource of the North American Jewish community will not have been properly serviced."

Rober Loup, interview of Oct. 19, 1988:

"If the leadership of the community is not educated Jewishly, they will not be committed to Jewish education. I believe that one of the reasons that kids do not attend education programs is because their parents choose not to offer them this possibility. Who will deal with the development of Jewish education if we do not have educated leadership?"

Dr. Alvin Schiff, interview of Nov. 3, 1988:

You cannot have effective leadership unless people have a sense of the cognitive dimensions of Judaism."

Sara Lee, interview of July 8, 1988:

"If you send a gifted educator to a supportive community, then great things can happen."

## Options

### Israel:

Charles Bronfman, interview of July 4, 1988:

"I am concerned about Jews waking up in the morning and feeling happy about the fact that they are Jewish. Israel is a great resource for that."

Robert Loup, interview of July 18, 1988:

Informal education and the Israel experience are the best tools to offer a worthwhile, fun and exciting first Jewish educational experience to young people. Such an experience can be the basis on which to build subsequent involvement.

### Camping:

Rabbi Haskel Lookstein, letter of Aug. 8, 1988:

"If there is a Foundation which wants to make a very significant contribution to Jewish education, the training of leaders, the development of a love for klal Yisrael and the land and people of Israel and to do it all in a Hebrew setting and in a camp which runs according to halakha but which is hospitable to people who are not full observant, [Camp Massad] ought to be resurrected."

### Informal education:

Rabbi Irving Greenberg, interview of July 5, 1988:

"Informal educational institutions can, in a short period, have a major influence on people's Jewish future. This is being demonstrated and has been demonstrated for forty years. Yet these institutions have not been multiplied. Our society is increasingly open to informal education beyond childhood. These kinds of programs should be multiplied because adults will respond to them."

### Family education:

Dr. Alvin Schiff, letter of Aug. 5, 1988:

The need to develop family support systems for pupils is absolutely essential if Jewish education is to become more effective. This means a knowledgeable adult base for our Jewish child education."

### Supplementary school:

Peggy Tishman, interview of July 5, 1988:

"As long as Sunday school is something you have to live through rather than enjoy it cannot be valuable. So much of Jewish America has an impoverished Sunday school experience as its only Jewish education."

### Evaluation

David Hirschhorn, letter of Aug. 11, 1988:

"The Commission would be making an important contribution if the methodology for such evaluation [of programs in Jewish

education] could be developed. Many programs are being undertaken with unclear objectives as to what the program is intended to achieve. How are we to measure success or failure? . steps are taken to provide for greater accountability in the use of these funds."



## Suggestions

Lookstein, letter of Aug 8, 1988:

Children of day school teachers (Judaic and general studies) should be allowed to study in that day school for free or in another day school for half the tuition ((the school in which the parent teaches should pay the other half)).

Same::

Resurrect Camp Massad.

Bieler, letter of Oct. 16, 1988:

Yeshiva high schools should be a priority for the attention of BJE's. Currently, teachers' centers, conferences, specialists are concerned primarily with supplementary schools or the lower schools of day schools.

Same::

Creation of stipends for teachers to attend national conferences and incentives that would encourage schools to release staff members to participate. A rotation system should be created in schools where different individuals are given the opportunity to attend such conferences and then subsequently make a presentation to their colleagues in the school. Teachers of Jewish subjects would also benefit from the opportunity to attend conferences dealing with general education issues as well as Jewish studies scholarship in order to provide them with exposure to high-level thinking and potentially infuse them with fresh ideas.

Same:

A society of master teachers should be created, not only to recognize excellence, but to allow these individuals to make recommendations, develop innovations, serve as models, etc. Regular meetings of such a group would provide encouragement to the members themselves.

Same:

Apprenticeships for teacher training, where the trainee would be assigned to work with a master teacher who has demonstrated an ability to train teachers. Serious supervision.

Same::

Create joint day and supplementary school positions. This would enhance the quality, diversity and professional spirit of faculty



and give educators a fuller sense of involvement in the overall community and Jewish institutions.

Same:

A curriculum institute/think tank staffed by teachers which would provide classroom teachers with opportunities to work on curricular projects in tandem on a communal-wide level or national basis. Teachers ought to be empowered to develop units for their schools and to present to others..

Same:

Hebrew language training for Jewish educators.. In order to not depend on shlichim or yordim,, an effort must be made to provide educators in the field (or going into the field) with higher level of fluency in Hebrew..

Rabbi Alfred Gottschalk,, interview of July 5,, 1988::

"The most practical thing we could do would be to build some kind of an institute or think tank where the best minds in the Jewish world,, and the best minds of JEws who are not involved in Jewish education - social scientists,, humanists,, ect.. - would sit together and deliberate on the values that we want Jewish children and their parents to internalize..

Prof. Isadore Twersky,, interview of July 5,, 1988::

Matching grants to institutions to reward excellence.. ((ala Ford Foundation))

Rabbi Josh Elkin, interview of Dec.5, 1988::

Help Jewish educators learn to work more comfortably with lay leaders; build local cooperation between lay and professional leaders; improve the public image of Jewish education by involving lay leaders.

Lainer 111-88/2MN-W

Brom 10/90-2MN-W

THE COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA  
TOWARDS THE SECOND MEETING OF THE COMMISSION  
INTERVIEW OF COMMISSIONERS

1. COMMISSIONER 5 MARK LAINER

2. INTERVIEWER: SEYMOUR FOX

3. DATE: NOVEMBER 1, 1988

4. SPIRIT: VERY COMMITTED & ENTHUSIASTIC

5. SETTING: HOTEL IN JERUSALEM

6. DURATION: 1 HOUR

7. COMMISSIONER'S CURRENT STAND:

A. PERSONNELS SUPPORT

B. COMMUNITY ENTHUSIASTIC SUPPORT, CLAIMS THAT ALL THE  
OTHER OPTIONS DEPEND ON IT,

8. SUMMARY:

IT WAS VERY USEFUL MEETING WITH LAINERs A> TO BRING HIM UP  
TO DATE, AND B> TO CONTINUE TO BUILD ON HIS INITIAL ENTHUSIASM  
AND COMMITMENT. HE LISTENED CAREFULLY AS I REVIEWED THE METHOD,  
PARTICULARLY THE CRITERIA AND WAS ABSOLUTELY STUNNED BY THE  
AMOUNT OF WORK AND THE NUMBER OF CONSULTATIONS THAT HAD TAKEN  
PLACE. HE KNOWS MANY OF THE PEOPLE LIKE SARA LEE, INTIMATELY,  
ALVIN SCHIFF, AND WALTER ACKERMAN- AND THE FACT THAT THESE PEOPLE  
WERE INVOLVED IN EARLY STAGES MAKE A BIG DIFFERENCE IN HIS  
THINKING.

HE WAS CONCERNED ABOUT THE FACT THAT RABBI ZELDIN AND RABBI  
SCHULWEISS MAY NOT BE PLANNING TO COME ON THE 13TH. SO I THINK  
THIS DESERVES A VERY SPECIAL INTERVENTION, POSSIBLY A PHONE CALL  
BY ONE OR SEVERAL OF US.

HE MADE AN IMPORTANT DISTINCTION WHICH ADDS ADDITIONAL  
STRENGTH TO THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN PROGRAMMATIC AND PRE-  
CONDITIONS: HIS CLAIM IS THAT ONLY A COMMISSION LIKE THIS COULD  
UNDERTAKE THE MACRO ISSUES, WHICH IS ANOTHER WAY IN WHICH HE  
TALKS ABOUT PRE-CONDITIONS.

HE FEELS THAT THIS COMMISSION COULD CHANGE THE CLIMATE IN  
THE JEWISH COMMUNITY AND THOUGH HE IS COMMITTED TO PERSONNEL,

HE IS NOT AS ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT THAT, FOR HE THINKS THAT LOS ANGELES' PERSONNEL PROBLEM IS SERIOUS, BUT NOT AS CRITICAL AS IN OTHER PLACES IN THE WORLD."

HE WAS VERY IMPRESSED WITH MR. MANDEL'S DECISION TO MAKE IT CLEAR SEVERAL TIMES DURING THE MEETING THAT THE COMMISSION BELONGED TO THE COMMISSIONERS, AND WAS PLEASED THAT WE WERE TAKING ALL OF THESE STEPS SO THAT THERE WAS NO "RIGGING" OF THE DECISION PROCESS. HE THOUGHT IT WOULD BE USEFUL FOR MR. MANDEL TO LAY OUT AT THE BEGINNING OF THE MEETING THE WAY THAT THIS MEETING MIGHT PROGRESS AND TO REMIND THE COMMISSIONERS AT APPROPRIATE TIMES THAT THE COMMISSION WAS THEIRS. HE ASKED QUESTIONS ABOUT HOW WOULD WE PROCEED POST THE DECISION, THOUGHT THE IDEA OF TASK-FORCES OR COMMITTEES WAS A GOOD IDEA, AND WAS HOPING THAT THE SAME KIND OF STAFF WORK WOULD ACCOMPANY THE NEXT STEPS."

HE SAW IT VERY USEFUL FOR US TO BRING THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THOSE CITIES THAT HAVE COMMISSIONS TOGETHER, TO MEET AT SOME POINT, BOTH TO GIVE INPUT TO THE WORK OF OUR COMMISSION, AND TO BE KEPT IN SYNC WITH OUR WORK.

HE PLANS TO BE AT THE MEETING ON THE 13TH.



THE COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA

HOWARD'S THE SECOND MEETING OF THE COMMISSION

INTERVIEW OF COMMISSIONERS

1. COMMISSIONER: ISADORE TWERSKY
2. INTERVIEWER: SEYMOUR FOX
3. DATE: OCTOBER 13, 1988
4. SPIRIT: VERY POSITIVE AND INVOLVED
5. SETTING: DR. TWERSKY'S OFFICE AT HARVARD UNIVERSITY
6. DURATION: 1 HOUR
7. COMMISSIONER'S CURRENT STAND:

ACCEPT THE IDEA OF THE PERSONNEL AND THE COMMUNITY AS A GOOD WAY TO START THE WORK OF THE COMMISSION»

8. SUMMARY:

MOST OF THE MEETING WAS DEVOTED TO A SUMMARY OF HOW WE HAVE PROCEEDED FROM THE LAST COMMISSION MEETING. I WENT THROUGH THE OPTIONS, THE CRITERIA, THE ASSUMPTIONS THAT GUIDED THE GENERATION OF THE OPTIONS, AND INDICATED HOW THEY WERE APPLIED.

I SUMMARIZED OUR MEETINGS IN CLEVELAND AND TOLD HIM THAT WE WERE SUGGESTING TWO SETS OF OPTIONS NECESSARY, OR MEANS OPTIONS, AND PROGRAMMATIC OPTIONS.

HE THOUGHT THAT DISTINCTION WAS A GOOD ONE AND IT WOULD BE GOOD TO BEGIN WITH THE TWO OPTIONS THAT WE HAVE SUGGESTED.

I BELIEVE THAT HE WILL WANT TO BE VERY ACTIVE ON ANY KIND OF MECHANISM WE ESTABLISH SUCH AS A TASK-FORCE, ETC.

HE TOLD ME THAT HE WAS BEING FUNDED BY WEXNER AT HARVARD TO CREATE A PROGRAM ON JEWISH EDUCATION AND ASKED TO FURTHER CONSULT WITH ME ON THAT MATTER. THIS OF COURSE WAS MENTIONED TO ME EARLIER IN A CONVERSATION WITH PROF. ISIDORE SCHEFFLER.



MAY 03 '89 11:21- NATIV CONSULTANTS

972 2 699551

P.6/8

**TOWARDS THE THIRD COMMISSION MEETING  
INTERVIEW OF COMMISSIONERS**

76I

**COMMISSIONER NAME:** DAVID HIRSCHORN

**INTERVIEWER:** PROF. SEYMOUR FOX

**DATE:** APRIL 3, 1989

**PLACE:** BALTIMORE, MD.

Summary:

I had a meeting with Mr. Hirschorn at the Blaustein Building in Baltimore where we discussed the ideas he had presented at the previous Commission meeting on the importance of research and evaluation.

This was a very enjoyable three-hour meeting and I will give a more complete report after I see Mr. Hirschorn again on May 3th.

I did begin to sketch the concept of demonstration site and the need for some implementation instrumentality to help build and develop the demonstration site.

I discovered that Mr. Hirschorn is particularly interested in the work of the Reform Movement, and I believe that his foundation, and he personally, would be very much interested in participating actively in the work of the Commission and in its outcomes.

MAY 03 '89 20:09 NATIV CONSULTANTS

972 2 69951

P.5/8

## TOWARDS THE THIRD COMMISSION MEETING

## INTERVIEW OF COMMISSIONERS

COMMISSIONER NAME: PROF. MARTIN LIPSET

INTERVIEWER: PROF. SEYMOUR FOX

DATE: APRIL 5, 1989

PLACE: RUSSELL SAGE FOUNDATION

SUMMARY:

I had a very enjoyable hour and a half with Prof. Lipset. I took him through the steps of the work of the Commission since the meeting in December to where we are today.

I went through the concept of the demonstration site very carefully. He asked some very important questions, particularly concerning the personnel for supplementary schools. Again, he brought up his concern about us leaving out the college-age, the Millel Foundation group. I think that he understood the necessity for an implementation instrumentality and I began to sketch some of the possibilities there. At that point, he brought up the importance of research and made a very reasonable argument for the kind of research which should accompany the it and would help us make decisions more intelligently.

He has the meeting of the 14th of June on his calendar and I believe that he will be very helpful, as he has been in the past.

MEMO TO: David Ariel, Seymour Fox, Mark Gurvis, Annette Hochstein,  
Stephen H. Hoffman, Martin S. Kraak, Morton L. Mandel,  
Joseph Reimer, Arthur Rotman, Herman D. Stein,  
Jonathan Woocher, Henry L. Zucker

FROM: Virginia F. Levi

DATE: October 6, 1956

.....

Attached, for your information, are reports on interviews of the following  
commissioners conducted by Jonathan Woocher, Joseph Reimer and Art Rotman.

1. Maurice Corson
2. Arthur Green
3. Daniel Shapiro



## REPORT ON INTERVIEW OF RABBI MAURICE GORSON - 10/4/89

(conducted by Jonathan Wrothier)

Rabbi Gorson is skeptical about the Community Action Site approach. He believes that a strategy of broad-based change through what will essentially be pilot projects is flawed in several respects:

1. Since the CAS will rely on extraordinary resources, replication in communities lacking those resources and even continuation in the CAS once the special resources are withdrawn program in Columbia to be representative of the... a relevant cautionary example,
2. Implementing the CAS will apparently be seen as requiring the creation of a new structure which is likely to be made permanent. This will be unnecessarily costly and duplicative. If the CAS strategy is to be followed, he suggests that implementation be done through a special desk

In general, he feels that the Commission has not yet reached out successfully to engage the critical grass roots delivery systems, especially the synagogues and their supplementary schools. They may have no investment in the findings and recommendations.

He also believes that insufficient emphasis has been given to examining existing structures and how to strengthen them: JESNA, the denominational commissions and departments, the bureaus of Jewish education. These are the agencies which together with the schools and other direct service providers are the delivery system (and will be so for the foreseeable future). Unless they are materially strengthened, the Commission will not have the desired impact.

MC feels that a "messianic" element has been creeping into the Commission's thinking. This has led to a shortchanging of many practical areas of intervention, e.g., advocating better compensation and benefit packages for teachers, including pension and health insurance, stipends for professional development, etc.

In looking ahead to October 23, MC hopes we will come away with:

- 1) a commitment not to build a new bureaucracy
- 2) a commitment to focus greater attention on and to involve directly the synagogue community and the campuses (an important lacuna in the Commission's work thus far)
- 3) more attention given to how to upgrade professionalism and self-esteem of educators, which he sees as a national, not

MC expects to attend the meeting on October 23.

JOSEPH REIMER

9/27/89

- CONVERSATIONS WITH ARTHUR GREEN

Rabbi Green and I met during August and discussed the Commission. I called today to check in again.

Arthur's main concern is with pacing. He admits to being impatient and new to this process, but wonders why the pace feels slow-moving. As his colleague Prof. Tversky, Green believes reflection is for academics and action should be the mode for the Commission. He fully favors the Community action approach and would like to see us begin its implementation by setting up reasonable criteria by which sites could be selected. He continues to favor setting up a multiplicity of sites. He fears that if we delay starting implementation, the Commission will lose momentum. He does not have much interest in discussing the final report or research papers.

Rabbi Green will attend on October 23, and was honored to be asked to deliver the d'var Torah.



16 EAST 34th STREET NEW YORK, N.Y. 10010-1670

September 28, 1989

Date of Interview: September 27, 1989

Interview with: Daniel Shapiro, \*

Location: New York City \*

Interviewer: Art Rotman

Duration: 45 minutes

### North American Commission on Jewish Education

Daniel Shapiro, New York City. Duration: 45 minutes

Shortly before the interview started, Dan Shapiro had determined that it would not be possible for him to attend the next meeting. While he was still interested in providing his input, I could not help but detect less of an interest in the meeting itself, since he knew he would not be there.

#### Continuing Mechanism

Shapiro recognizes that there should be a continuing mechanism to monitor and coordinate the efforts in the individual communities. At some point in the interview, he felt that the Commission should be that continuing entity, since it had worked so well up to now and since the group was so cohesive. At another point in the interview, he felt that to do so would be to run the risk of creating another national coordinating agency, which would be duplicating the work of the existing national agencies. After discussion back and forth, he finally came to the conclusion, which he would like to recommend to the Commission, that it continue, but meet only once a year in an "overseer" capacity. The actual responsibility for the coordination should be assumed by a separate operating entity with its own Board of Directors, with fewer members than the current Commission and associated with JESNA and JWB in the same way as the Commission. This operating board would meet perhaps three or four times a year and would have responsibility for hiring staff and for making ongoing policy decisions. It would take guidance from the successor to the Commission and keep the "large overseer" Commission informed.

### Community Action Sites

The approach of having demonstrations in particular communities appeals to Shapiro. He suggested that we limit it to no more than two or, at the maximum, three such sites. The incremental value beyond that number decreases and there is the risk of the entire structure becoming unwieldy. Care should be taken to provide a geographic spread so that the sites are not all concentrated in one area. Consideration should also be given to size of community, with at least one site amongst the larger communities, such as Boston, and another in a smaller community, such as New Haven or Rochester. We should also be careful to insure that there is a spread in relative "sophistication", avoiding the most sophisticated and developed communities and, on the other hand, avoiding as well those that are at the other end of the spectrum in sophistication and development. That is, the Community Action Site would not have difficulty in getting established; on the other hand, to select a community which had highly developed infrastructure would mean selecting a community which is atypical and difficult to replicate. Consideration should also be given to the potential for local community financial support, since he assumes that such support would be a requirement.

Based on his New York experience, Shapiro suggests that we make every effort to involve the Orthodox, even though this might be difficult. He was very interested to hear about the prospect of Moshe Mandel and Rabbi Norman Lamm, convening a group of the Orthodox re the work of the Commission. Efforts should be made to involve all elements in the community, recognizing, of course, that it may not be possible to bring in some of the more extreme groups.

### Summary

Dan Shapiro is very positive about the work of the Commission. He feels that it is an excellent group and is pleased to be a part of it. He thinks that the potential for making a major breakthrough is there but cautions that there is a great deal of difficult work before this can be achieved.

