BTW
INFORMING CHANGE

Memo

To:	Leah Meir, The AVI CHAI Foundation Josh Miller & Steven Green, The Jim Joseph Foundation Abby Knopp, Ramie Arian & Avi Orlow, The Foundation for Jewish Camp
From:	BTW *informing change*
Date:	December 2012
Subject:	The Nadiv Story, Unfolding

BACKGROUND: THE NADIV PROGRAM MODEL

The Nadiv Program (Nadiv) is an innovative pilot with primary objectives of enhancing the quality of Jewish education at participating camps, enriching experiential education at participating schools, and building a mutually beneficial camp-school partnership model. Nadiv leaders also hope the program will inspire replication and adaptation by other camp-school pairings and other kinds of Jewish educational institutional partnerships as well as pave a new professional career path for Jewish educators. Nadiv is made possible by a five year, $3.3 million funding partnership between the Jim Joseph Foundation and The AVI CHAI Foundation and is operated by the Foundation for Jewish Camp (FJC).

Nadiv aims to meet its objectives by creating six new permanent positions for experiential Jewish educators, called Nadiv Educators, who toggle their responsibilities between a nonprofit Jewish summer camp and a Jewish school. The Nadiv Educators and these six camp-school partnerships form the central, driving force of Nadiv. The Nadiv pilot is currently in early implementation. At the time of this writing, Nadiv Educators have completed their first summer at camp and are in their first year at school.

Each partnership is unique in character, structure, expectations and possibilities. Each partnership includes one of two types of Jewish schools: a day school or a congregational school. Three camps are affiliated with the Union for Reform Judaism's (URJ) North American Camping Unit (NAC), two are independent camps and one is affiliated with Young Judaea. As a result, the six Nadiv partnerships fall into four configurations: independent camp-day school, Young Judaea Camp-day school, URJ camp-day school, and URJ camp-congregational school.

INTRODUCTION

This memo shares the story of the formation and early implementation of the new Nadiv program. Nadiv has a complex story, involving many stakeholders and perspectives at various points in time. Therefore, building the Nadiv story, as recalled and interpreted by those various stakeholders, is an important step in documenting the pilot. The funders supporting Nadiv wanted to chronicle the development of Nadiv's vision, design, planning and initial implementation, believing that only after the process is outlined and understood can there be a conversation about what lessons ought to be considered for future initiatives.

To be clear, this memo is not a comprehensive accounting or full chronology of the Nadiv story. Rather it provides a "balcony view" of the story and a synthesis of the experiences and impressions of the people most closely associated with Nadiv. An accompanying memo documents the research methods used to inform this story and summarizes key lessons learned, which may be transferable to others.

We wish to remind the reader of Nadiv's complexity. By definition, transforming a new idea into action, especially a concept which brings together multiple stakeholders across different contexts, is a multi-faceted endeavor. Nadiv's key stakeholders wisely anticipated this complexity early on; the professional team deliberately built some fundamental structures at the outset and intentionally planned for others to develop over time so they could fluidly meet the project's emerging needs.

Nadiv's dynamic evolution complicates the effort to tell its story in a linear fashion. Nevertheless, we try to present it as linearly as possible. Another limitation of this memo is that it is based on the recollection of interviewees. We have pieced together multiple perspectives, and the result is our best effort to tell the common story. Additionally, we give weight to important junctures and tensions that came up in developing this program. For purposes of ease to the reader, we reference "Nadiv" well before it became known as Nadiv.

THE INITIAL VISION (2002–2010)

Nadiv was conceived by the camping bodies of Reform and Conservative Judaism, the Union for Reform Judaism (URJ) and Ramah, respectively. In 2002 the two movements jointly submitted a proposal to philanthropist Jim Joseph to create a year-round Jewish educator position at all Reform and Conservative movement camps to improve the quality of Jewish education at camp. Later, and after further research about the need for this position, the URJ independently proposed the concept to The AVI CHAI Foundation, which was interested in partnering with other funders. They suggested that the URJ return to the newly staffed Jim Joseph Foundation.

The Jim Joseph Foundation responded to the concept with interest, but shared that a purely denominational program would not have the broad impact the Foundation was seeking to have. It also questioned whether the position could be sustained without dependence on ongoing foundation support. Following a formal board discussion about the Nadiv concept in June of 2010, the Jim Joseph Foundation expressed a readiness to pursue this idea further, but wanted to see it expand to include a range of Jewish camps, not just those associated with the URJ. Given the broadened scope, they requested that FJC be invited play an active role in helping shape the concept.