TOWARDS THE THIRD COMMISSION MEETING

INTERVIEW OF COMMISSIONERS

COMMISSIONER NAME: MS. MONA ACKERMAN

INTERVIEWER: PROF. STEPHEN FOX

DATE: MAY 5, 1989 — 1:00 P.M.

PLACE: NEW YORK CITY YORK CITY

Summary:

Mona Ackerman is very excited about the work of the Commission, thinks that it will serve as a catalyst, as for all activities in Jewish education. Her main interest is in model day care, early childhood -- which she sees day care as related to family education, as well.

She believes that a rationale has to be developed of why Jewish continuity can be built in the day care, and that's something she'd like to be involved in.

She would be happy to participate in a sub-group of the funders. She certainly thinks the funders should be brought together. She was very concerned, and brought this up several times, that the funding be thought about before we go into a demonstration site. She understood the idea of demonstration site quickly and thought that her own day care interests could find their expression there.

She then brought up something which I imagine will accompany us throughout our work. She says == I have to make a large contribution in New York City. If your demonstration site could have something to do with my work in New York City, I can give a



great deal of money.. If I am going to go outside of New York City,, I don't know how much money I can give.. She made it clear she would be willing to give money to that..

She thought all the funders should be asked to contribute some money now to a feasibility study about the demonstration\*site.. She said,, "if anyone of the funders is not ready to contribute, they ought to be thrown off the Commission."

She is the first person I met who asked us to serve as broker for her.. She asked us particularly to meet with Schiff and work out with him what her role could be in New York City in the area of day care.. Schiff had mentioned something to me about this and now I understand that he has been negotiating with her as well.. She thought that we could be brokers without a vested interest and could represent her in terms of content..

She also asked that we be in touch with Kathy Hat who is her right arm on the foundation..

She seems to be fairly close to Eli Evans and she is ready to join small groups.. She has some problems about the meeting on the 14th,, because her son is graduating from Ramah that same day.. I think if we remind her and encourage her to come,, she will come to all or most of the meeting..

Again,, here we are reminded of how important it is to get the funders together..

I think that she also must be met with regularly to keep her on board..

## REPORT ON MEETING WITH LESTER POLLACK,, 6/1/89

Submitted by Jonathan Weesher

I met with Lester Pollack in his office. Despite missing the last Commission meeting, Lester appeared very positive about and committed to the work of the Commission.

I reviewed the development of the Commission's agenda, and especially the decision to focus on the areas of personnel and community support. He understood and accepted the rationale for this decision. He raised the question, however, of why, if so many other major substantive areas continue to merit attention, the Commission should not be an ongoing venture. The Commission's goals and the issues of Jewish educational change will remain relevant for quite some time. Therefore, he suggested, the work on personnel and community support might only be the first phase of its activity. He also raised the issue of trying to spawn local replicas of the Commission to continue the work, much in the way in which local JCCs established Maximizing Jewish Life by the model of the JWB commission.

I outlined the current thinking regarding a possible mechanism for carrying the work of the Commission into implementation. He strongly agreed that the Commission must produce more than a report. He was less interested in the details of the proposed implementation mechanism. He indicated that at this point he felt the Commission must focus on the substance of what it wishes to say, and that it would be sufficient for Mort to state that the issue of implementation was very much on the minds of the planning group, that a report would not be the final product, and, perhaps, to set up a small group of commissioners to look in more detail at implementation options with a mandate to report back at some subsequent meeting.

He felt that the meeting on June 14 should focus on substance, not process. He suggested that proposed "chapter headings" of a final report be presented by staff for discussion. These would outline the major issues in the two areas the commission will focus on. Assuming agreement is reached on the topics which the report should cover, he suggested that the Commission subsequently divide into sub-groups, each of which would assume responsibility for one of the major sections. Papers would be prepared for discussion by these groups, and the groups would eventually report back to the Commission as a whole with drafts of the sections.

Lester will be at the Commission meeting on June 14, although he



TO: Arthur J. Naperstek FROM: Henry L. Zucker DATE: 5/11/89  
Victor J. Flayl NAME: APZ  
 REPLYING TO  
 YOUR MEMO OF: \_\_\_\_\_

SUBJECT: COMMISSION INTERVIEW WITH RABBI MAURICE CORSON  
 ON MAY 11, 1989, ONE HOUR AT THE LAGUARDIA AIRPORT  
 AND IN THE LIMOUSINE ON THE WAY TO HIS NEW YORK OFFICE  
 LARRY MOSES PARTICIPATED IN SOME OF THE INTERVIEW

Corson is skeptical about the mechanism to follow up the findings of the Commission. He believes that Seymour Fox knew before the Commission was organized what sort of follow-up mechanism should be developed. Corson believes that while there is need of a follow-up mechanism, it is not a good idea to establish a new KJB agency. Rather, the function should be assigned to JESNA.

The Wexner Foundation would not support an independent MJE. It probably would support a JESNA department for the same purpose.

Corson is very touchy on the idea of financial support of the Commission's recommendations because he made it clear in advance that in joining the Commission, he was not implying that Wexner would take on a financial obligation to support the Commission's findings. I made it clear that all financial support for ideas which emerge from the Commission would be strictly on a volunteer basis. Participating foundations would take on financial support in areas in which they have a specific interest.

Corson commented that there are serious splits in the organizational functioning of all three denominations, and that this will probably have a negative effect on the ability of the denominations to be helpful in carrying out ideas developed by the Commission. For example, anything recommended by the Hebrew Union College is likely to be ignored or opposed by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

In general, Corson was supportive of the work of the Commission. He believes it will produce a report which will have substantial influence on Jewish education. He made it clear that the Wexner Foundation has a deep interest in Jewish education and is already supporting major efforts in this field and will continue to do so.

TOWARDS THE THIRD COMMISSION MEETING

INTERVIEW OF COMMISSIONERS

COMMISSIONER NAME: DR. MONA ACKERMAN

INTERVIEWER: SEYMOUR FOX

DATE: MAY 5, 1989 -- 1:00 P.M.

PLACE: NEW YORK CITY

Summary:

Mona Ackerman is very excited about the work of the Commission and thinks that it will serve as a catalyst for all activities in Jewish education. Her main interest is in model early childhood day care, which she sees as related to family education.

She believes that a rationale has to be developed of why Jewish continuity can be built through day care, and that's something she'd like to be involved in.

She would be happy to participate in a sub-group of the funders. She certainly thinks the funders should be brought together and was very concerned, and brought this up several times, that the funding be thought about before we go into a demonstration site. She understood the idea of demonstration site quickly and thought that her own day care interests could find their expression there.

She then brought up something which I imagine will accompany us throughout our work. She said that she has to make a large contribution in New York City. "If your demonstration site could have something to do with my work in New York City, I can give a great deal of money. If it is going to be outside of New York City, I don't know how much money I can give."

She thought all the funders should be asked to contribute some money now to a feasibility study about the demonstration site. She said, "If any one of the funders is not ready to contribute, they ought to be thrown off the Commission."

She is the first person who asked us to serve as a broker for her. She asked us particularly to meet with Dr. Alvin Schiff and work out with him what her role could be in New York City in the area of day care. Schiff had mentioned something to me about this and now I understand that he has been negotiating with her as well. She thought that we could be a broker without a vested interest and could represent her in terms of content.

She also asked that we be in touch with Kathy Hat who is her right arm on the foundation.

She seems to be fairly close to Eli Evans and she is ready to join small groups. She has some problems about the meeting on the 14th, because her son is graduating from Ramaz that same day. I think if we remind her and encourage her, she will come to all or most of the meeting.

Again, we are reminded of how important it is to get the funders together. I think that she also must be met with regularly to keep her on board.

REPORT ON INTERVIEW WITH HARRIET ROSENTHAL, 5/4/89 BY JONATHAN WOOCHEER

## I. IJE

HR found the concept as described exciting, although she wondered how the operational decisions would be made.

She sees evaluation as a significant issue, especially if the goal is to develop good, replicable models for other communities to emulate. Program impacts will need to be evaluated and measurable.

HR agrees that concentrating on one site (a la the Flexner report and Johns Hopkins) can push others to address their needs.

She also raised the question of whether and how the IJE will develop the conceptual base needed to guide the change process. Do the professional "experts," e.g., agree on universal standards for professional development? She is skeptical that the Commission could in fact agree on what is adequate training of Jewish educators. So what base of concepts will guide the IJE in its work? The diversity of the community also makes it difficult to devise universal personnel standards.

As a practical matter, she is also concerned about whether communities will buy into the scope and intensity of change which IJE might try to induce. When one seeks to introduce universal changes, there is often a tendency to retreat to the "tried and true" because it is much easier to build consensus around. Communities may not be prepared to make the degree of commitment -- financial and political -- which they will be expected to under this approach.

## II. Commission Process

HR feels the next meeting should focus first on the personnel issue. (When we need to, we can figure out how to market almost anything.)

We need the beginnings of a plan for how to develop the personnel we need. We should attempt to answer: What would constitute a "well-trained" teacher or administrator? Can such people teach all age groups? What would be a well-trained informal educator? Do we have the places available, locally, to train such individuals? We have to define who the personnel are and what training they need.

Ideally, we should develop a model of what a well-planned educational process would look like in a few communities. Based on the demographic profile, this is what we would need for a good educational system in community X, in terms of structures, support systems, funding, personnel, and lay leadership.

We might also ask what would constitute a well-educated Jewish child, perhaps by the time of Bar or Bat Mitzvah as what we would want for our own children.

INTERVIEW WITH  
LIONEL SCHIPPERARTHUR J. NAPARSTEK  
MAY 1, 1989

Lionel Schipper is very supportive of the Commission and its initiatives. However, he had not been invited to join the Commission until after the August 1st meeting and, because of a previously scheduled meeting, was not able to attend the December 13th meeting and will not be able to attend the June 14th meeting.

I asked Lionel if he agreed with the Commission's overall mandate to bring about systemic change and across-the-board impact on Jewish education through an across-the-board approach, both through formal and informal education. He agrees with that as an approach. He indicated that he would have difficulty with a continental or national initiative that would impact on the local level. He feels that what is needed is a variety of programs that would begin on the local level through congregations. He does not see the federation as a key mechanism locally. Instead, it would be the congregation or the local board of education.

If there was to be any mechanism, he would like to see a Canadian mechanism be established with a modest budget, be small, and be only institutionalized to initiate and motivate people. He went on to indicate that if there was criteria used to choosing a local community action site, the criteria should be organized around the congregation and individuals such as an activist rabbi. The rabbi would have to take the lead, engage the federation, and have the federation become supportive.

With regard to the question of quality, he went on to say that you have to have quality people monitor and evaluate it. With regard to the question of negotiations with existing institutions in the community, here again he feels that the institutions would be the board of education and the congregation. Only through getting that process going can you begin to think of appropriating funding sources. The funding for this would have to come from federations, but after the process was initiated.

With regard to monitoring and evaluation, he does not have an opinion but worries about quality. Innovations: he does see a national organization as being responsible for diffusion as well as networking. It cannot occur on a local level. With regard to how a central mechanism would work with a local community, here again he points to the quality of people.

Overall impression: Lionel Schipper is committed to the notion of Jewish education, but does not have focus on how to bring about change. The quality of the interview with him was very different than with those who have participated in Commission meetings.



INTERVIEW WITH  
ALVIN SCHIFF

ARTHUR J. NAPARSTEK  
MAY 3, 1989

Alvin Schiff has been very close to the process as he participated in the Jewish educators meeting of late March and was briefed at that time.

We began the discussion with Alvin talking about how national initiatives must tie into localities. He went on to say that the quality of what happens on the national level is dependent on the input from localities. Once a national mechanism develops guidelines, it has to implement them locally.

Alvin put forward a model that he has used in developing initiatives, both on a national basis as well as locally. He stated that the role of the national mechanism is first to develop plans; second, to validate these plans; third, to demonstrate the plans in program form through localities and; fourth, to replicate the plans throughout the country.

The remaining part of the interview dealt with a look at the functions that the IJE may fulfill:

1. Criteria for Choosing Community Action Site

What are the criteria for choosing a community action site? What size should it be? What are the important characteristics? Alvin's response on criteria was that it should not be seen as a Mandel initiative solely. He also feels that the mechanism should be located in New York as much of the resources are there. The first criteria is for us to determine whether the community has the ability to bring about change in personnel. He went on to say that it may not matter how big the community is, but whether or not it has critical mass, for example, does it have three or four schools? He feels that we should select communities that are both large, medium and small and to determine whether or not they have the infrastructure to bring about change. Infrastructure can be defined in terms of leadership, organization, etc.

2. Quality of Projects

How do we guarantee that the projects are of the quality the Commission aspires to? He feels the quality must come from the IJE and the relationship with the local community. We need to use a variety of techniques in order to receive ideas and proposals from local communities. He identified three ways of assessing that: (1) experimental programs that would be initiated by the IJE staff and





## REPORT ON INTERVIEW WITH YITZ GREENBERG, 4/28/89 BY JONATHAN WOCHER

## I.. IJE

YG raised the question of why an existing agency or consortium of agencies could not and should not play the role envisioned for the KJE.

He agrees that the strategy of seeking change at the local level is correct, but cautions that we should not underestimate the difficulty of achieving the high degree of coordination envisioned even at the local level. Institutions do not have a commonality of perspectives and interests. Thus, the strategy being projected may call for a level of organization greater than local institutions are currently capable of, and yet fall short of promoting change in the national arena. He is concerned that the process will become mired in politics, the least productive area if one is interested in educational change. In trying to encompass everything (in a community), nothing may be achieved.

In practical terms, he wondered where the educators would come from to implement the comprehensive approaches. YG feels that a different cut on the personnel problem, e.g., on developing and sustaining 100 new educators, through fellowships or a venture capital fund to support a "nurturing" network for talented individuals in the field who burn out too soon, might be more productive. Creating a structure for supporting 100 such educators would be worth \$15-20 million a year in terms of its impact.

Later, when the dynamics have changed and the talented people are out there, we can think in terms of coordinating more systemic change.

With respect to the building community leadership and support option, YG is concerned that the work of existing organizations like CLAL not be duplicated.

He is also concerned, on the other hand, about how to deal with the fact that existing structures are often mediocre. We can't just "pay them off" to secure their political cooperation. Qualitative judgments will have to be made.

In general, YG advocates that KAF make clear its commitment to fund new initiatives in one area, e.g., personnel, and try to convince other foundations represented on the Commission to take an area of their choosing -- either a project or a community. Once the initiatives are up and running, we can tackle the question of coordination.

YG does see the potential role of a "think tank" type instrument, although this is not his highest priority. One option would be to give the funds to an existing organization like SESNA to do this. If an independent entity is to be created (and YG is

concerned this may be premature), it should not be massive. There is also the question of where to locate such an entity. Brandeis or another non-denominational setting -- perhaps even Beit El -- is a possibility, and fellows could be brought in from the denominational institutions.

## II. Commission Process

The June meeting should focus on strategies for change. (If there are foundations already committed to certain initiatives, these should be incorporated.)

There should be papers in advance on strategies, assuming that several alternative models have been identified (my note: e.g., the IJE model and YG's proposal). These can be the focus for discussion.

There is no need to sell the personnel option at the meeting. The need is to convince others beside MIM to do their share, either with respect to this area or another of their choosing.

If we can agree on a model of how to create change, then the need is to discuss the substantive areas each will focus on. If there is disagreement on the "how," then we need to discuss the different models.

INTERVIEW WITH  
RONALD APPLEBY

ARTHUR J. NAPARSTEK  
MAY 1, 1989

I began the interview with a review of where we were at the end of the December 13th meeting and asked Ron if he agreed that the Commission came to a consensus on the personnel and community options as enabling and preconditions in relationship to the programmatic options. Ron indicated he was in agreement with that.

I then asked Ron if he was clear on the mission of the Commission. Ron indicated clarity in terms of the Commission's objective as being implementation and to bring about change, further to deal with change in a systematic way. ~~Y described this with Ron, it was similar to the LJE and the major ideas behind it in a more complete way. With regard to the LJE, Ron is very positive. He believes that the federation is a key player in bringing about any kind of change.~~

## 2. Quality of Projects

Ron felt that the screening and evaluation of projects was very important. National organizations could play that role like JESNA or JWB as part of the screening process. Projects have to be consistent with its mission as laid out by the Commission and IJE, that is, projects should be focused on bringing about systemic change and have full potential for impact and application.

## 3. Negotiations with Existing Institutions

How will negotiations with existing institutions in the community be conducted? Ron felt that the federation was key from a funding point of view. The mechanism had to be the federation. Make it as high on the agenda as possible.

## 4. Appropriate Funding

How will appropriate funding sources be matched with specific projects? Here again, Ron felt that the federation was the focus point.

## 5. How will Innovations be Diffused from One Community Action Site to Another?

Ron thought that we needed to develop a communication instrument. He also thought that an annual formal convocation might work. This would provide a system of accountability and reporting through annual ~~conventions~~, perhaps through the IJE General Assembly.

## 6. How will a central mechanism work with local communities to help them rise to their full stature without imposing something on them from the top down?

Ron felt that we could not leave out the stakeholders or the lay community, that partnerships needed to be developed. Local people can get excited where there is interest. Make the lay people players. It cannot be imposed but instead a process has to be initiated. There are various methods to doing that. Ron suggested that what might work in Toronto would be a white paper that could become the focal point of debate.

With regard to the June 14th meeting, Ron will be attending. He felt the key aspect of that meeting was to get people involved, get them excited with the process and with the ideas and vision that are behind the IJE. The IJE should evolve out of a set of ideas that, in effect, justify it as a mechanism for change.

REPORT ON INTERVIEW WITH DAVID DUBIN, 4/25/89 BY JONATHAN WOOGHER

## I. IJE

DD agrees strongly that there is a need to come up with something practical at the end of the Commission's life, which will include the promise of funds and the involvement of the Commission.

DD envisions a post-Commission process which involves teams bringing ideas to communities in order to "seed" these communities with new ideas appropriate for their situation. These would be, in effect, "mobilization units" to work with communities, and would include Commissioners as well as professionals. The concept could also encompass study teams which would help communities with comprehensive planning.

The assistance must include resources; there must be a pool of funds available at the end of the process to implement what has been designed. Money is the key to differentiate an IJE from JESMA, JWB, and other current instrumentalities. The IJE must not compete with these in fund raising or in direct services. We need to be alert to the question: what are we doing for the institutions which exist?

## II. Commission process

DD suggested that the next Commission meeting should present illustrations of specific problems and strategies for solutions in the areas of focus ((personnel and community-building)).

E.g., the scholar-in-residence model as developed at the JCC on the Palisades is now being brought to a number of different communities as a way of creating a community "master teacher" who can work with lay leaders.

Other possible problems and strategies might be:

- 1) Problem: lack of top lay people involved in Jewish education  
Strategy: hire a professional just to develop leadership and human resources for Jewish education
- 2) Problem: lack of money for innovation  
Strategy: development of a local "venture capital" fund for innovative projects

Before the meeting, Commission members should have the opportunity to suggest ideas of this type. At the meeting, the Commission should help prioritize various suggestions.

He suggests a short staff paper identifying specific problems related to the enabling options and some ~~enabling~~ strategies. It should be indicated that the document will be used to a) expand the list of options through discussion, and b) prioritize strategies.