Following this discussion, the URJ graciously introduced FJC to the Nadiv vision. As FJC's familiarity with Nadiv increased, URJ stepped back and FJC staff took the lead. In a verbal agreement among all of the involved parties, FJC became the official home of Nadiv in the fall/winter of 2010, with the URJ playing a key advisory role as the project continued to evolve.

DEVELOPING THE NADIV MODEL (2010–2011)

In Search of Sustainability: Toward a Partnership Model

In late 2010, as funding requests were in process (the grant became official in March 2011), FJC and the funders continued fleshing out the Nadiv design. Long-term sustainability was a major discussion point. This stemmed from a deep-rooted concern that camps would not be able to afford an additional year-round position and led to a strong push for Nadiv to develop a sustainable business model.

FJC first raised the possibility of a partnership model as a business platform, whereby Jewish camps would share the cost of year-round educators with Jewish schools. This cost-sharing proposition posited that a camp-school partnership, rather than just a new position at camp, would increase camps' market penetration in partner schools and the revenue generated by increased camper enrollment would justify the position, thereby sustaining it in the long-haul. A shared position also eliminated concerns of some stakeholders who were not convinced that camps had enough year-round work for a full-time Jewish educator.

There were other perceived benefits to a partnership model. First was the exciting possibility that the Nadiv Educator would improve the quality of experiential education at schools by bringing camp energy to a school setting. Second, the funders were intrigued by the promising possibility of synergistic and collaborative partnerships, and were eager to test out this experiment.

Moving forward, FJC and the funders then began learning about existing partnership models, such as The Legacy Heritage Foundation camp-synagogue partnership program and the more recent collaboration between URJ Camp George and the Leo Baeck Day School, which became the Nadiv prototype. The funders interviewed stakeholders from these programs to explore the vision, structure and implementation of the models with a specific eye to challenges and lessons learned.

Bringing in School Voices & Other Targeted Guidance

Throughout this visioning process, the Nadiv "intervention's" primary focus was camp. The idea for Nadiv came from camps, was being implemented by a camping organization, and anticipated outcomes were camp-focused. Additionally, there was no school partner or coordinating body positioned to co-lead Nadiv—on behalf of either day or congregational schools. To address this imbalance, the funders and FJC began to bring schools more fully into the Nadiv effort. In the spring of 2011, one deliverable requested of FJC by the funders was the development of an Advisory Council to provide overall guidance for the Nadiv program as well as targeted direction, when needed. They specifically requested that the Council include voices from both individual congregational and day schools (e.g., Temple Beth Shalom, Needham, MA; Leo Baeck Academy) and intermediary organizations supporting the day and synagogue school systems (e.g., RAVSAK, The Jewish Education Project) (Exhibit 1). The two Nadiv mentors (discussed further below) as well as three FJC staff also serve on the Council. The funders—who had been integrally involved in the design of Nadiv—opted out of joining the Council.

> ***"We need to make sure schools are happy. The Advisory Council was built to address this."***
>
> —Key Stakeholder

FJC convened the full Advisory Council several times during the initial planning year, and reached out to individual members for counsel as needed. Members provided leadership and guidance at major inflection points throughout the planning year, such as reviewing the Nadiv Educator job description, supporting the recruitment process, developing the community of practice and helping structure the partnership agreements.

Exhibit 1

Advisory Council Members

Name	Organizational Affiliation	Expertise
Michelle Abraham	Nadiv Mentor (URJ)	Mentorship; Jewish education
Ramie Arian	Consultant to FJC	Nadiv Project Manager
Hayim Herring	Herring Consulting Network	Coordination/cooperation between partnering agencies
Abby Knopp	FJC	FJC project leadership
Marc Kramer	RAVSAK: The Jewish Community Day School Network	Day schools
Todd Markley	Temple Beth Shalom, Needham, MA	Congregational schools
Alvin Mars	Nadiv Mentor (Independent Camps)	Mentorship; Jewish education
Avi Orlow	FJC	FJC; Jewish education
Eric Petersiel	Leo Baeck Academy, Toronto, Ontario	Camp-school partnership
Debbie Sussman	Camp Yavneh, Northwood, NH	Camps
Cyd Weissman	The Jewish Education Project	Congregational learning experience with educators who serve multiple agencies
Jennifer Zwilling	Hillel: The Foundation for Jewish Campus Life	Senior Educator roles; recruitment and placement

Funders and FJC also considered the kinds of Jewish schools that might become part of Nadiv. They knew that program implementation—in particular, the role of the Nadiv Educator—would be different in day school and congregational school environments. Funders, eager to see where Nadiv would "stick," decided that both congregational and day schools should be included in the pilot.

Another early exploratory discussion was about Nadiv's value proposition from the school perspective. Key stakeholders hypothesized about school interest in improving the quality and increasing the presence of experiential Jewish education.