Some of the programmatic options will be "paid respect" within the strategies as specific reference points -- e.g., developing family educators, or educational programs for Jewish leaders as a vehicle for building advocacy.

The Commissioners must have a role in the strategy development process.

MAY 03 1989 201 82 NATIVGOWS CONSULTANTS

972 2 699951

972 2 699951 P.5/8

## TOWARDS THE THIRD COMMISSION MEETING

## INTERVIEW OF COMMISSIONERS

COMMISSIONER NAME: PROF. MARTIN LIPSET  
INTERVIEWER: PROF. SEYMOUR FOX  
DATE: APRIL 5, 1989 5, 1989  
PLACE: RUSSELL SAGE FOUNDATION

Summary:

I had a very enjoyable hour and a half with Prof. Lipset. I took him through the steps of the work of the Commission since the meeting in December to where we are today.

I went through the concept of the demonstration site very carefully. He asked some very important questions, particularly concerning the personnel for supplementary schools. Again, he brought up his concern about us leaving out the college-age, the Hillel Foundation group. I think that he understood the necessity for an implementation instrumentality and I began to sketch some of the possibilities there. At that point, he brought up the importance of research and made a very reasonable argument for the kind of research which should accompany the it and would help us make decisions more intelligently.

He has the meeting of the 14th of June on his calendar and I believe that he will be very helpful, as he has been in the past.

TOWARDS THE THIRD COMMISSION MEETING

INTERVIEW OF COMMISSIONERS

COMMISSIONER NAME: MR. LESTER CROWN

INTERVIEWER: SEYMOUR FOX

DATE: MONDAY, MAY 8, 1989 10:30-12:30 P.M.

PLACE: CHICAGO, ILL.

Summary:

Mr. Crown reiterated his interest in having the Commission wait for the results of the work of individual foundations and build on their results (as he had mentioned in his meeting with Mr. Mandel in New York in April). Thus we would know what works before we went into any kind of macro activity.

Susan Crown and Barbara Manilow attending the meeting as well.

Mr. Crown like the idea of discussing what we know currently from best practice and putting that together in first conceptions of what demonstration sites could be, but continued to return to giving the foundations an opportunity to "do their thing."

On the other hand, he is looking for whatever possible input the Commission could have in the work of his foundation and he thought that other foundations are equally interested.

He described his own conversations with Larry Tisch and trying to get him to offer his expertise and understanding of the media for the work of Jewish education. He also described his conversations with Evans on this issue.

Mr. Crown sees essentially two major roles of the Commission: one is to stimulate the interest of individuals, funders and foundations. He believes that the Commission has already succeeded in doing this. Second is to market, diffuse, distribute information on anything related to best practice, to vision, etc.

He showed a good deal of interest in the Cleveland Commission and I promised him that we would send the report of the Cleveland Commission. He would like most of this material to be funneled not only through him, but through Barbara Manilow and Susan Crown. I agreed to stay in contact, not only with Mr. Crown, but with Barbara and Susan.

Mr. Crown will not be able to attend the meeting on the 14th; he will be at the Air Show in Paris selling airplanes.

In the conversation, much interest was expressed about the area of personnel. They brought to my attention one project which they believe has had some impact in Chicago in the area of general education. It's called the Golden Apple Award, and its director is Dren Geerof. The Foundation of Excellence in Teaching. (The number is 312-407-0006.)

Jonathan Woosher is going to be involved in a series of consultations for the Crown Foundation and I think we ought to coordinate our efforts with his. They have not settled on their area of work.

Mr. Crown thinks it would be useful to arrange a meeting of the funders and he would be willing to participate in it. I think we ought to plan that meeting as soon as we can.

In this meeting Mr. Crown showed a great deal of interest and support for the work of the Commission and though he will be missed on the 14th, I think that his absence should not be interpreted as lack of interest.

Despite the fact that he was under great business pressure, he carried on a full meeting and devoted a good deal of energy and time to our agenda.

MEMO TO: David Ariel, Seymour Fox, Mark Gurvis, Annette Hochstein,  
Stephen H. Hoffman, Martin S. Kraar, Morton L. Mandel,  
Joseph Reimer, Arthur Rotman, Herman D. Stein,  
Jonathan Weecher, Henry L. Zucker

FROM: Virginia F. Levi

DATE: October 6, 1989

*Living*

(cr)

Attached, for your information, are reports on interviews of the following commissioners conducted by Jonathan Weecher, Joseph Reimer and Art Rotman.

1. Maurice Corson
2. Arthur Green
3. Daniel Shapiro





**REPORT ON INTERVIEW OF RABBI MAURICE CORSON - 10/4/89**

(Conducted by Jonathan Wroblewski)

Rabbi Corson is skeptical about the Community Action Site approach. He feels that the broad-based change through what will essentially be pilot projects is flawed in several respects:

1. Since the CAS will rely on extraordinary resources, replication in communities lacking these resources and even continuation in the CAS once the special resources are gone will be difficult. The Molten program in Cincinnati is a relevant cautionary example.
2. Implementing the CAS will apparently be seen as requiring the creation of a new structure which is likely to be permanent. This will be unnecessarily costly and duplicative. If the CAS strategy is to be followed, he suggests that implementation be done through a special desk

In general, he feels that the Commission has not yet managed successfully to engage the critical grass roots delivery systems, especially the synagogues and their supplementary schools. They may have no investment in the findings and recommendations.

He also believes that insufficient emphasis has been given to examining existing structures and how to strengthen them: JESNA, the denominational commissions and departments, the bureaus of Jewish education. These are the agencies which together with the schools and other direct service providers are the delivery system (and will be so for the foreseeable future). Unless they are materially strengthened, the Commission will not have the desired impact.

MC feels that a "messianic" element has been creeping into the Commission's thinking. This has led to a shortchanging of many practical areas of intervention, e.g., developing better compensation and benefit packages for teachers, including pension and health insurance, stipends for professional development, etc.

In looking ahead to October 23, MC hopes we will come away with:

- 1) a commitment not to build a new bureaucracy
- 2) a commitment to focus greater attention on and to involve directly the synagogue community and the campuses (an important lacuna in the Commission's work thus far)
- 3) more attention given to how to upgrade professionalism and

MC expects to attend the meeting on October 23.

JOSEPH REIMER

9/27/89

CONVERSATIONS WITH ARTHUR GREEN

Rabbi Green and I met during August and ~~on the same day~~ the ~~same day~~ ~~the same day~~. I called today to check in again.

Arthur's main concern is with pacing. He admits to being impatient and new to this process, but wonders why the pace feels slow-moving. As his colleague Prof. Twersky, Green believes reflection is for academics and action should be the mode for the Commission. He fully favors the Community action approach and would like to see us begin its implementation by setting up reasonable criteria by which sites could be selected. He continues to favor setting up a multiplicity of sites. He fears that if we delay starting implementation, the Commission will lose momentum. He does not have much interest in discussing the final report or research papers.

Rabbi Green will attend on October 23, and was honored to be asked to deliver the d'var Torah.

September 28, 1989

Date of Interview: September 27, 1989

Interview with: Daniel Shapiro, 1

Location: New York City

Interviewer: Art Rotman

Duration: 45 minutes

North American Commission on Jewish Education

Daniel Shapiro, New York City. Duration: 45 minutes

Shortly before the interview started, Dan Shapiro had determined that it would not be possible for him to attend the next meeting. While he was still interested in providing his input, I could not help but detect less of an interest in the meeting itself, since he knew he would not be there.

Continuing Mechanism

Shapiro recognizes that there should be a continuing mechanism to monitor and coordinate the efforts in the individual communities. At some point in the interview, he felt that the Commission should be that continuing entity, since it had worked so well up to now and since the group was so cohesive. At another point in the interview, he felt that to do so would be to run the risk of creating another national coordinating agency, which would be duplicating the work of the existing national agencies. After discussion back and forth, he finally came to the conclusion, which he would like to recommend to the Commission, that it continue, but meet only once a year in an "overseer" capacity. The actual responsibility for the coordination should be assumed by a separate operating entity with its own Board of Directors, with fewer members than the current Commission and associated with JESNA and JWB in the same way as the Commission. This operating board would meet perhaps three or four times a year and would have responsibility for hiring staff and for making ongoing policy decisions. It would take guidance from the successor to the Commission and keep the "large overseer" Commission informed.

### Community Action Sites

The approach of having demonstrations in particular communities appeals to Shapiro. He suggested that we limit it to no more than two or, at the maximum, three such sites. The incremental value beyond that number decreases and there is the risk of the entire structure becoming unwieldy. Care should be taken to provide a geographic spread so that the sites are not all concentrated in one area. Consideration should also be given to size of community, with at least one site amongst the larger communities, such as Boston, and another in a smaller community, such as Dunstable. We should also be careful to insure that there is a spread in relative "sophistication", avoiding the most sophisticated and developed communities and, on the other hand, avoiding as well those that are at the other end of the spectrum in sophistication and development. There should be sufficient understanding and familiarity in place so that the Community Action Site would not have difficulty in getting established; on the other hand, to select a community which had highly developed infrastructure would mean selecting a community which is atypical and difficult to replicate. Consideration should also be given to the potential for local community financial support, since he assumes that such support would be a requirement.

Based on his New York experience, Shapiro suggests that we make every effort to involve the Orthodox, even though this might be difficult. He was very interested to hear about the prospect of Merv Mandel and Rabbi Norman Lamm, convening a group of the Orthodox re the work of the Commission. Efforts should be made to involve all elements in the community, recognizing, of course, that it may not be possible to bring in some of the more extreme groups.

### Summary

Dan Shapiro is very positive about the work of the Commission. He feels that it is an excellent group and is pleased to be a part of it. He thinks that the potential for making a major breakthrough is there but cautions that there is a great deal of difficult work before this can be achieved.

November 27, 1988

Commission on Jewish Education in North America

Towards the Second Meeting

Interviews of Commissioners

1. Commissioner: Rabbi Irving Greenberg
2. Interviewer: Annette Hochstein
3. Date: 11-28-88
4. Spirit: somewhat skeptical, though willing to be brought on board (he did not attend the first meeting)
5. Setting: a Jerusalem home
6. Duration: 1 hour
7. Commissioner's current stand:
  - A. Personnel: very important, but skeptical about the Commission's ability to undertake it at the macro level. Rather, thinks we should deal first with senior personnel or first with personnel for a specific type of program e.g. personnel for early childhood.
  - B. The community: skeptical about the ability of the Commission to undertake at this time as vast a project. Also unclear about what it would mean. Concern that it might take away much needed funding from programs. Would prefer a micro approach.
  - C. Programmatic options: probably prefers these.



### 3. Summary:

The first part of the meeting was used to bring I.G. on board as to the first meeting of the Commission, the responses, and the process since. We went through the materials of the first meeting (which he recalled having seen). I described the meetings, the dynamics, the responses. From there we went on to discuss the current materials. We went through the document and I.G. made some specific comments about specific options (he read quite a few of them).

Overall he had the following objections:

1. He felt that the staff was in fact presenting a strong recommendation and that this would be the decision. He expressed skepticism at both the personnel and the community options - not on the grounds that they are not important, but on the grounds that dealing with problems at the macro level may not be all that feasible. Rather than take on the major issues, have the foundations deal with more manageable and more limited options or part of options. He conceives of dealing with parts of personnel and parts of the community. He would really choose micro projects over major undertakings.

I found it difficult to breach the gap in his understanding of the Commission, the process, the extent of representation, the private communal aspect of the Commission. It was important that

the meeting took place because some of the perceptions could be corrected, however it would be necessary for him to actually see the Commission in action in order to get a good sense of what it is about.

At the level of specific remarks: he suggested that for supplementary schools when ought to try model schools. In the part on alternatives, he suggests that we left out the possibility for specific alternatives within the framework of the existing supplementary schools, for example: all-weekend activities and all-summer sessions etc. Rabbi Greenberg felt that the community problem or dealing with the community would only have a limited impact on what is going on - he also, found the definition fuzzy. When I raised the question of increased funding and suggested that perhaps one of the goals might be to double the funding for Jewish education, he said that this was a questionable goal given that the existing programs are so ineffective. Though friendly throughout, the underlying tone was one of a fair amount of skepticism, and the expression of specific interests rather than general ones. I believe he really wants an involvement at the micro level, probably in some specific programs.



18 EAST 26th STREET • NEW YORK, N.Y. 10010 • IS 779

November 10, 1988

Commission on Jewish Education in North America  
Towards the Second Meeting of the Commission

Interview of Commissioners

Commissioner: Esther Leah Ritz

Interviewer: Art Rotman

Date: November 10, 1988

Setting: Phone call

Duration: 40 minutes

Spirit: Positive, thoughtful, logical

December 13 meeting:

Will not attend because of recuperation from surgery on that date.

Commissioner's opinions:

Reaction to August 1 meeting: ELR found the method of having interviews in advance and the results of the interviews put on the table at the beginning of the meeting very helpful. It moved us forward quickly as we didn't need to "begin from scratch". The Commission recognized her own contributions made in the interview in the summaries presented.

The first meeting served the purpose of getting people to know one another, for individual commissioners to "see who the other players were" and to "find themselves". As a result the plan of having the group identify the elements of a consensus rather than to come to a final conclusion worked out well.

The problem before the Commission will be to "walk a tightrope". Many of the commissioners are identified with individual points of view. However, the Commission cannot possibly address all these directions. A consensus has to be achieved which would include many of the elements raised at the Commission meeting but would, at the same time, provide a coherent whole. As an example of the tightrope, ELR identified this supplementary education. "Everybody knows that supplementary education is not effective," On the other hand, "that's where the kids are". The low quality has apparently not discouraged the parents. The reasons for this are apparently that any alternative would be more expensive and probably would provide more of a Jewish experience than the parents consider to be desirable. Many of parents are also identified philosophically with the public school system and the need to support it. Because of the large number of pupils in the system, it should not be ignored by the Commission. On the other hand, it need not and should not be a major thrust.



Priorities. ELR is of the opinion that no single element in and of itself is the answer, whether it be personnel or community or finance. However there are several elements which should be attacked simultaneously. These are:

- Senior professional personnel
- " Finance and subsidies, and lay involvement
- " Parent education

There is an inter-relationship between each of these elements. While an improvement in one will not do the trick, an improvement in all of the above will have a synergistic effect one on the other. In elaboration of the above, ELR pointed out that the senior professional personnel needs to be "beefed up" both in the formal and informal settings. The financing depends on considerable increased support by community leaders and givers; the education of parents needs to provide the parents with enough of an education so that they will themselves see the need for more education for their children and, at the same time, they need education which will parallel their children's experience. The more learned outside the homes than can be reinforced within the home, the better.

Modality. The informal approach is valid in and of itself as a method of learning. The approach used in informal settings stands on its own. However the informal approaches have been very successful in the classroom and schools should be using such approaches to a greater extent.

The informal setting "means mass education". It's possible for camps, Centers, etc. to reach out to those who are "marginally or tangentially involved". These settings need to see themselves not only as ends in and of themselves but they need to see themselves as having a responsibility to move their members or users from the informal setting to the more formal setting of the synagogue and the school.



While many of these users will happily make use of the synagogue or school, there are many who will not. For those the informal settings should offer the more formal type of schooling. As an example, the Hebraica Jewish Community Center in Buenos Aires has developed a successful Jewish school.

Target Populations. In addition to the parents, the target population should be preschool and elementary school children. Adolescents and young adults are too preoccupied with "growing up" for them to devote much energy to their Jewishness. However, if the adolescent or young adult had a good Jewish foundation in the preschool and elementary school years, then it will be possible to break through the barrier of the bar mitzvah age so that in adolescence they can maintain their interest at a time when they are old enough to be able to deal with concepts.

The community is spending considerable sums at this point in integrating the new immigrants and in particular the Russians. Many are being subsidized in day schools. ELR is of the opinion that we have probably not been successful in integrating them into the community in this way nor in making them more Jewishly committed. We should review this to see whether the impact is what the community had in mind and if not use our resources elsewhere.



1 &amp; EAST 26th STREET • NEW YORK, N. Y. 10010 • 1 6 7 3

November 23, 1980

Commission on Jewish Education in North America toward the Second Meeting

Interview of Commissioners

Commissioner: Harriet Rosenthal

Interviewer: Art Rotman

Date: November 22, 1980

Spirit: Very positive

Setting: Harriet Rosenthal's home, So. Orange, NJ

Duration: 1 1/2 hours

Commissioner's current stand: Personnel and community both clearly the consensus issue arising from the first meeting. Program option priority: Younger groups from preschool through high school and generally education in informal setting.

Summary: Rosenthal believes that the focus should be on children at the "beginning of the process" starting with preschool when the "slate is clean". By the time they get to college, they have so many other concerns, that it is too late.

Rosenthal also identified another age group as being vulnerable, mainly the older adult. They have completed their main life goals such as career and family and, at this point in their lives have the time and, in many cases, the money to make choices which they have been delaying.

Education in informal settings is a priority.

Israel visits are not usually a good opportunity for education.

The study of Hebrew on an active scale, while an interesting possibility, would not probably make much difference in Jewish continuity.

Personnel: What is needed is a multi-faceted assault on the entire system including:

- Better compensation
- Better training
- A career line ☐

"Awards and rewards are needed for entering and staying". The late '40s and early '50s are an opportunity for career change. This could be a fruitful source of recruitment.

Community: There is a need for a long-term commitment by the community leadership, which will hopefully mean that resources will follow. There would be a need to involve top leadership and people of influence by involving them in the process at an early stage. Faced with the problem and concerns, leadership will respond.

Rosenthal thought out loud that a program of no tuition would be an interesting development. However, on reflection she feels that it would not make a substantial difference in people's choices.

Ways of proceeding:

- Once the goals have been set and strategies developed which should be, Rosenthal guesses, by the second meeting, it would be desirable to break up into smaller groupings in some way, as it is only in smaller groupings that any action can be developed.
- In the case of the staff work, Rosenthal thought that it would be essential to develop this type of option clarification for whatever options are selected. In the particular case of preschool, with which she has considerable familiarity because of her involvement with the JCC, the approach is somewhat "elephant" and the questions raised are really rhetorical.

November 27, 1988

Commission on Jewish Education in North America  
Towards the Second Meeting  
Interviews of Commissioners

1. Commissioner: Rabbi Irving Greenberg
2. Interviewer: Annette Hochstein
3. Date: 11-28-88
4. Spirit: somewhat skeptical,, though willing to be brought on board (he did not attend the first meeting)
5. Setting: a Jerusalem home
6. Duration: 1 hour
7. Commissioner's current stand:
  - A. Personnel: very important,, but skeptical about the Commission's ability to undertake it at the macro level. Rather, thinks we should deal first with senior personnel or first with personnel for a specific type of program e.g.. personnel for early childhood.
  - B. The community: skeptical about the ability of the Commission to undertake at this time as vast a project. Also unclear about what it would mean. Concern that it might take away much needed funding from programs. Would prefer a micro approach.
  - C. Programmatic options: probably prefers these.

## 8. Summary:

The first part of the meeting was used to bring I.G. on board as to the first meeting of the Commission, the responses, and the process since. We went through the materials of the first meeting (which he recalled having seen). I described the meetings, the dynamics, the responses. From there we went on to discuss the current materials. We went through the document and I.G. made some specific comments about specific options (he read quite a few of them)..

Overall he had the following objections:

1. He felt that the staff was in fact presenting a strong recommendation and that this would be the decision. He expressed skepticism at both the personnel and the community options - not on the grounds that they are not important, but on the grounds that dealing with problems at the macro level may not be all that feasible. Rather than take on the major issues, have the foundations deal with more manageable and more limited options or part of options. He conceives of dealing with parts of personnel and parts of the community. He would really choose micro projects over major undertakings.

I found it difficult to breach the gap in his understanding of the Commission, the process, the extent of representation, the private communal aspect of the Commission. It was important that



the meeting took place because some of the perceptions could be corrected, however it would be necessary for him to actually see the Commission in action in order to get a good sense of what it is about.

At the level of specific remarks: he suggested that for supplementary schools when ought to try model schools. In the part on alternatives, he suggests that we left out the possibility for specific alternatives within the framework of the existing supplementary schools, for example: all-weekend activities and all-summer sessions etc. Rabbi Greenberg felt that the community problem or dealing with the community would only have a limited impact on what is going on - he also, found the definition fuzzy. When I raised the question of increased funding and suggested that perhaps one of the goals might be to double the funding for Jewish education, he said that this was a questionable goal given that the existing programs are so ineffective. Though friendly throughout, the underlying tone was one of a fair amount of skepticism, and the expression of specific interests rather than general ones. I believe he really wants an involvement at the micro level, probably in some specific programs.

**THE COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA  
TOWARDS THE SECOND MEETING OF THE COMMISSION  
INTERVIEW OF COMMISSIONERS**

1. COMMISSIONER: John Colman
2. INTERVIEWER: Henry L. Zucker
3. DATE: November 9, 1988
4. SPIRIT: Upbeat, Supportive, Thoughtful
5. SETTING: HLZ's office
6. DURATION: 1 hour
7. COMMISSIONER'S CURRENT STAND:

Personnel and community are the priority topics for the Commission. These are the enabling priorities which are absolutely crucial. The programmatic options are important, but not necessarily crucial to a successful outcome of the Commission's work.

8. SUMMARY:

We reviewed the post-August 1st work of the staff and the planning group and senior policy advisors and some of the reactions in interviews of Commission members. Colman agreed that personnel and community are the two key priorities, the development which is absolutely necessary for the success of the Commission's work.

The mass of material and options presented at the August 1st meeting and subsequently is less crucial, but valuable nevertheless, and should not be lost. Colman suggests boiling down this material and crystallizing a smaller number of option categories, which then are carefully described and presented to the Commission. He suggested that the community option include the importance of top leadership participation in Jewish education leadership. He urged that rabbis be included in the leadership needed to carry out the Commission's recommendation. He urged that we not overlook the need for community leaders to be engaged as learners themselves.

Colman believes the first meeting of the Commission was a success, but warned against settling for a "winning streak of one." It was necessary to free-wheel at the first meeting and to get peoples' ideas ventilated. The second meeting should begin with a synthesis of the thinking at the first meeting and the post-first meeting discussions. Staff should not present this summary in the form of recommendations, but rather as a reprise of the thinking presented.

Colman believes that the Commission is off to a great start. He believes the second meeting should determine the priorities which need to be developed for substantive discussion at meeting number 3, and that the chairman needs to draw a careful line between encouraging commissioners to participate and controlling the discussion so that decisions are made which will move the Commission to the next phase of its work.

We talked about the development of comprehensive studies of Jewish education in at least nine communities. We agreed that the Commission needs to stay in close touch with this development, both for integration of the local committees' thinking in the recommendations of our Commission, and also to encourage the follow up of the Commission's recommendations.

Colman plans to attend the meeting on December 13.

THE COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA  
TOWARDS THE SECOND MEETING OF THE COMMISSION  
INTERVIEW OF COMMISSIONERS

- 1.. COMMISSIONER:: MARK LAINER
- 2.. INTERVIEWER:: SEYMOUR FOX
- 3.. DATE:: NOVEMBER 1., 1988
- 4.. SPIRIT:: VERY COMMITTED & ENTHUSIASTIC
- 5.. SETTING:: HOTEL IN JERUSALEM
- 6.. DURATION:: 1 HOUR
- 7.. COMMISSIONER'S CURRENT STAND:
  - A.. PERSONNEL: SUPPORT
  - B.. COMMUNITY: ENTHUSIASTIC SUPPORT. CLAIMS THAT ALL THE OTHER OPTIONS DEPEND ON IT.
- 8.. SUMMARY:

VERY USEFUL MEETING WITH LAINER:

  - A) TO BRING HIM UP TO DATE; AND
  - B) TO CONTINUE TO BUILD ON HIS INITIAL ENTHUSIASM AND COMMITMENT.

HE LISTENED CAREFULLY AS I REVIEWED THE METHOD, PARTICULARLY THE CRITERIA AND WAS ABSOLUTELY STUNNED BY THE AMOUNT OF WORK AND THE NUMBER OF CONSULTATIONS THAT HAD TAKEN PLACE. HE KNOWS MANY OF THE PEOPLE LIKE SARA LEE, ALVIN SCHIFF, AND WALTER ACKERMAN VERY WELL. AND THE FACT THAT THESE PEOPLE WERE INVOLVED IN EARLY STAGES MAKE A BIG DIFFERENCE IN HIS THINKING.

HE WAS CONCERNED ABOUT THE FACT THAT RABBI ZELDIN AND RABBI SCHULWEISS MAY NOT BE PLANNING TO COME ON THE 13TH. SO I THINK THIS DESERVES A VERY SPECIAL INTERVENTION, POSSIBLY A PHONE CALL BY ONE OR SEVERAL OF US.

HE MADE AN IMPORTANT DISTINCTION WHICH ADDS ADDITIONAL STRENGTH TO THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN PROGRAMMATIC AND PRE-CONDITIONS (NECESSARY CONDITIONS). HIS CLAIM IS THAT ONLY A COMMISSION LIKE OURS COULD UNDERTAKE THE MACRO ISSUES, WHICH IS ANOTHER WAY IN WHICH HE EMPHASIZES THE SIGNIFICANCE OF PRE-CONDITIONS.

HE FEELS THAT THIS COMMISSION COULD CHANGE THE CLIMATE IN THE JEWISH COMMUNITY AND THOUGH HE IS COMMITTED TO PERSONNEL, HE IS NOT AS ENTHUSIASTIC. HE THINKS THAT THE LOS ANGELES' PERSONNEL PROBLEM IS SERIOUS, BUT NOT AS CRITICAL AS IN OTHER PLACES IN THE WORLD.

HE WAS VERY IMPRESSED WITH MR. MANDEL'S DECISION TO MAKE IT CLEAR SEVERAL TIMES DURING THE MEETING THAT THE COMMISSION BELONGED TO THE COMMISSIONERS, AND WAS PLEASED THAT WE WERE TAKING ALL OF THESE STEPS SO THAT THERE WAS NO "RIGGING" OF THE DECISION PROCESS. HE THOUGHT IT WOULD BE USEFUL FOR MR. MANDEL TO LAY OUT AT THE BEGINNING OF THE MEETING THE WAY THAT THIS MEETING MIGHT PROGRESS AND TO REMIND THE COMMISSIONERS AT APPROPRIATE TIMES THAT THE COMMISSION WAS THEIRS. HE ASKED QUESTIONS ABOUT HOW WE WOULD PROCEED AFTER THE DECISION, THOUGHT THE IDEA OF TASK-FORCES OR COMMITTEES WAS A GOOD IDEA, AND WAS HOPING THAT THE SAME KIND OF STAFF WORK WOULD ACCOMPANY THE NEXT STEPS.

HE SAW IT VERY USEFUL FOR US TO BRING THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THOSE CITIES THAT HAVE COMMISSIONS (CLAL, ETC.) TOGETHER, TO MEET AT SOME POINT, BOTH TO GIVE INPUT TO THE WORK OF OUR COMMISSION, AND TO KEEP THEM INFORMED ABOUT OUR WORK.

HE PLANS TO BE AT THE MEETING ON THE 13TH.



October 20, 1988

THE COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA  
TOWARDS THE SECOND MEETING OF THE COMMISSION  
INTERVIEW OF COMMISSIONERS

1. COMMISSIONER: ROBERT EE, LOUP
2. INTERVIEWER: ANNETTE HOGSTEIN
3. DATE: OCTOBER 19, 1988
4. SPIRIT: INQUIRING, POSITIVE SKEPTICISM, KEEN INTEREST.
5. SETTING: BREAKFAST IN JERUSALEM
6. DURATION: 11 HOUR AND 15 MINUTES
7. COMMISSIONER'S CURRENT STAND:
  - A. PERSONNEL: YES
  - B. THE COMMUNITY: YES (PARTICULARLY THE JEWISH EDUCATION OF THE COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP)
  - C. PROGRAMMATIC OPTIONS: ELIMINATE THOSE THAT ARE BEING DEALT WITH ELSEWHERE.

8. SUMMARY:

A. I BEGAN THE CONVERSATION BY REFERRING TO A BRIEF CONVERSATION FOLLOWING THE FIRST COMMISSION MEETING. AT THAT TIME MR. LOUP WARNED THAT IT WAS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT TO NARROW THE FOCUS OF THE COMMISSION REPORT ON ONE PROCESS WE USED TO ATTEMPT TO NARROW THE FOCUS. WE WENT OVER THE LIST OF OPTIONS, THE INVENTORY, THE CHECK-LIST ((CRITERIA)).

B. MR. LOUP OFFERED THE FOLLOWING COMMENTS AS THE PRESENTATION UNFOLDED:

1. THE LIST OF OPTIONS:

A) WE SHOULD WEIGH EACH OPTION IN LIGHT OF THE CARE OF BY EXISTING AUSPICES. IT IS IMPORTANT NOT TO DUPLICATE EFFORTS -- FOR EXAMPLE, IF THE JEWISH EDUCATION COMMITTEE OR THE JEWISH AGENCY DEALS WITH THE ISRAEL EXPERIENCE, THIS COMMISSION SHOULD NOT DEAL WITH IT. DON'T RE-INVENT THE WHEEL.

2. R.L. SAID THAT HIS BIGGEST CONCERNS WERE:

- A) TO EDUCATE THE LEADERSHIP; AND
- B) TO EDUCATE THE CHILDREN.

"IF THE LEADERSHIP OF THE COMMUNITY IS NOT EDUCATED JEWISHLY, THEY WILL NOT BE COMMITTED TO JEWISH EDUCATION. I BELIEVE THAT ONE OF THE REASONS THAT KIDS DO NOT ATTEND EDUCATION PROGRAMS IS BECAUSE THEIR PARENTS CHOOSE NOT TO OFFER THEM THIS POSSIBILITY. WHO WILL DEAL WITH THE DEVELOPMENT OF JEWISH EDUCATION, IF WE DO NOT HAVE EDUCATED LEADERSHIP?"

I TOLD MR. LOUP THAT LAMM AND SCHORSCH FELT MUCH LESS STRONGLY ABOUT THE COMMUNITY AND IN FACT WERE NOT SURE THAT THIS WAS AN OPTION. HE RESPONDED BY SAYING THAT LAMM AND SCHORSCH ARE PART OF A JEWISHLY EDUCATED GROUP THAT SIMPLY DOES NOT UNDERSTAND PEOPLE LIKE HIM (LOUP). TAKE AS AN EXAMPLE WHAT CLAL IS DOING IN IT'S LEADERSHIP-LEARNING PROCESS CURRENTLY. IT IS CERTAINLY EDUCATING US FOR JEWISH DECISION-MAKING AND IS MAKING A REAL POSITIVE DIFFERENCE.

EDUCATED LEADERSHIP WILL BE THE FOUNDATION OF EVERYTHING.

3. DID WE CONSIDER THE POSSIBILITY OF FUNDING THE EXPANSION OF WHAT ALREADY EXISTS? THIS MIGHT BE AN IMPORTANT OPTION. THE

4. ANOTHER OPTION TO CONSIDER IS THAT OF PREPARING A UNIVERSAL MARKETING PLAN, OR RECRUITMENT PLAN, FOR JEWISH EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS. IT IS NOT INCLUDED IN OUR LIST. WE SHOULD NOT ASSUME THAT BY IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF PROGRAMS WE WILL AUTOMATICALLY HAVE PEOPLE ENROLLED. THEY WILL HAVE TO BE RECRUITED AND WE NEED A MARKETING PLAN.

5. MR. LOUP SUGGESTED THAT THE COMMISSION CONSIDER TWO TYPES OF ISSUES:

A) SHORT-TERM CONCERNS: BURNING ISSUES THAT HAVE TO BE TAKEN CARE OF IMMEDIATELY; AND

B) LONG-TERM ISSUES: WHAT DO WE DO HAVING TAKEN CARE OF EMERGENCIES?

6. DEALING WITH THE BAD REPUTATION, THE STIGMA OF JEWISH EDUCATION, IS A MAJOR PROBLEM.

7. NOTE: WHEN WE BEGAN THE MEETING, I REALIZED THAT MR. LOUP VIEWED THE COMMISSION LITERALLY AS A GROUP TO ADVISE THE MANDEL FOUNDATION ON WHAT IT SHOULD DO. I POINTED OUT AGAIN THE BROAD PRIVATE-COMMUNAL COALITION. MR. LOUP RETORTED THAT BECAUSE THE PRESIDENTS OF JWB, CJP, OR JESNA ARE PRESENT, THIS DOES NOT MEAN THAT THEY REPRESENT THEIR ORGANISATIONS. I POINTED TO THE FACT THAT IT WAS A FORMAL PARTNERSHIP. THIS WAS AN IMPORTANT

CLARIFICATION WHICH LED US TO LOOK AGAIN AT THE COMPOSITION OF THE COMMISSION AND AT THE INTENTIONS AS FAR AS OUTCOMES AND IMPLEMENTATION ARE CONCERNED. I BELIEVE THIS WAS A VERY USEFUL CLARIFICATION.

8. MR. LOUP WILL ATTEND THE MEETING OF DECEMBER 13TH.



Commission on Jewish Education in North America Towards the Second Meeting  
Interviews of Commissioners

1. Commissioner: Bill Berman

2. Interviewer: AJN

3. Date: 11-11-88

4. Spirit: Warm interest - positive and enthusiastic

5. Setting: U.S. Air W.I.P.P. lounge at Detroit Metro airport

6. Duration: 3 hours

7. Commissioner's current stand

A. Personnel: less than important, somewhat ambivalent about it, it.

B. Community: Yes (but with a particular orientation).

C. Programmatic Options: Does not believe that every option should be weighed equally, in fact, has felt several were effective.

8. Summary: Berman is totally committed to the notion of community as a way in which the Commission should develop its program and and

page 2.

enabling condition. He believes that the Jewish people are disaffected from the Jewish community. As families assimilated, options opened up and personnel in Jewish institutions have failed to stimulate children and adults.

#### Ik. Community

- A. Community should come first. He defines community in the unidirectional structure through which we could reach those who are marginal or are outside the system. He pointed out that prior to 1968, federations saw themselves as health and welfare organizations, and Jewish education was out of the mainstream. Since 1968, federations see their role as protecting Jewish education. He added that someone needs to pay for Jewish education and leadership is needed to begin to build the system. I pressed Bill on exactly how it could be conceptualized and how it would work. He pointed out that what is needed is a system of networks that can organize parents, organize leaders, organizations support systems around schools. He felt that in cities where the Jewish community is not particularly organized but is a growing city, like San Jose, California, the major challenge is finding the network and building a sense of community. Without a framework, this cannot be accomplished. It is just not federation. The community must be defined in functional and structural terms. Only through such structures can we get a sense of leadership and finances. Further, he pointed out that through the



federation structures, nine Jewish education commissions have now been established. This new development should be assessed.

### iii. Programmatic Options

He indicated that not every option mentioned by a Commissioner should carry equal weight. He felt we needed to come up with 5 to 8 major option areas, and under each option, begin to find working models that could help us move along. He saw the programmatic options as tools that could be used. In other words, his major question is what are the tools to reverse the disaffection, what is causing the disaffection and what are the major tools to reverse it.

IV . Data: He does not believe that we are using data in the best possible way, and feels that we should be using the National Jewish Data Bank at CJF. That data would give us a much better sense of how to deal with the problems.

Mr. Berman will attend the meeting on December 13. k

FAX SENT

DATE: 9/8/88

JERUSALEM, AUGUST 8, 1988

TO: MORT MANDEL  
ART NAPARSTECK  
HENRY ZUCKER  
GINNY LEVI

FROM: SEYMOUR FOX  
ANNETTE HOCHSTEIN

MAY THE MORNING AFTER ALWAYS FEEL SO GREAT!!

BEFORE SETTING OUT FOR HOME, WE DID SOME FOLLOW-UP CALLS WITH COMMISSIONERS, AS DECIDED BY THE PLANNING GROUP. DETAILED ACCOUNTS OF SOME CONVERSATIONS ARE ATTACHED. ANNETTE SPOKE WITH LAMM, LOOKSTEIN, RITZ, SCHORSCH AND TISHMAN. SEYMOUR SPOKE WITH SCHIFF, MELTON, BIELER, LOUP, BATSHAW AND MEMBERS OF JTS' FACULTY TO WHOM SCHORSCH REPORTED. SEYMOUR HAS ALREADY BRIEFED SARA LEE AND SPOKEN TO GOTTSALK.

THE FOLLOWING POINTS OF CONSENSUS EMERGED FROM THOSE CONVERSATIONS:

1. SUPERLATIVE PRAISE FOR THE MEETING ITSELF WITH UNDISGUISED AWE AT MORT'S HAVING SUCCEEDED TO CONVENE SUCH A HIGH-POWERED GATHERING. COMPLIMENTARY REFERENCES WERE MADE TO THE DETAILED PREPARATIONS, INTERVIEWS AND SUMMARY DOCUMENT.
2. THE FIRST MEETING DID ITS JOB. THE NEXT MEETING SHOULD FOCUS MORE NARROWLY ON A FEW TOPICS ☐ AND BE MORE DOWN TO EARTH. PERSONNEL ☐ THE TEACHERS — EMERGES STRONGLY AS THE LEADING TOPIC, THOUGH THE ADVICE FROM COMMISSIONERS, IS TO OFFER A FEW ALTERNATIVE TOPICS AS CHOICES.
3. USEFUL ADVICE WAS OFFERED ON HOW TO PROCEED TO MORE SPECIFIC WORK WITHOUT OFFENDING THE COMMISSIONERS' DESIRE TO BE INVOLVED.

IF THE CONVERSATIONS WE HELD ARE REPRESENTATIVE OF OTHER COMMISSIONERS' VIEWS TOO, IT WOULD SEEM THAT WE ARE ENCOURAGED TO MOVE AHEAD IN THE DIRECTIONS DISCUSSED DURING OUR PLANNING MEETINGS.

VERY BEST REGARDS,



**Commission on Jewish Education in North America towards the second meeting.**

**Interview with Commissioners**

**Commissioner: David Dubin**

**Interviewer: Art Rotman**

**November 22, 1966**

**Spirit: Very interested**

**Setting: David Dubin's office, Palisades JCC, Tenafly, NJ**

**Duration: One and half hours.**

**Commissioner's record sheet. Detailed and accurately, should be the basis of discussion. Open and honest effort by party to convey the true and accurate.**

**Comments on first meeting of Commission:**

The discussion was necessarily discursive since it was the first time that the group had come together. However, much more was accomplished than Dave Dubin had expected would be. This was probably because of the headway that had been made in having the results of the interviews available at the meeting. Dubin was very impressed with the caliber of his fellow commissioners and the diverse mix. He left the meeting with several new ideas as a result of the comments made at the meeting.

Based on his own experience, adults can be very responsive to Jewish education. He has found them to be very responsive to such education in study groups. However, while priority should be placed on the above groups, it should not be to the exclusion of others.

### Supplementary School

Dubin is of the opinion based on his experience that the results of the afternoon school or Sunday School is largely "a waste of time" unless there is reinforcement at home. Supplementary schooling should only be offered if there is such a contract with the parents. In any case, the community should be geared up to provide educational experience for the parents in the form of study groups, courses, etc. In other words, the only way in which supplementary education should be offered is on a two-track basis, one track for the child and one track for the parent, offered separately and with equal emphasis.

### Resource Integration

In considering the various "options" Dubin was prompted to suggest that based on his experience, it should be in the pooling of community resources. The synagogue, the Jewish school and the JCC should combine their resources, each contributing their own strength. This can be particularly helpful in programs where the entire family learns together, for example, in workshops around the holidays.

### Means Options

It is Dubin's impression that the consensus of the first meeting was to concentrate on both personnel and community.

### Community

Too many of the level of lay leadership connected with the Jewish education efforts are secondary or tertiary level. On the one hand, a better caliber of leader must be recruited and on the other hand, whatever leadership does end up connected with Jewish education should be trained to fulfill their roles appropriately. Dubin proposed that there be what he refers to as a "Jewish mobilization unit" to study gaps in the community and the Jewish continuity efforts and to have the authority to legislate changes. The TM and of health would be

### Personnel

Each community should have available a number of "master teachers". These would be prestigious positions where the salary would in the \$50-\$60,000 level. These master teachers should be hired by a consortium of agencies representing the community and function in a variety of settings including the day schools, the elementary schools, the JCCs, adult education, etc.

Dubin has had an extremely popular experience with the scholar-in-residence at the Palisades JCC and recommends that Jewish educational institutions, whether formal or informal, should have such a scholar. The position suggested is more of a philosopher who would, in addition to being a sound teacher, provide inspiration to the staffs and the boards of directors. Certainly, each JCC should have such a scholar/philosopher. Dubin urged that the Commission consider the establishment of such positions. It is only by advocating seemingly wild but bold ideas that the Commission will make an impact.

### Task Forces

~~At the first meeting, it was decided that working with a large group was appropriate for the first meeting, we will need now to start doing work in small groups. The work will be~~  
accomplished by having small groups, not necessarily including all the commissioners, in between the meetings, to prepare any materials for the next meeting. Dubin rejected the idea of breaking up into task forces at the meeting itself. He thought that it could be seen by members of the Commission, being rather sophisticated, as being too much of an exercise. One of the attractions apparently of the Commission is the fact that people enjoy one another's company and this could best be achieved by maintaining the entire group format for the Commission meetings themselves.



TO: See Distribution FROM: Arthur J. Naparstek DATE: 11/10/88  
NAME NAME  
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL  
REPLYING TO  
YOUR MEMO OF:

SUBJECT: Interview Summary from Art Rotman

Enclosed is a copy of an interview summary of Commissioner David Dubin  
given by Art Rotman.

Distribution

Morton L. Mandel

☒ Seymour Fox

☒ Annette Hochstein

Virginia F. Levy

Joseph Reiner

Henry L. Zucker

THE COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA  
FOLLOWING UP ON THE FIRST MEETING:

PHONE CALLS WITH COMMISSIONERS.

1.COMMISSIONER: ISMAR SCHORSCH

2.PHONER: ANNETTE HOCHSTEIN

3.DATE: AUGUST 3, 1988

4.SPIRIT: VERY INVOLVED AND COMPLIMENTARY. NO TRACE OF THE  
ORIGINAL SKEPTICISM. MY FEELING: HE WANTS THIS TO  
SUCCEED.

5.THE CALL:

HOW WE SHOULD PROCEED:

"ON DECEMBER 13 YOU MAY WANT TO NARROW THE FOCUS IN THE FOLLOWING  
WAY:

YOU MIGHT COME BACK TO THE GROUP — FOLLOWING ANALYSIS OF THE  
INTERVIEWS PLUS THE CONTENT OF THE MEETING, (SEEN TOGETHER AS  
AN ONGOING CONVERSATION WITH COMMISSIONERS) — SAYING YOU  
DECIDED TO ZERO IN ON SAY FOUR TOPICS.

THEN YOU MUST DO A COGENT PRESENTATION OF THE RATIONALE FOR  
THESE TOPICS AND OFFER THAT FOR DISCUSSION.

YOU SHOULD ALSO OFFER SOME STRATEGIES AS TO HOW TO ADDRESS  
THESE TOPICS. PERHAPS YOU COULD BEGIN TO LINK THEM TO  
EXISTING INSTITUTIONS AND PROGRAMS."

ABOUT THE PROCESS: RABBI SCHORSCH REFERRED TO "THE BRILLIANT IDEA  
TO INTERVIEW THE COMMISSIONERS".

HE SUGGESTED GETTING THE COMMISSIONERS HE ARE PROFESSIONALS  
(ELKIN, ETC....) TO MEET WITH THE STAFF.

HE URGES US TO BE ASSERTIVE, BECAUSE SOME OF THE COMMISSIONERS  
WILL HAVE LITTLE PATIENCE FOR CONTINUED THEORETICAL DISCUSSION.

HE REITERATED THE POINTS HE EXPRESSED AT THE MEETING:

A.STAY AWAY FROM THE COLLEGE CAMPUS

B.NEED QUALITY CURRICULUM PREPARED FOR HIGH-SCHOOLS

C.MUST DEAL WITH HIGH-SCHOOL AGE THOUGH NONE OF THE EXISTING  
FRAMEWORKS ADDRESSES THIS EFFECTIVELY. DAY-SCHOOL IS NOT THE  
ANSWER.

NOTE: AT A MEETING YESTERDAY DAVID FINN REPORTED HAVING HAD LUNCH WITH SCHORSCH, SCHORSCH REPORTEDLY WAS VERY PLEASED AND IMPRESSED WITH THE COMMISSION MEETING. WHAT A FAR CRY FROM THE EMPHATIC OPENING SALVO OF MY INTERVIEW WITH HIM ONLY TEN DAYS AGO IN JERUSALEM : "I AM SKEPTICAL!".

SEVERAL JTS FACULTY MEMBERS REPORTED TO SEYMOUR THAT SCHORSCH REPORTED VERY FAVOURABLY ON THE COMMISSION.

Interview:

1. Commission Alvin Schiff
2. Interviewer: AJN
3. Date: 11-3-88
4. Spirit: Positive, enthusiastic, and hurt because he was not mentioned in "Jewish Week" article.
5. Setting: Schiff's office at the bureau.
6. Duration: 3 hours
7. Commissioner's current stand:
  - A. Personnel - Yes
  - B. Community - Yes
  - C. Programmatic options - eliminate those that are redundant and develop a creative scheme to deal with the rest.

Summary: Dr. Schiff opened the meeting by asking if I had seen the article in "Jewish Week". I told him I had heard about it but had not seen it. He said he was very hurt that he was not mentioned. He was upset by Peggy Tishman's quotes in the article and indicated that he is the strongest supporter of the Commission, among educators in New York City and did not understand why the reporter did not seek his advice. I indicated that I value his advice as does Mort Mandel and I also reassured him that there would be appropriate forums as the commission developed. Once we put that behind us, the interview proceeded with great enthusiasm and intellectual stimulation, particularly on his part. Alvin Schiff offered the following comments:

- I, Personnel - Alvin agrees that personnel is a key issue. We need to focus not only principals but teachers. We need to look at principals in relationship to different types of schools. There are principals and directors. A principal of a day school needs different tools than the director of a part-time supplemental school. In terms of issues, I asked Alvin about the requisite conditions related to Jewish education such as continuity. He indicated that there are 3 levels or goals that the commission needs to consider. The first level is Jewish survival. Alvin pointed out that with Jewish survival, there is no need for education. The second level is Jewish continuity. With Jewish continuity, a requisite condition is Jewish education. The third level is enhanced Jewish living and of course, with enhanced Jewish living is also the need for Jewish education.
- II, Community - There is a need for communal leadership; however, it must be substantively based. You cannot have effective leadership unless people have a sense of the cognitive dimensions of Judaism. The focus on community should deal with lay leadership and financial support. The Commission needs to understand why support of day schools and camps are necessary and why they are different. In terms of community, Alvin pointed out that we need to define it. He identified three dimensions to community. 1. He defined it in geographic terms; 2. people terms; and 3. structural organizational terms. First under geographic



terms,, we need to look at geography from a national,, regional,, and local perspective.. How do we work in each arena? Two,, in people terms,, we need to look at the interrelationship between the lay and the professional.. Who are the people that we need to focus on? Three,, in structural and organizational terms,, we need to look at the various organizations as well as the religious organizations.,

Schiff then went on to talk about the principles that make community go. First,, we need to describe the construct and context of community i.e. geographic,, people and structural.. Secondly,, what is the mission? What does the community want to do to focus in on day schools or whatever? Third,, what is our operational philosophy in relationship to community? How do we want to connect organizations and institutions? How do we begin to deal with the networks and national organizations like JWB,, JESNA,, COJE? How do we link in with the World Zionist Organization Hadassah,, etc.? The Commission he claims,, must be positioned so that it is bigger than any one entity..

III. Programmatic Options - Alvin felt that we had to organize a list of rubrics and each one should be a priority.. He identified a number of redundancies in the list. He listed the following: 3,, 5,, 6,, 7,, 12,, and 16..

Alvin will be attending the meeting on December 13. The interview with him was excellent..

Highlights of Meeting with Jonathan Woocher

(JAN)

Purpose of the meeting was to determine progress on his assignment to develop a strategy paper related to the commission linking to national networks and organizations on formal education. Woocher and Ariel were to have a paper by November 1; however, they appear to have gotten stuck and were unable to produce the paper. John and I talked about developing a mechanism within JESNA such as a lay committee in which we could begin to share the progress of the Commission and establish a process internally within JESNA. I also spoke with Woocher about putting together a committee made up of himself, Art Rotman, possibly Carmie Schwartz and David Ariel to develop an overall strategy for dealing with formal and informal education, as well as networks in the community related to the Commission. He agreed with that approach and felt that once the task forces are organized and the Commission becomes more substantive, it would be possible for JESNA to prepare input papers for each of the task forces.

Highlights of Meeting with Art Rotten (FAN)

We discussed the relationship of JWB and the Commission process. I reviewed my conversation with Woocher and he thought a lay committee might make sense and agreed with the notion of papers that could be presented to the Task Forces. We did agree to get together again prior to the Commission meeting for the purposes of framing an overall comprehensive strategy.



Highlights of Meeting with David Finn (1AN)

David Finn indicated that what is missing from the Commission is a process that would lead to great ideas. He feels that there are several models that we might look toward. For example, the Conference on Scientific, Academic, Religious, Political, and Military proceedings, the HUC Model on Ethics, and the Bill Moyers model. He also felt that we need an overall communication strategy that deals with the scholarly community as well as the lay and the professional community. It is only through an overall and comprehensive communications strategy that we will create a climate that will make all the over program intervention strategies possible. He recommended the following:

1. Make a decision that a communications plan needs to be part of the process.
2. Put together a group in terms of developing the plan. Development of a plan is the first step. The timing of this is very important and he offered his firm as a consultant. He said he would put his thoughts in writing.



INTERVIEW WITH  
MANDELL L. BERMAN

ARTHUR J. NAPARSTEK  
APRIL 28, 1989

The interview began with a review of where we were at the end of the December 13th meeting. I reaffirmed that the Commission came to consensus on the personnel and community options as enabling and preconditions in relationship to the others. I asked Bill if he had the same understanding of the Commission with regard to the conceptual framework. Berman indicated that he was in agreement, that he felt there was a consensus with the framework.

Berman also agreed that the challenge for the next meeting of the Commission is to answer the question of how to bring about significant across-the-board change through personnel and the community. Berman felt very strongly about implementation. He stated that only a report by the Commission would not be sufficient, that implementation of some type was necessary and that he felt it had to take place on the local level. I asked him if he thought a demonstration program would make sense. He agreed that demonstrations would make sense only if they build on what was currently working in the field.

Berman is of the strong opinion that there is much good that is going on and the Commission needs to identify those "best practices" and build upon them through demonstrations. I asked him how the community could grapple with such issues as in-service training, the recruitment of educators, etc. He indicated that the key on the local level has to be through negotiations with the federations. He did not believe we could create new mechanisms locally, but instead had to use existing organizations. We may use local surrogates that are then picked by the federation.

I asked him how we would diffuse innovation. It was at this point that he began to discuss the need for some type of national initiative that could begin to coordinate and identify local programs and provide opportunities for innovation, monitoring and evaluation. We moved from there to a discussion of establishing a mechanism on a national level that would begin to meet these needs.

I raised the question with Berman that if a mechanism were to be established, it will be necessary to deal with the following issues. I asked for his opinion on these issues:

1. What are the criteria for choosing a community action site? Here Berman feels very strongly that we need to identify successful programs. Excellence is the strongest criteria.



Interview with Mandell L. Berman

Page 2

2. Berman feels that key to the success of a national mechanism will be money. He believes that \$5 million per year for five years should be raised. However, if a locality were to become involved in the program, it would have to raise matching funds. The matching funds, in effect, would become a part of the criteria for selection. Thus, criteria would be programs that currently exist, and offering matching funds. To the issue of how do we guarantee projects of the quality the Commission aspires to, Berman suggested that a monitoring and evaluation program be established through existing organizations on the national level such as JESNA or JWB, that through the evaluation process quality would be ensured and that the national mechanism, in effect, would not become the policeman of the programs.
3. To the question of how will negotiations with the existing institutions in the community be conducted, Berman suggested that guidelines need to be developed by the national organization and constantly refined by the board so that negotiations will be guided by these guidelines.
4. To the question of what kind of local mechanism will need to be established to run the community action sites, Berman responded that local federations are the key.
5. To the question of how will a central mechanism work with local communities and help them rise to their full stature without imposing something on them from the top down, Berman felt that the mechanism around evaluation and monitoring can do that.

In conclusion, Berman felt that the national mechanism should work with existing programs and enrich them through the leveraging and matching strategies, that these programs in turn should be evaluated and monitored by national organizations like JESNA and JWB, and that through that evaluation and monitoring a diffusion process should be initiated throughout the country so that replication could occur.

The remaining part of the interview dealt with his suggestions related to the June 14th meeting. He felt very strongly that there is a need to excite people and get them to buy into the process in the June 14th meeting. He felt that we should come to some degree of closure on our strategy for how the Commission will work from June 14 through June 1990. He felt that there is a need for commissioners to receive material prior to the meeting, that everything should be organized in advance, and that the key part of the meeting should be through small groups, that each small group should have a chair (not a permanent chair), nor should these small groups become permanent subcommittees but at least chairs for the day.

Berman felt that the June 14th day should begin with a brief overview by MLM from approximately 10:00 a.m. to 10:45 a.m. From 10:45 a.m. until 2:00 p.m. we should meet in small committees of subgroups, and at 2:00 p.m. reconvene for a full meeting. Prior to the June 14th meeting, chairs need to be selected, people should be assigned to the small groups, and each commissioner should receive written material that gives a sense of direction for the meeting.

TO: Arthur J. Naparscek  
Virginia F. Levi

FROM: Henry L. Zucker

DATE: 5/16/89

REPLYING TO  
YOUR MEMO OF: \_\_\_\_\_

SUBJECT: INTERVIEW WITH ELI EVANS

IN THE OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER

I met with Eli Evans on May 11, 1989 at his office for about one hour. Part of our agenda was devoted to another subject and our discussion about the Commission lasted perhaps 30-40 minutes.

It is clear that Eli believes we should not put the emphasis at the June 14 meeting on an implementation mechanism; rather we should come up with some ideas and should begin to point to what we will eventually be reporting and how we will implement our emphases on personnel and on community and financing. We should make it clear that we hope to come up with new ideas tied with money. For example, Eli believes that there is a need for funds for a national pension system for education personnel. He believes there should be a fund for Jewish education built on the model of the National Endowment for the Arts.

Eli believes that the Commission has made good progress, but that there is now some impatience to get at more specific ideas.

Eli referred to his prior discussion with Seymour Fox. Seymour suggested the possibility of a national fund for the IJE, possibly in the neighborhood of \$50 million. Evans believes there is not a chance to raise a fund of this size. Evans believes that a fund of any considerable size would have to begin with a major contribution from Mendel, Bronfman, and Crown.

We reviewed the personnel option, the community option, and the implementation mechanism and the need for a follow up of each by the Commission. It is clear that Eli believes that the implementation mechanism should grow out of prior discussions about the enabling options and the related programmatic options. He believes it is necessary for the commissioners to become excited about the need for improvement in education and about the possibility of bringing about improvements.

MAY 03 09-111821

NRTIV CONSULTANTS

972 2 699951

P.7/8

## TOWARDS THE THIRD COMMISSION MEETING

## INTERVIEW OF COMMISSIONERS

\* (●)

COMMISSIONER NAME: MS. SARA LEE  
INTERVIEWER: PROF. SEYMOUR FOX  
DATE: APRIL 22, 1989  
PLACE: NEW YORK, NEW YORK

77 I

Summary:

Annette Hochstein accompanied me at this meeting which began at the Mayflower Hotel and continued with a thoroughly enjoyable brunch. We had a very intense discussion on the work of the Commission.

We did not have to review with Sara Lee the history of the work of the Commission; she is very much involved, has kept herself informed and did not have to be reminded of what was taking place.

Annette and I feel that Sara Lee's suggestion for establishing a task force in the area of personnel, which she suggested in writing to us earlier, is worthy of very careful consideration and that she could play a leading role, possibly even serve as a co-chair for such a task force.

We had previously discussed the concept of demonstration sites so it was easy to move in to the connection between the decisions of the Commission on December 13th and the possibility of establishing some version of a demonstration site.

She quickly understood the significance of the need for an

MAY 03 '89 11:22 NATIVE BUSINESS CONSULTANTS

972 2 69951

P.8/8

implementation instrumentality. She offered many suggestions and raised a good number of problems related to the concept of an ii. She strongly urged us to get the educators involved as soon as possible, and thought that many of them would want to help us in the work of building demonstration sites and the ii. She also participated, later in the week, in the meeting of the educators who are on the Commission, which took place at the Board of Jewish Education in New York city.

She is concerned about the role of the denominations in our work. We told her that meetings are being arranged between MLM and the various presidents of institutions of higher learning.

She has the June 14th date on her agenda, and is planning to attend.

I believe that Sara Lee is an important person for the Commission and will be willing to play a key role in our work.

# TOWARDS THE THIRD COMMISSION MEETING

## INTERVIEW OF COMMISSIONERS

II

COMMISSIONER NAME: PROF. HERB GOTTSCHALK

INTERVIEWER: PROF. SEYMOUR FOX

DATE: APRIL 7,, 1989

PLACE: 11 WEST 4TH ST., NEW YORK, NEW YORK

### Summary:

My meeting with Prof. Gottschalk took place at the New York office of the Hebrew Union College. Its purpose was to bring him up-to-date of the work of the staff since the last meeting of the Commission on December 13th.

I took Prof. Gottschalk through the various steps that we had considered, moving from demonstration sites to the problem of who might undertake the assignment of implementing or carrying out the ideas of the demonstration site.

Prof. Gottschalk thoroughly grasped the notion of the need for some kind of mechanism. I think he was concerned about the complexity of establishing something as elaborate as an ii. During the discussion he brought up several important points, such as the role that rabbis could and should play in any demonstration site that may be undertaken. He particularly emphasized the weakness of the training of rabbis for the role that they must undertake as educators. I believe that Prof. Gottschalk will cooperate in helping us establish demonstration sites and will do his very best to bring the Reform Movement on board.



When I brought up the problem of denominations and indicated that MLM will want to meet with him to consult with him on that issue, he seemed to take the position that nothing should be done; that things were "fine" as they are. I think this is something which should be kept in mind as MLM prepares his meeting with Prof. Gottschalk on the issue of the denominations..

He has the 14th of June on his calendar and we went down to look at his facility in New York, toward the possibility of it serving as the next site for our meeting. In general, I can say that Prof. Gottschalk is certainly an involved and cooperative Commission member.

MAY 12 '89 11:10

NEW YORK WATSON LIMITED

v t c c 0555 055551

P. 37/8

## TOWARDS THE THIRD COMMISSION MEETING

## INTERVIEW OF COMMISSIONERS

1

COMMISSIONER NAME: PROF. FRED GOTTSCHALK

INTERVIEWER: PROF. SEYMOUR FOX

DATE: APRIL 7, 1989

PLACE: 1 WEST 4TH ST., NEW YORK, NEW YORK

Summary:

My meeting with Prof. Gottschalk took place at the New York office of the Hebrew Union College. Its purpose was to bring him up-to-date of the work of the staff since the last meeting of the Commission on December 13th.

I took Prof. Gottschalk through the various steps that we had considered, moving from demonstration sites to the problem of who might undertake the assignment of implementing or carrying out the ideas of the demonstration site.

Prof. Gottschalk thoroughly grasped the notion of the need for some kind of mechanism. I think he was concerned about the complexity of establishing something as elaborate as an ii. During the discussion he brought up several important points, such as the role that rabbis could and should play in any demonstration site that may be undertaken. He particularly emphasized the weakness of the training of rabbis for the role that they must undertake as educators. I believe that Prof. Gottschalk will cooperate in helping us establish demonstration sites and will do his very best to bring the Reform Movement on board.

MAY 03 103101805

#  
NATIV CONSULTANTS

972 2 699951

P.4/8

When I brought up the problem of denominations and indicated that MLM will want to meet with him to consult with him on that issue, he seemed to take the position that nothing should be done; that things were "fine" as they are. I think this is something which should be kept in mind as MLM prepares his meeting with Prof. Gottschalk on the issue of the denominations.

He has the 14th of June on his calendar and we went down to look at his facility in New York, toward the possibility of it serving as the next site for our meeting. In general, I can say that Prof. Gottschalk is certainly an involved and cooperative Commission member.

Arthur J. Naparstek  
TO: " " Virginia E. Levi

FROM: Henry L. Zucker

DATE: 5/15/89

REPLYING TO  
YOUR MEMO OF: .....

IN PARALLEL TO AND WITH

SUBJECT: INTERVIEW WITH ELI EVANS

I met with Eli Evans on May 11, 1989 at his office for about one hour. Part of our agenda was devoted to another subject and our discussion about the Commission lasted perhaps 30-40 minutes.

It is clear that Eli believes we should not put the emphasis at the June 14 meeting on an implementation mechanism; rather we should come up with some ideas and should begin to point to what we will eventually be reporting and how we will implement our emphases on personnel and on community and financing. We should make it clear that we hope to come up with new ideas and with money. For example, Eli believes that there is a need for funds for a national pension system for education personnel. He believes there should be a fund for Jewish education built on the model of the National Endowment for the Arts.

Eli believes that the Commission has made good progress, but that there is now some impatience to get at more specific ideas.

Eli referred to his prior discussion with Seymour Fox. Seymour suggested the possibility of a national fund for the IJE, possibly in the neighborhood of \$30 million. Evans believes there is not a chance to raise a fund of this size. Evans believes that a fund of any considerable size would have to begin with a major contribution from Mandel, Bronfman, and Crown.

We reviewed the personnel option, the community option, and the implementation mechanism and the need for a follow up of each by the Commission. It is clear that Eli believes that the implementation mechanism should grow out of prior discussions about the enabling options and the related programmatic options. He believes it is necessary for the commissioners to become excited about the need for improvement in education and about the possibility of bringing about improvements.

INTEL-OFFICE  
CORRESPONDENCE

MAY 03 09 11:21 NATIVE CIVIL CONSULTANTS

972 2 69951

P. 7/8

**TOWARDS THE THIRD COMMISSION MEETING**  
**INTERVIEW OF COMMISSIONERS**

**COMMISSIONER NAME:** MS. SARA LEE

**INTERVIEWER:** PROF. SEYMOUR FOX

**DATE:** APRIL 2, 1989

**PLACE:** NEW YORK, NEW YORK

Summary:

Annette Hochstein accompanied me at this meeting which began at the Mayflower Hotel and continued with a thoroughly enjoyable brunch. We had a very intense discussion on the work of the Commission.

We did not have to review with Sara Lee the History of the work of the Commission; she is very much involved, has kept herself informed and did not have to be reminded of what was taking place.

Annette and I feel that Sara Lee's suggestion for establishing a task force in the area of personnel, which she suggested in writing to us earlier, is worthy of very careful consideration and that she could play a leading role, possibly even serve as a co-chair for such a task force.

We had previously discussed the concept of demonstration sites so it was easy to move in to the connection between the decisions of the Commission on December 13th and the possibility of establishing some version of a demonstration site.

She quickly understood the significance of the need for an



MAY 03 13221892

NATIV CONSULTANTS

972 2 699951

P.8/8

implementation instrumentality. She offered many suggestions and raised a good number of problems related to the concept of an ii. She strongly urged us to get the educators involved as soon as possible, and thought that many of them would want to help us in the work of building demonstration sites and the ii. She also participated, later in the week, in the meeting of the educators who are on the Commission, which took place at the Board of Jewish Education in New York city.

she is concerned about the role of the denominations in our work. We told her that meetings are being arranged between NLM and the various presidents of institutions of higher learning.

She has the June 14th date on her agenda, and is planning to attend.

I believe that Sara Lee is an important person for the Commission and will be willing to play a key role in our work.

my 03 04 11:16

mnhw wihulimis

DTE. 2 000000000

0.380

## TOWARDS THE THIRD COMMISSION MEETING

## INTERVIEW OF COMMISSIONERS

(

COMMISSIONER NAME: PROF. FRED GOTTSCHALK

INTERVIEWER: PROF. SEYMOUR FOX

DATE: APRIL 1989

PLACE: 1 WEST 4TH ST., NEW YORK, NEW YORK

Summary

My meeting with Prof. Gottschalk took place at the New York office of the Hebrew Union College. Its purpose was to bring him up-to-date of the work of the staff since the last meeting of the Commission on December 13th.

I took Prof. Gottschalk through the various steps that we had considered, moving from demonstration sites to the problem of who might undertake the assignment of implementing or carrying out the ideas of the demonstration site.

Prof. Gottschalk thoroughly grasped the notion of the need for some kind of mechanism. I think he was concerned about the complexity of establishing something as elaborate as an ii. During the discussion he brought up several important points, such as the role that rabbis could and should play in any demonstration site that may be undertaken. He particularly emphasized the weakness of the training of rabbis for the role that they must undertake as educators. I believe that Prof. Gottschalk will cooperate in helping us establish demonstration sites and will do his very best to bring the Reform Movement on board.

MAY 03 15:10 83 NATIV CONSULTANTS

972 2 68851

Pg. 4/8

When I brought up the problem of denominations and indicated that NLM will want to meet with him to consult with him on that issue,, he seemed to take the position that nothing should be done; that things were "fine" as they are. I think this is something which should be kept in mind as NLM prepares his meeting with Prof. Gettschalk on the issue of the denominations.

He has the 14th of June on his calendar and we went down to look at his facility in New York, toward the possibility of it serving as the next site for our meeting. In general, I can say that Prof. Gettschalk is certainly an involved and cooperative Commission member.

MAY 03 88 11221-

NATV CONSULTANTS

972 2 69951

P.7/8

## TOWARDS THE THIRD COMMISSION MEETING

## INTERVIEW OF COMMISSIONERS

COMMISSIONER NAME: MS. SARA LEE  
INTERVIEWER: BROOF. SEMMOHR FOX  
DATE: APRIL 2, 1989  
PLACE: NEW YORK, NEW YORK

Summary:

Annette Hochstein accompanied me at this meeting which began at the Mayflower Hotel and continued with a thoroughly enjoyable brunch. We had a very intense discussion on the work of the Commission.

We did not have to review with Sara Lee the history of the work of the Commission; she is very much involved, has kept herself informed and did not have to be reminded of what was taking place.

Annette and I feel that Sara Lee's suggestion for establishing a task force in the area of personnel, which she suggested in writing to us earlier, is worthy of very careful consideration and that she could play a leading role, possibly even serve as a co-chair for such a task force.

We had previously discussed the concept of demonstration sites so it was easy to move in to the connection between the decisions of the Commission on December 13th and the possibility of establishing some version of a demonstration site.

She quickly understood the significance of the need for an

MAY 03 183211832

NATIV CONSULTANTS

972 2 699551

P.8/18

implementation instrumentality. She offered many suggestions and raised a good number of problems related to the concept of an ii. She strongly urged us to get the educators involved as soon as possible, and thought that many of them would want to help us in the work of building demonstration sites and the ii. She also participated, later in the week, in the meeting of the educators who are on the Commission, which took place at the Board of Jewish Education in New York City.

She is concerned about the role of the denominations in our work. We told her that meetings are being arranged between NLM and the various presidents of institutions of higher learning.

She has the June 14th date on her agenda, and is planning to attend.

I believe that Sara Lee is an important person for the Commission and will be willing to play a key role in our work.



TO: Arthur J. Naparstek  
Virginia F. Levi  
NAME  
OR PARTIAL TELEPHONE LOCATION

FROM: Henry L. Zucker  
NAME

DATE: 5/15/82  
 REPLYING TO  
 YOUR MEMO OF: \_\_\_\_\_

SUBJECT; COMMISSION INTERVIEW WITH RAJBI MAURICE CORSON  
 ON MAY 11, 1989, ONE HOUR AT THE LAGUARDIA AIRPORT  
 AND IN THE LIMOUSINE ON THE WAY TO HIS NEW YORK OFFICE  
 LARRY MOSES PARTICIPATED IN SOME OF THE INTERVIEW

Corson is skeptical about the mechanism to follow up the findings of the Commission. He believes that Seymour Fox knew before the Commission was organized what sort of follow-up mechanism should be developed. Corson believes that while there is need of a follow-up mechanism, it is not a good idea to establish a new IJB agency. Rather, the function should be assigned to JESNA.

The Wexner Foundation would not support an independent IJE. It probably would support a JESNA department for the same purpose.

Corson is very touchy on the idea of financial support of the Commission's recommendations because he made it clear in advance that in joining the Commission, he was not implying that Wexner would take on a financial obligation to support the Commission's findings. I made it clear that all financial support for ideas which emerge from the Commission would be strictly on a volunteer basis. Participating foundations would take on financial support in areas in which they have a specific interest.

Corson commented that there are serious splits in the organizational functioning of all three denominations, and that this will probably have a negative effect on the ability of the denominations to be helpful in carrying out ideas developed by the Commission. For example, anything recommended by the Hebrew Union College is likely to be ignored or opposed by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

In general, Corson was supportive of the work of the Commission. He believes it will produce a report which will have substantial influence on Jewish education. He made it clear that the Wexner Foundation has a deep interest in Jewish education and is already supporting major efforts in this field and will continue to do so.

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

THE COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA  
FOLLOWING-UP ON THE FIRST MEETING:

PHONE CALLS WITH COMMISSIONERS.

1.COMMISSIONER: PEGGY TISHMAN

2.PHONER: ANNETTE HOCHSHEIN

3.DATE: AUGUST 3, 1988

4.SPIRIT: VERY INVOLVED AND TISHMAN-WISE TO THE POINT.

5.THE CALL:

THE SUPPLEMENTARY SCHOOL IS WHERE THE CHILDREN ARE AND THAT'S WHERE THEY MUST BE EDUCATED. THE SUPPLEMENTARY SCHOOL MUST BE BROUGHT ON PAR WITH THE EXCELLENT ELEMENTARY AND HIGH-SCHOOLS WHERE THE KIDS GO FOR GENERAL EDUCATION.

WE MUST DEAL WITH THE QUALITY OF TEACHERS AND WITH THE QUALITY OF MATERIALS.

THE WAY TO FIND OUT WHAT'S NEEDED IS NOT BY TALKING TO X BUT BY TALKING TO THE PARENTS OF THE KIDS WHO DROP OUT. FIND OUT WHAT THEY WANT, WHY THEY DROPPED OUT, WHAT THEY NEED.

[CONVERSATION TRUNCATED WHEN P.T. ANNOUNCED "OK. I MUST GET OFF THE PHONE NOW". I WAS OFF THE NEXT SECOND, AND THINK SHE MAY HAVE WANTED TO SAY A LITTLE MORE. HER GENERAL TONE WAS VERY POSITIVE.]

\* \* \* \* \*

INTERVIEW WITH  
PEGGY TISHMAN

ARTHUR J. NAPARSTEK  
MAY 4, 1989

Peggy opened the discussion by stating there is a need for an attitudinal change in the Jewish community if the quality of Jewish education is to be improved. She agrees that there is a firm linkage between the national and local role and that any initiative that comes out of the Commission must build on the successes that are already out there. She also feels that we have to reach out to young people and develop strategies for recruitment.

She seemed to have known about our thoughts related to a national mechanism, and preempted my questions by immediately discussing that a national mechanism was a great idea which should become an arm of JESNA; that we should use their administrative infrastructure. That led me into asking her about the various issues that would have to be dealt with if such a mechanism was established, either within JESNA or linked to JESNA or independent of JESNA.

1. Criteria

On the question of criteria, she responded by indicating that small, medium and large cities would be appropriate.

2. Quality Issues

On quality issues, she feels that trial and error is perhaps the way to go and learn from the mistakes we make. The key on quality is for the staff of the IJE and its board to work on setting standards and being flexible. She then moved into another discussion on JESNA and indicated that JESNA should be given an additional mandate, take on the priority of dealing with this mechanism.

3. Negotiations with Existing Institutions

With regard to questions and issues related to negotiations with existing institutions and how they would be conducted, she urged us to consider working through local federations and their boards.

4. Funding

With regard to funding, she indicated that funding will be a problem as so many campaigns are now flat. She did not go further into that other than to indicate that it would be a problem.

5. Monitoring and Evaluation

What kind of monitoring and evaluation should accompany the implementation of the projects? Here again, she did not have any ideas but talked about the need for excellence.

We then moved into a discussion of the June 14th meeting. Her opinion was that there has been unfocused discussion at earlier meetings and that we now had to excite the commissioners. We need to give a series of interesting options that commissioners could consider in personnel and community. What is going on in the field that would be interesting and exciting may be of interest to commissioners.

She saw the morning part of the meeting as being devoted to personnel and community in terms of overview, options, with plenary group discussion. In the afternoon, to begin to break down into small groups or workshops and to begin to examine the options, to begin to look at questions related to how do we implement, the question of national organizations as a way of bringing about change, and coherence to the whole process.



## Interview

1. Commissioner: ~~Peggy~~ Tishman
2. Interviewer: ABN
3. Date: 11-2-88
4. Spirit: Somewhat subdued and a bit apologetic. Indicated unhappiness with the "Jewish Week" quote. More positive than I have experienced her to date on the subject. Very constructive.
5. Setting: Peggy Tishman's office at the Federation in New York. York.
6. Duration: 1 hour
7. Commissioner's current stand.
  - A. Personnel  
Yes, but not all that interested.
  - B. Community  
Yes, with the caveat that community means a lot of different things to different people.
  - C. Programmatic Options  
As presented, she did not become excited by them; however, through the interview, she came around.
8. Summary:

We began the interview by reviewing what had taken place since the last Commission meeting. She picked up on it immediately and agrees on the direction in which we are going, and also agrees with the notion of task forces. She feels two groups are pivotal for Jewish education. One, the issue of family; and second, the issue of early childhood and elementary school. Sees conditions for programmatic \* options are family and early childhood.



As the interview continued,, she offered the following comments.

- I. Community - everyone has a different definition of community..  
She mentioned the JWB report on community as very helpful and went a long way toward defining community.. She concluded that this is a very important area..
- II. Personnel - She felt that this is a critical area that runs through all the options.. Unless there is personnel in terms of a profession,, a sense of esteem,, we will not be able to move much further..
- III. Programmatic Options - Peggy identified family and early childhood/elementary school as key programmatic options.. As she talked about the programmatic options,, a thought occurred to me that we may need to assess the programmatic options in a life cycle context.. In other words,, to assess from early childhood,, through late adulthood.. In a sense,, the family then becomes a requisite condition for a number of the other programmatic options.. One way of approaching the 24 or 25 programmatic options would be through a life cycle approach in that we could develop a matrix in which we would look at early childhood through the day school lens or a supplemental school lens,, and how media as a tool can move us forward.
- IV. Task Forces - Peggy Tishman agrees with task forces and believes people should self select into the task forces.. She feels that task force meetings should be at the time of the commission,, perhaps the day before if you could get people there.. Clearly,, she is committed to the third task force,, but the focus should be

on childhood and family, and the life cycle approach may be the way of dealing with it.

Peggy Tishman will attend the meeting of December 13.

THE COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA  
FOLLOWING-UP ON THE FIRST MEETING:

PHONE CALLS WITH COMMISSIONERS.

1.COMMISSIONER: PEGGY TISHMAN

2.PHONER: ANNETTE HOCHSTEIN

3.DATE: AUGUST 3, 1988

4.SPIRIT: VERY INVOLVED AND TISHMAN-WISE TO THE POINT.

5.THE CALL:

THE SUPPLEMENTARY SCHOOL IS WHERE THE CHILDREN ARE AND THAT'S WHERE THEY MUST BE EDUCATED. THE SUPPLEMENTARY SCHOOL MUST BE BROUGHT ON PAR WITH THE EXCELLENT ELEMENTARY AND HIGH-SCHOOLS WHERE THE KIDS GO FOR GENERAL EDUCATION.

WE MUST DEAL WITH THE QUALITY OF TEACHERS AND WITH THE QUALITY OF MATERIALS.

THE WAY TO FIND OUT WHAT'S NEEDED IS NOT BY TALKING TO X BUT BY TALKING TO THE PARENTS OF THE KIDS WHO DROP OUT. FIND OUT WHAT THEY WANT, WHY THEY DROPPED OUT, WHAT THEY NEED.

[CONVERSATION TRUNCATED WHEN P.T. ANNOUNCED "OK. I MUST GET OFF THE PHONE NOW". I WAS OFF THE NEXT SECOND, AND THINK SHE MAY HAVE WANTED TO SAY A LITTLE MORE. HER GENERAL TONE WAS VERY POSITIVE.]

\* \* \* \* \*

(1) T

1. Commissioner Carol Ingall
2. Interviewer: Joseph Reimer
3. Date: 12-6-88
4. Duration: 1/2 hour by telephone

Carol Ingall was quite familiar with the steps taken since the August meeting and agreed with the validity of distinguishing between programmatic and enabling conditions. She thought it appropriate to focus on the generic "preconditions." She sees the programmatic options as having such variations from community to community that a national effort, such as the Commission, would have its greatest impact by focusing on the generic issues. Personnel and community seem right to her as specific generic foci.

Her own primary interest is in the area of personnel. Carol sees the two main issues within personnel to be recruitment and retention and is personally interested in both - though more so in recruitment.

She favors moving to a task force structure and thinks task forces can be used on December 13. She prefers to have task force piggybacked to Commission meetings.

Carol is enthusiastic about the Commission and will attend the meeting on December 13.

1. Commissioner: Jack Bieler
2. Interviewer: Joseph Reiliner
3. Date: 12/7/88
4. Duration: 1/2 hour by telephone

Rabbi Bieler really enjoyed the October meeting in Boston and found it very stimulating. He would look forward to future meetings of that quality.

Jack felt the meeting gave him a good understanding of the method used to develop the option papers and the distinction between programmatic and enabling options. He finds the distinction valid and the focus on the preconditions of personnel and community as almost self-evident.

His concern is that in reading the option papers,, they were so general as to not take the reader to the hub of the issues. He offered the example of the paper on day schools where some of the finer points on how to establish quality education (that he suggested), were not in the paper. His concern is that commissioners get enough detail to be able to make informed decisions.

Jack's hope is that the task force structure get underway in a way that allows some commissioners,, like himself, who have the time and interest to get involved in the details of an issue,, to meet more frequently and really interact over the issues. He currently finds the issues of personnel and community too broadly defined and predicts that once commissioners begin to work on them in detail,, differences of perspective will emerge that will need to be worked out.

His own interest is in working on the issue of personnel. He is anxious to contribute from what he is learning on the subject and to gain for himself a broader picture.

Jack's level of involvement and enthusiasm is high. He will attend the meeting on December 13. He wanted us as a staff to think about whether or not current tensions over the issue of "Who is a Jew?" might spill-over into the meeting and create a less harmonious atmosphere.



1. Commissioner: Josh Elkin
2. Interviewer: Joseph Reimer
3. Date: December 5, 1988
4. Duration: 1/2 hour in Rabbi Elkin's office

Rabbi Elkin really enjoyed the October meeting in Boston which he felt gave him a good sense of where the Commission is moving.

He readily accepts the distinction between "preconditions" and programmatic options, and agrees that the former need to take priority, as dealing with them will have the broadest impact. Yet he thinks that keeping some programmatic options available for the Commission may help in enfranchising commissioners who have specific interests in them.

Josh is concerned that the communal option remains ill-defined. This is his main interest: how to help Jewish educators learn to work more comfortably with lay leaders; how to build local cooperation between lay and professional leaders; and how to improve the public image of Jewish education by involving lay leaders.

Josh favors moving to a structure of 3 task forces and believes task forces should have a life of their own. He would look forward to being active on a task force on community. He is enthusiastic about the Commission and will attend the December 13 meeting.

THE COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA  
FOLLOWING-UP ON THE FIRST MEETING;

PHONE CALLS WITH COMMISSIONERS.

1.COMMISSIONER: NORMAN LAMM

2.PHONER: ANNETTE HOCHSHEIN

3.DATE: AUGUST 3, 1988

4.SPIRIT: INVOLVED, FACTUAL, PLEASED. LITTLE TRACE OF THE  
ORIGINAL SKEPTICISM. MY FEELING: HE WANTS THIS TO  
SUCCEED.

5.THE CALL:

RABBI LAMM THINKS THE MEETING WAS HANDLED VERY WELL, THOUGH HE  
BELIEVES DAY-LONG MEETINGS ARE NO GOOD. THEY REPRESENT A GENUINE  
SACRIFICE FOR HIM.

HE SUGGESTS THAT WE SHOULD NOW NARROW THE FOCUS TO 5 TOPICS,  
CONCENTRATING ON THE THE TEACHERS. THIS IS THE REAL MAIN  
PRIORITY. NO MATTER HOW IMPORTANT OTHER TOPICS ARE, NONE IS AS  
IMPORTANT AS THIS: UPGRADING TEACHING; TEACHER SALARIES; TRAINING  
INSTITUTIONS.

THE PROCESS TO DECEMBER: WE SHOULD DO THE WORK.  
COMMISSIONERS SHOULD BE CONSULTED FOR IDEAS, THEN WHEN WE HAVE  
SUFFICIENT DATA FOR SELECTING TOPICS A LETTER SHOULD BE SENT TO  
ALL TELLING THEM: WE SEEM TO FIND CONSENSUS ON THE FOLLOWING  
TOPICS. THEREFORE WE SUBMIT TO THEIR ATTENTION THE FOLLOWING  
LIST OF PRIORITIES.

RABBI LAMM COMPLAINED ABOUT THE DAY-LONG MEETING, SAYING IN  
ESSENCE THAT THEY REPRESENT TOO GENUINE AND BIG A SACRIFICE. HE  
URGES US TO MAKE MEETINGS SHORTER.

\* \* \* \* \*

6/1

Lamm10.88/2MN-W

October 18, 1988

THE COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA

TOWARDS THE SECOND MEETING OF THE COMMISSION

INTERVIEW OF COMMISSIONERS

1. COMMISSIONER: NORMAN LAMM
2. INTERVIEWER: ANNETTE HOCHSTEIN
3. DATE: OCTOBER 17, 1988
4. SPIRIT: FACTUAL, FORTHCOMING, FRIENDLY
5. SETTING: PHONE CALL FROM JERUSALEM
6. DURATION: 35 MINUTES

7. COMMISSIONERS CURRENT STAND:

A. PERSONNEL: STRONG SUPPORT

B. THE COMMUNITY AT THE START IS GENERATING ADDITIONAL FUNDING FROM KEY DONORS (OPTION 23). THIS WILL MOTIVATE THE COMMUNITY MORE THAN ANY OTHER ATTEMPT AT CHANGING THE ATMOSPHERE.

C. PROGRAMMATIC OPTIONS: THESE SHOULD COME AFTER THE ABOVE PRE-CONDITIONS OR MEANS OPTIONS.

8. SUMMARY:

A. I BEGAN BY TELLING RABBI LAMM THAT WE TOOK OUR DIRECTION FROM THE CONTENT OF THE FIRST COMMISSION MEETING, ~~AND~~ OF THE INTERVIEWS, OF THE CONVERSATIONS AND FROM THE LETTERS WRITTEN BY COMMISSIONERS.

B. REFERRED TO N.L.'S SPECIFIC INPUT: HIS ~~STANDS~~ STANDS, PARTICULARLY IN FAVOR OF DEALING WITH TEACHERS.

C. REFERRED TO MY PHONE CONVERSATION WITH HIM ON AUGUST 3RD WHERE HE SUGGESTED THAT WE SHOULD NARROW THE FOCUS TO A FEW TOPICS AND DO OUR HOMEWORK, THEN CONSULT WITH THE COMMISSIONERS AS IDEAS DEVELOP. TOLD HIM THIS WAS PART OF CONSULTING.

D. EXPLAINED THE METHOD: THE LIST OF OPTIONS, THEIR IMPLICATIONS (THE INVENTORY), THE CHECK-LIST (CRITERIA). TOLD N.L. OF THE EMERGING TWO CATEGORIES OF OPTIONS:

1. PROGRAMMATIC OPTIONS;
2. MEANS/OPTIONS OR PRECONDITIONS.

Wanted. emphasis on day-2

EX. W. S. W. in Ay-11 contact of a G/jp community

1. AMT 6. 8. 2. Cc2 w/ ELs V WA3-? US. pzt A. J. On page

A- He too personal - (could be more direct) B- unapologetic his

C. Power

12 I Holt 3

E. AT THIS POINT RABBI LAMM EXPRESSED HIS FEELINGS THAT WE WERE RIGHT ON TARGET AND THAT WE SHOULD DEFINITELY DEAL WITH THE MEANS OPTIONS FIRST, BEFORE DEALING WITH THE PROGRAMMATIC ONES.

F. PRESENTED THE MEANS OPTIONS (READ THE LIST UPON REQUEST). I THEN SAID THAT PERSONNEL AND THE COMMUNITY WERE EMERGING AS MORE IMPORTANT OR MORE NECESSARY THAN THE OTHERS AND ASKED FOR HIS RESPONSE.

G. N.L. RESPONDED AS FOLLOWS:

A)) PERSONNEL IS CLEARLY THE MOST IMPORTANT TOPIC TO DEAL WITH. IT IS ABOVE EVERYTHING ELSE IN IMPORTANCE AND MUST BE DEALT WITH FIRST.

B) AS FAR AS THE COMMUNITY IS CONCERNED. ((MISUNDERSTOOD>> THE OPTION DUE TO POOR FORMULATION ON MY PART)) THE RECASTING OF COMMUNAL STRUCTURES IS AN IMPOSSIBLE TASK. THE SECOND PRE-CONDITION SHOULD BE TO GENERATE ADDITIONAL FUNDING. A BRIEF CONVERSATION FOLLOWED ABOUT THE NATURE OF THE COMMUNITY AND THE FUNDING OPTIONS. RABBI LAMM THEN SAID THAT INDEED THERE IS A DIALECTIC BETWEEN FUNDRAISING AND THE COMMUNITY SUPPORT FOR JEWISH EDUCATION. HOWEVER, HE SUGGESTED THAT IF PEOPLE WOULD SEE REAL COMMITMENT ON THE PART OF A FEW KEY LAY PEOPLE ((LARGE DONATIONS)), THEN THEY WOULD GET THE MESSAGE ABOUT THE IMPORTANCE OF JEWISH EDUCATION, WOULD BE MOTIVATED, AND WOULD FOLLOW THE EXAMPLE.

THE PROGRAMMATIC OPTIONS SHOULD BE DEALT WITH LATER, AT A SECOND STAGE. DEALING WITH THEM FIRST WOULD SIMPLY BE TO SQUANDER EFFORTS WITHOUT HAVING THE MEANS TO DEAL WITH THE OPTIONS EFFECTIVELY.

H. THE WORK--THE PROCESS: ASKED ABOUT TASK-FORCES: RABBI LAMM REITERATED HIS VIEW THAT 1) A MAJOR STUMBLING BLOCK TO THE TASK-FORCES WOULD BE IF THEY REQUIRED MEETINGS IN ADDITION TO THOSE OF THE COMMISSION. 2) THE HOMEWORK, THE WORK, SHOULD BE DONE BY THE STAFF WHO SHOULD TAKE THE INITIATIVE AND PRESENT AN OUTLINE OF DISCUSSION FOR THE TASK-FORCES. 3) N.L. ALSO WARNED AGAINST TASK-FORCES THAT WOULD BE TOO LARGE AND THEREFORE NOT EFFECTIVE, "BECAUSE PEOPLE IN LARGE GROUPS WANT TO BE HEARD."

RABBI LAMM ACCEPTED TO MEET WITH ME ON DECEMBER 9TH AT 8:15 A.M. TO DISCUSS THE CONTINUATION OF OUR WORK AND THE UPCOMING MEETING.

I. RABBI LAMM WILL ATTEND THE MEETING OF DECEMBER 13TH. 13TH.



MAY 03 '89 11:21

NATIW CONSULTANTS

972 2 699951

P:6/8

## TOWARDS THE THIRD COMMISSION MEETING

## INTERVIEW OF COMMISSIONERS

COMMISSIONER NAME: DAVID HIRSCHHORN

INTERVIEWER: PROF. SEYMOUR FOX

DATE: APRIL 3,, 1989

PLACE: BALTIMORE, MD.

Summary:

I had a meeting with Mr. Hirschhorn at the Blaustein Building in Baltimore where we discussed the ideas he had presented at the previous Commission meeting on the importance of research and evaluation.

This was a very enjoyable three-hour meeting and I will give a more complete report after I see Mr. Hirschhorn again on May 5th.

I did begin to sketch the concept of demonstration site and the need for some implementation instrumentality to help build and develop the demonstration site.

I discovered that Mr. Hirschhorn is particularly interested in the work of the Reform Movement, and I believe that his foundation, and he personally, would be very much interested in participating actively in the work of the Commission and in its outcomes.



hirsch/1FOX-W  
fox11/1FOXW

TOWARDS THE THIRD COMMISSION MEETING

INTERVIEW OF COMMISSIONERS

COMMISSIONER NAME: MR. DAVID HIRSCHHORN

INTERVIEWER: PRBDF. SEMOUR FOX

DATE: MAY 31, 1989 -- 3:00-5:00 PPM.

PLACE: BALTIMORE, MD.

Summary:

This is my second meeting with Mr. Hirschhorn. It was another excellent meeting. Mr. Hirschhorn is definitely someone who wants to be involved in the work of the Commission and has particular interests which fit it very much with the general work of the Commission, and particularly the work of the ii.

I reviewed with him the conception of demonstration site, leaving open the question of what we meant by that, with the possibilities being from a whole community to several schools in different communities. And he made some important points, particularly in relationship to the politics of working with any particular community.

He understood the need for a mechanism to carry this out, and is very much supportive of the idea of the ii. Again, he returned to his two major interests which are research-evaluation goal setting, and believes that it's very important to encourage the various denominations to work out their goals, to articulate them, and then to decide on what practice is likely to lead us to their goals.

He saw the evaluation and monitoring aspect of the work of the ii

as very important.. And I think he would be particularly interested in being involved with this.. He brought up the question of federation grant giving and its relationship to Jewish education and very much concerned about the fact that we have very little in evaluation to guide federations as they take decisions.. He continuously referred to his own role in the Baltimore Federation..

The other topic that was of importance to him was the supplementary school and he wanted to find out how much can be done in a supplementary school.. We discussed the fact that there are several supplementary schools in the United States that appear to be successful.. He thought it would be useful to study those schools,, to see what it is that makes them "successful" and decide whether they could be replicated..

He would be happy to participate in small group meetings related to the issue of research or the supplementary school..

He was ready to speak at the next meeting of the Commission on the issue of research and the supplementary school.. And I promised to get back to him to remind him as to whether this would be useful..

He mentioned the importance of bringing Bob Hiller into the inner group and I think that should be put on my agenda or Hank Zucker's.. Very much also concerned with the issue of profession-building, and thought that this was going to be one of the key issues and challenges for the Commission..

I think we have a very supportive member of the Commission who is very happy to participate and be active..

At the end of the interview, Mr. Hirschhorn thought it was useful

for me to meet with several other members of the Blaustein family,, and he proceeded to discuss with them the work of the Commission and described it, I thought,, very effectively..

Mr. Hirshhorn is expecting to attend the meeting on the 14th.

JOSEPH REINER

9/21/89

INTERVIEW WITH HASHEM LOOKSTEIN

1. Rabbi Lookstein was pleased with the last meeting and with its emphasis on Community Action Sites. He hopes that we continue with a clear emphasis on action.

2. When I read to him the list of papers commissioned, he grew concerned. Will these be academic in tone and substance? Will they be more d'rash than halacha? He hopes not. He wants a continued emphasis on agility.

3. Rabbi Lookstein was also concerned about commissioner input into the papers. He wondered "What is there in our three meetings that will make these papers different?" Do they grow out of Commissioner input? I stressed that the commissioners will have much input at this meeting and in reaction to the first drafts, that the final report will emerge from the commissioners' reactions to these papers. He reacted more favorably, but stressed the need for their not being only academic.

4. Speaking of his own expectations, he said that he wanted the commission to give him a clear list of steps of what ought to be done, e.g., to increase the professional satisfaction of Jewish teachers. He'd like to be able to take these findings to his board and say, "Here is what we need to be doing to get these results."

5. Rabbi Lookstein is planning to attend on October 23.

INTERVIEW WITH  
HASKEL LOOKSTEIN

ARTHUR J. NAPARSTEK

MAY 4, 1989

291

I opened the interview with a discussion on the overall mission of the Commission. Haskell agrees that the Commission's objectives are to bring about change and implementation. When we talked about how change could come about, Haskell indicated that an ongoing mechanism would be needed.

From that we went into the interview related to the issues that needed to be dealt with.

1. Criteria

He felt that in choosing community action sites, we needed to look at places that were open to new ideas, that were not doctrinaire and would allow for external stimulation. Excellence should guide us in terms of picking places. But the key issue from his point of view is the openness to new ideas from which a lot of different organizations and groups could learn. He said that the major ingredient about the Commission which inspired him was the fact of openness.

2. Quality

How do we guarantee that the projects are of the quality that the Commission aspires to? There, he indicated that we have to choose well and, after choosing, monitor the projects. He said that no program should be guided by a blank check. We should withdraw if need be.

3. Negotiations with Existing Institutions

How will we negotiate with the existing institutions in the community? Here again, different communities will require different styles of negotiation. In New York, Alvin Schiff plays that kind of role. In other communities, it might be the federation.

4. Appropriate Funding

How will appropriate funding sources be matched with specific projects? Leveraging is essential. We need to be careful here so that people are not guided only by funding and that, instead, the funding will lead to programs that can bring about systemic change and are consistent with the Commission's overall objectives.



JESNA playing those roles.

6. Central Mechanism

How will a central mechanism work with local communities? Lookstein does not have any answers on that other than to say that we cannot have a central mechanism impose its will on local communities.

With regard to the June 14th meeting, Lookstein will attend and would like to see the meeting have more group discussions. That was the only response he gave to that question.



INTERVIEW WITH  
HASKEL LOOKSTEIN

ARTHUR J. NAPARSTEK  
MAY 4, 1989

I opened the interview with a discussion on the overall mission of the Commission. Haskell agrees that the Commission's objectives are to bring about change and implementation. When we talked about how change could come about, Haskell indicated that an ongoing mechanism would be needed.

From that we went into the interview related to the issues that needed to be dealt with.

1. Criteria

He felt that in choosing community action sites, we needed to look at places that were open to new ideas, that were not doctrinaire and would allow for external stimulation. Excellence should guide us in terms of picking places. But the key issue from his point of view is the openness to new ideas from which a lot of different organizations and groups could learn. He said that the major ingredient about the Commission which inspired him was the fact of openness.

2. Quality

How do we guarantee that the projects are of the quality that the Commission aspires to? There, he indicated that we have to choose well and, after choosing, monitor the projects. He said that no program should be guided by a blank check. We should withdraw if need be.

3. Negotiations with Existing Institutions

How will we negotiate with the existing institutions in the community? Here again, different communities will require different styles of negotiation. In New York, Alvin Schiff plays that kind of role. In other communities, it might be the federation.

4. Appropriate Funding

How will appropriate funding sources be matched with specific projects? Leveraging is essential. We need to be careful here so that people are not guided only by funding and that, instead, the funding will lead to programs that can bring about systemic change and are consistent with the Commission's overall objectives.

JESNA playing those roles.

## 6. Central Mechanism

How will a central mechanism work with local communities? Lookstein does not have any answers on that other than to say that we cannot have a central mechanism impose its will on local communities.

With regard to the June 14th meeting, Lookstein will attend and would like to see the meeting have more group discussions. That was the only response he gave to that question.

Interview:

1. Commissioner Haskel Lookstein
2. Date: 11-2-88
3. Spirit: Positive, friendly, supportive and committed.
4. Setting: Office at Ramaz Upper School
5. Duration: 3 hours
6. Commissioner's current stand:
  - A. Personnel - yes.
  - B. Community - ambivalent, not really clear on where that would go.
  - C. Programmatic Options - eliminate almost everything except day schools and Camp Masad.
7. Summary:

I began our discussion by bringing him up-to-date on all that has gone on. He was somewhat aware as we have been talking on the telephone, and he has talked with others. His major concern was to keep the momentum going, and his focus was very utilitarian, with a focus on personnel.

Rabbi Lookstein offered the following comments as the interview proceeded.

- I. Personnel - He strongly agrees with personnel. It is the most important issue and must be put in terms of remuneration and fringe benefits. Linked to personnel is staff development and in-service training.

He discussed the notion of effective schools, and feels that we should build on the literature of effective schools.

131

dimensions of Judaism.

- IV. Task Forces - He is not very supportive about task forces. He believes they will distort the process by injecting politics of the different movements into the Commission. However, he does believe that we have to organize ourselves in some way, and he feels very strongly that a task force approach should be staff inspired. He also believes that the program task forces should identify innovative models. He gave us an example - How do you begin to learn how to participate in a beginning service? What are the models?
- Rabbi Lookstein is looking forward to attending the meeting of December 13.





THE COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA  
FOLLOWING-UP ON THE FIRST MEETING:

PHONE CALLS WITH COMMISSIONERS.

1.COMMISSIONER: HASKEL LOOKSTEIN

2.PHONER: ANNETTE ROCHSTEIN

3.DATE: AUGUST 3, 1983

4.SPIRIT: VERY INVOLVED AND THRILLED BY THE MEETING.

5.THE CALL:

HOW TO PROCEED: THOUGH MANY TOPICS ARE IMPORTANT, IF WE DO NOT  
IMPACT THE QUALITY OF PERSONNEL NOTHING WILL MAKE ANY DIFFERENCE.  
THE PROBLEM IS NOT THE PRINCIPALS. THE PROBLEM IS THE TEACHERS  
WHO MAKE THE SCHOOL. "EVERY TIME WE LOOSE A TEACHER I SHUDDER,  
BECAUSE IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO FIND A GOOD REPLACEMENT". I DON'T  
KNOW HOW TO DO IT. SALARIES DO MAKE A DIFFERENCE, BUT I DON'T  
KNOW HOW TO HANDLE THE PROBLEM OF QUALITY. I WOULD BE READY TO  
SIT AND HELP THINK ABOUT IT".

[RABBI LOOKSTEIN BROUGHT UP THE PREDICAMENT OF THE CENTRIST  
ORTHODOX IN AN INCREASINGLY FUNDAMENTALIST AND RIGHT-WING  
UNIVERSE. HE SPOKE OF SPECIFIC INSTITUTIONS THAT HAVE CLOSED —  
SUCH AS THE HEBREW SPEAKING CAMP MASSAD. — HE WILL PUT THIS  
DOWN ON PAPER AND SEND IT TO ART. I POINTED OUT THAT IT WAS  
PROBABLY PREMATURE TO EXPECT SPECIFIC INTERVENTIONS AT THIS  
TIME.]

ABOUT THE MEETING:

"I WAS EXHILARATED BY THE MEETING. I HAVE NEVER ATTENDED ANYTHING  
OF THE KIND. THE DOCUMENTS WERE MARVELLOUS" ETC....

\* \* \* \* \*

6-1-1

THE COMMISSION ON JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA  
TOWARDS THE THIRD MEETING OF THE COMMISSION

POST-MEETING TWO INTERVIEW OF COMMISSIONERS

1. COMMISSIONER: RABBI HASKEL LOOKSTEIN
2. INTERVIEWER: ANNETTE HOCHSTEIN
3. DATE: DECEMBER 27, 1988
4. SETTING: A HOME IN JERUSALEM
5. DURATION: 1 HOUR
- 6.. SUMMARY:

HL OPENED THE MEETING WITH COMPLIMENTARY REMARKS CONCERNING THE SECOND MEETING OF THE COMMISSION, THE FASCINATING MATERIALS, AND THE PRESENTATIONS. HE SUMMARIZED THE BASIC POINT OF THE MEETING HE CAME AWAY WITH: THAT WHILE THE ENABLING OPTIONS THAT WERE POINTED OUT BY THE PROFESSIONALS ARE UNDOUBTEDLY ON TARGET AND CORRECT, WE WILL NEED TO FIND A WAY TO DEAL WITH THE PROGRAMMATIC OPTIONS TOO.

ASKED WHERE HE WOULD LIKE TO SEE THE COMMISSION GO FROM HERE, HL ANSWERED THAT OPTIMALLY FOR HIM, THE COMMISSION SHOULD STIMULATE LARGE AMOUNTS OF FUNDING FOR THE ATTRACTION AND RETENTION OF DAY-SCHOOL TEACHERS IN NORTH AMERICA. IN PRACTICAL TERMS, THIS MEANS "HELPING US (THAT IS, JEWISH EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA) MAKE THE PROFESSION ONE SUFFICIENTLY WELL-PAYING COMPARED TO OTHER OPPORTUNITIES FOR OUR TALENTED YOUNG PEOPLE, SO THAT THOSE WHO CHOOSE JEWISH EDUCATION SHOULD NOT HAVE TO PAY AS HEAVY A PRICE IN TERMS OF SALARIES AS THEY DO NOW."

THE SALARY ISSUE IS VERY REAL. IT IS A MAJOR COMPONENT OF THE DIFFICULTY OF RECRUITMENT. IT WILL UNDOUBTEDLY BE CENTRAL TO ANY OPPORTUNITY FOR IMPROVEMENT.

IF WE WANT TO BREAK OUT OF THE IMAGE OF EDUCATION AS A "SECOND EARNER'S" JOB ONLY, WE WILL HAVE TO MAKE A REAL EFFORT ON THE SALARY LEVEL.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT IS THE SECOND COMPONENT OF PERSONNEL THAT WILL REQUIRE MAJOR ATTENTION. TEACHERS IN SCHOOLS SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO DO IN-SERVICE TRAINING. THE MAJOR ELEMENT FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF PERSONNEL RESIDES IN ADEQUATE IN-SERVICE, ON-GOING STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS.

RABBI LOOKSTEIN BELIEVES THAT UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOL SHOULD EDUCATE FUTURE EDUCATORS JEWISHLY,, WHILE EDUCATION SHOULD BE A MINOR COMPONENT OF THEIR STUDIES,, THE MAJOR ONE BEING LEFT FOR IN-SERVICE STAFF DEVELOPMENT. STAFF DEVELOPMENT SHOULD INCLUDE BOTH GENERAL AND JUDAIC STUDIES TEACHERS.. IT SHOULD BE DONE BY GOOD PROFESSIONAL EDUCATORS.. AT THIS POINT,, HL REFLECTED THAT THERE ARE NOT ENOUGH TEACHER-TRAINERS,, AND THAT WE MUST TRAIN THESE TOO. HE REFLECTED THAT MOST OF THE QUALITY TRAINERS ARE CONCENTRATED AT THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY..

WHEN ASKED HOW RAMAZ WOULD DO IN-SERVICE STAFF DEVELOPMENT,, HL RESPONDED THAT A GRANT WOULD ALLOW HIM TO BRING SOMEONE FROM THE MELTON CENTRE TO GIVE A 2-MONTH IN-SERVICE COURSE AT RAMAZ. REALIZING THE IMPLICATIONS,, WE WENT ON TO DISCUSS AGAIN HOW TO PRODUCE AT THIS TIME MORE PEOPLE WHO CAN TRAIN TEACHERS..

THE IDEA OF DEMONSTRATION CENTERS WAS DISCUSSED. HL ASKED WHAT IS THE MINIMUM SIZE OF A DEMONSTRATION CENTER THAT WOULD ENSURE THAT WHAT IS BEING DEMONSTRATED IS REPLICABLE ON A WIDE SCALE? E.G., IF A GIVEN DEMONSTRATION CENTER SUCCEEDS IN ATTRACTING 200 EDUCATORS OF QUALITY,, DOES IT INDICATE THAT 2000 COULD ALSO BE RECRUITED?

FOR RABBI LOOKSTEIN,, WHO UNDERSTANDS THE PLURALISTIC NATURE OF BOTH THE COMMUNITY AND ITS NEEDS,, THE DAY-SCHOOL REMAINS THE MAJOR AREA TO INVEST IN IN JEWISH EDUCATION..

IN GENERAL,, VERY PLEASED WITH THE COMMISSION. UNCLEAR ABOUT HOW WE WILL PROCEED TO CONCRETE RECOMMENDATIONS AND ACTION. BUT,, BASED ON PAST PERFORMANCE,, GIVES THE STAFF BENEFIT OF THE DOUBT. WANTS TO KEEP BEING LISTENED TO.

JAN 5 '90 7:53

PREMIER CORP. ADMIN.

PAGE 01



PREMIER INDUSTRIAL CORPORATION

## REQUEST FOR TELEX/MAILGRAM/FAX

72343 (REV. 2/88) PRINTED IN U.S.A.

SPECIFY HOW TO SEND MESSAGE

DATE REQUESTED

1/4/90

TYPE (USING DOUBLE SPACES) OR PRINT CLEARLY

☐ TELE NO.☐ MAILGRAM☒ FAX NO. 972 269 9951NO. OK PGS. 3  
(INCL. COVER SHEET)☒ URGENT - Time sensitive - must go at once☐ REGULAR - Send at time rates are most economical

TO: Seymour Fox

NAME Annette Hochstein

COMPANY Nativ

STREET ADDRESS  
CITY, STATE, ZIP 97206

PHONE NUMBER

FROM:

NAME Ginny Levi

COMPANY Premier

REGISTRATION  
EXPIRATION DATE JUL 1 1992

216 361 9962

TELEX NO.: 6873015 PREMI UW

FAX NO.: 972 269 9951

TIME SENT:

## MESSAGE:

Attached, for your information, is a report of an interview with  
Stuart Eizenstat conducted by Art Rotman.



15 EAST 26TH STREET, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10010-1157709

January 3, 1990

A report on interview with Stuart Elzenstat, member of Commission

Interviewer: Art Rotman

The interview had to be by telephone because of the difficulty of dovetailing schedules. Duration: Half-hour.

Stuart Elzenstat is very impressed with the work of the Commission and intends to attend the next meeting. However there is a 50/50 chance that he will be in Israel at that time, so that his indication of attendance is, at this time, only tentative. He will be in a better position to know as we get closer to the Commission meeting.

Fund. Stuart came out very strong on the need for the establishment of a large fund of several million dollars to be available for the implementation of the work of the Commission. He's of the opinion that there is a great deal that needs to be done both on a national level and a local level, if the recommendations of the Commission are to be effected. The availability of such a fund (the number of \$25,000,000 was mentioned), would allow the focusing of a sufficient mass of resources which would be essential if there was to be any kind of significant change.

Community Demonstration Sites. Stuart suggested that if four or five sites are selected that each be asked to demonstrate a different aspect of Jewish education, in addition to demonstrations in the area of personnel and lay leadership involvement. He suggested as examples:

- Early intervention/pre-school
- Adult education
- Day schools
- Supplementary schools

Hopefully, the demonstration sites will provide a "measurable" result of their efforts. In many communities there are, at this point, baselines for comparison. In others, we would need to develop such baselines. It's only by comparison of these baselines from one year to the next, or over a period of time, that we would be able to determine any success.



Stuart asked whether there would be any central mechanism selected in each community to be the prime mover. He was satisfied that it might be somewhat different in each community but that the Federations could play a key role.

Stuart stressed the need for accountability. Each community should have a line of responsibility to the central overall national entity for this accountability.

It would be necessary to get a commitment from the local community that they are seriously interested and will provide, in due course, the necessary funding. One way of doing this might be to provide an incentive. For example, if we wanted to end up with four or five sites, we would select ten or twelve. In each community the approach would be that the final selection would depend on the indication of community support. This, of course, would assume that there is a sufficiently large pool of funds available nationally, which could then be funnelled into the communities to act as an incentive. Stuart thought that it would be very difficult for the Federation to provide funds out of its campaign. He pointed out that in Washington, where he is president of the JCC, he has just received a letter from Federation indicating that the allocation to the Center would be five percent less than the previous year, which, with inflation, means in effect a ten percent cut. In the face of such cuts it would be difficult to get Federations to project that, even in a few years, they would be in a position to provide the necessary resources. However, these resources might be obtained from other large givers, depending on the success of the efforts in lay leadership involvement.

National Entity. Stuart feels that there needs to be a continuation of the Commission. The composition of the Commission is just right and it is so unusual to get such a diversified group to be so involved that it would be a shame to give it up. Meetings could be held once or twice a year.

The key to success would depend not only on the continuation of the Commission but on a small core of professionals of top quality, who would staff this entity. Staff with credibility in the communities who could act as catalyst, monitors, evaluators, etc. would be crucial.

JESNA

TEL No: 212 529 2009

Jan. 11, 90 10:18 P.02

**NOTES ON MEETING WITH DAVID DUBIN # 1/10/90**

prepared by Jonathan Woocher

DD appears comfortable with the progress of the Commission. We reviewed the draft recommendations in each of the areas.

1. **Community and Funding** -- DD feels that having good money available to provide a "jump start" will be critical to inspiring communities to engage in the process of leadership involvement and developing local funding.
2. **Personnel** -- DD emphasizes the importance of providing personnel with the opportunity to upgrade their skills within the framework of the organizations and institutions within which they are already working. He was very enthusiastic about the idea of organizing a national recruitment campaign.
3. **Programmatic Areas** -- DD felt it was not clear how these should be dealt with. Presumably they will be addressed in the context of the Community Action Sites and other local initiatives. He asked what the role of the Commission and implementing entity would actually be vis a vis programmatic areas. Would the implementing entity work with communities that are not community action sites? He understands the desire not to be limiting, but feels that limits will have to be set on what is done or the whole process will become too unwieldy.
4. **Research** -- no comments
5. **Community Action Sites** -- DD feels that the question of who will establish criteria for selection is important. He believes that the Commission itself should address the issue of criteria, and not leave it entirely for the implementing entity. He suggested such factors as: 1) relative absence of tud problems; 2) strong federation-agency relations; 3) a demonstrated passion for Jewish education; 4) a track record of innovation.
6. **Implementing Entity** -- DD asks whether the implementing entity will be established in cooperation with JWS, JESNA, and CJF, like the Commission itself. What does "independent" mean? He feels that there needs to be discussion of the composition of the Board of the Implementing entity. Who will be represented? He also feels that there will need to be a smaller working group to guide its day to day operations (my comment: like the Senior Policy Advisors?). He was not especially enthusiastic about the idea of continuing the Commission itself, but agreed that in view of the investment of the Commissioners, meeting once a year to receive reports might be worthwhile.

In general he felt that the recommendations represented a good effort to focus something which is global in its dimensions.

He will probably not be at the February 14 meeting because of a conflict with the JCC Executives institute.

1/11/90

INTERVIEW WITH JOHN COLMAN  
ON JANUARY 10, 1990  
BY HENRY L. ZUCKER

I met with John Colman on January 10 to bring him up to date on Commission developments and to prepare him for the February 14 meeting. He plans to attend that meeting.

We talked largely about the community/financing aspects of the Commission's work. I was especially desirous of getting his views about federation participation in the implementation work. He is particularly well qualified to discuss this because he is currently the president of the Chicago Federation.

We agreed on the following points::

- 1.. Our Report should not leave the impression that money alone will cure the problems in Jewish education. Certainly throwing money at these problems does not assure success in overcoming them. However, it is clear that substantial new funds will be needed for improvements which will be identified in the Commission's report. The Commission and the implementation mechanism needs to point the way to how to raise these
- End

Interview with John Colman

Page 2

4. At this time, it will be difficult in most federations to increase rapidly the support of Jewish education from operating funds. This is because annual campaigns are flat and there are other important claims on campaign funds. At the present time, for example, there is the special need for large sums for the resettlement of Russian and eastern European Jews.

It is not unreasonable, however, to expect that there will be a gradual increase in support of Jewish education from normal federation operating funds even if this must come at the expense of other beneficiary agencies. For example, it is more logical to grant additional funds for local Jewish education than it is to send money to the Jewish Agency which in turn, devotes it to Jewish education in America.

5. At least a dozen cities now have special committees or commissions on Jewish education, doing locally what the Commission on Jewish Education in North America is attempting nationally. As these communities get to understand the need, and spell out necessary improvements, they are likely to find the funds which are needed to improve the field.
6. Many federations have a substantial new source of funds in the form of endowments, which can be applied to Jewish education. It is easy to overestimate the amount of money currently available from these funds. Nevertheless, there is a substantial amount already available from this relatively new resource and a strong likelihood that this amount will grow rapidly. These funds, especially if they are leveraged with other federation funds and with funds from private foundations and individual donors, could form a nucleus for funding improvements in the field. These sources are especially important, because they can produce money fairly rapidly to get some of the improvements inaugurated while federations are gearing up to take greater responsibility over the long pull.
7. A few communities have already begun to face the funding problem by raising new funds or projecting new funding efforts by a combination of federation increases from operating and endowment funds, and appeals for funds from private foundations and families which are concerned with Jewish continuity and are interested in Jewish education. These initial efforts indicate that these efforts can be successful.

TOWARDS THE THIRD COMMISSION MEETING

INTERVIEW OF COMMISSIONERS

COMMISSIONER NAME: MR. DAVID ARNOW

INTERVIEWER: SEYMOUR FOX

DATE: FRIDAY, MAY 5, 1989, 10:30 A.M.

PLACE: NEW YORK CITY

Summary:

David Arnow began the interview by reminding us, as he had said to Annette, that he did not see continuity as the ultimate value, but rather the content of Judaism.

He was intrigued by the possibility that in the demonstration site each of the movements would be challenged to develop its own conception of philosophy of education, and thus the content of the Judaism that it wanted to perpetuate. He had some doubts about whether the movements could really produce an effective definition of Judaism.

He thought that the ii could be an interesting way of seeing that demonstration sites were truly implemented.

He reminded us of the sensitive issues involved in evaluation and the special kind of people that must carry out evaluation in order to prevent the participants in a demonstration site from feeling defensive. This same issue returned in the conversations with Mona Ackerman and Eli Evans.

Mr. Arnow strongly feels that the Commission should continue to do its work and is concerned about the idea of the ii replacing the Commission. He thinks that in light of the effort that has been made to create such a group, it would be a mistake to disband it, even after creating an ii, and even though he had the sense that he might be invited to participate in the ii. I believe that he would be interested in funding part of the program as well.

He brought up the issue of parent education which he thinks is very important. The importance of Hebrew was again brought up by him. He was concerned about Jews being very defensive about their Jewishness and wanted some balanced sense of identity. He brought



up the whole question of Israel, which he believes ought to be central to any conception of Jewish education, as it is central today to any conception of Jewish identity. He thinks that if Israel is anything less than a magnet for Jews, Jewish education will suffer greatly.

He is also someone whom we ought to continue to work with carefully between Commission meetings. I think he is a potential funder. He was concerned about the issue of marketing. He felt that marketing, or what we might call diffusion, was a very important matter to be carefully incorporated into the work of the ii to make sure that it was not merely one demonstration site that we were talking about.

He wants to participate in small group meetings around particular topics. He would be a good person to join with Hirschhorn and possibly Evans on the issue of research.

He will be attending the meeting on the 14th.