Developing Camp Criteria & Partnership Supports

FJC's next step was to develop criteria to identify camps that were aligned with the spirit of Nadiv. Here it is important to note that the selection criteria and process focused first on finding camps, and second on schools to partner with the camps.

While the criteria have evolved over time, the following guided the camp selection process:

- Commitment to Jewish education with room to improve
- A diverse mix of camp geographies and cultures
- Readiness for change (e.g., institutional support and capacity; ability to measure outcomes)
- Opportunity for growth in enrollment
- Ability to serve as a model for possible replication in the future
- Capacity to sustain the partnership financially
- Community perception of leadership
- Record of collaboration

"If you invest in a change program, you don't want your pilot group to fail because they have a bad director or a weak board or they can't focus on it because they can't get kids to camp. This needs leadership capacity, people who can try something new."

—Key Stakeholder

Based on these criteria, FJC began early reconnaissance of several possible independent camps to include in the Nadiv pilot. The URJ, which birthed the initial concept, was invited to identify three camps from within the URJ system.

FJC also built a mentor component to Nadiv. With a broad goal of helping the Nadiv Educators reflect on their work, the exact configuration was intentionally left flexible for ongoing development. FJC hired two mentors—one to work with the independent camps and a second to work with the URJ camps.

Planning for Sustainability

Funders wanted the camp-school partnerships to begin taking ownership of this position early on, i.e., to have "some skin in the game." Therefore they structured the Nadiv grant as an even-stepped cascading funding model, downsizing the funders' commitment over a period of five years (Exhibit 2). Notably, this five-year grant supports an initial planning year followed by four years of program implementation. The year 1 planning grant was for FJC to prepare for implementation (e.g., camp selection, school selection, partnership building, Nadiv Educator recruitment and hiring) and offered a bonus for partnerships: should the Nadiv Educator be hired during this time period, funders were willing to cover 100% of Nadiv Educator costs leading up to the 2012 camp season.

Exhibit 2

Structure of Nadiv Grant

Year of Nadiv Grant	Funder Commitment to Nadiv Educator Costs	Partnership Commitment to Nadiv Educator Costs
Year 1: Planning (2011–June 2012)	100%	0%
Year 2: 2012 camp season; 2012–2013 academic year	80%	20%
Year 3: 2013 camp season; 2013–2014 academic year	60%	40%
Year 4: 2014 camp season; 2014–2015 academic year	40%	60%
Year 5: 2015 camp season; 2015–2016 academic year	20%	80%
Ongoing implementation	0%	100%

The funders also expanded their hopes for Nadiv to include the possibility that the Nadiv Educators' enthusiasm for camp might increase the number of students who attend any Jewish camp, not just the specific Nadiv partnership camp.

THE INITIAL PLANNING YEAR (2011–2012)

Camp Selection

While FJC and the funders continued developing the Nadiv model, they also began searching for a project manager to lead this complex pilot. FJC hired Ramie Arian as the Nadiv project manager in spring 2011.

The funders and FJC contemplated the benefits and drawbacks of both an open and a closed RFP process for selecting camps to participate in the first Nadiv pilot. They ultimately chose to vet and select camps in a controlled setting, hoping that this would facilitate successful pilot implementation.

Moving forward with a closed selection process, the Nadiv project manager's first assignment was to assess possible camps for Nadiv, as identified by FJC and the URJ. Initial intake discussions with directors helped identify those that might fit with the spirit of the grant. During the 2011 camp season, together with the mentors

whenever possible, the project manager set out to visit a selection of interested camps. The purpose of these visits was to understand camp educational programs, to get a sense of their readiness for Nadiv, and to identify if Nadiv could make a contribution. When there was interest, readiness and a possible fit, the discussion turned to exploring possible school partners.

A total of fourteen camps were considered for the six available camp slots in the pilot. There are multiple reasons why some were either not selected or elected not to be considered for the Nadiv pilot. While many were interested, there were timing challenges. For example, one camp was unable to commit due to participation in other leadership programs and another was experiencing management transitions. Other camps were interested in exploring non-school partners. One hoped to partner with a local Jewish Federation to create a community Rabbi position, another was interested in partnering with a Jewish Community Center (JCC) developing a new supplementary education program, while another considered a multi-synagogue partnership. While intrigued by these possibilities, the funders and FJC preferred to minimize the complexities of this new and already complicated pilot and elected to choose camps that wanted to and could find a school partner. In two cases, this meant that camps that were invited to participate in Nadiv needed to withdraw when they were unable to find appropriate school partners.

Camp-School Partnering Process

Once a camp was selected, the next step was to identify a school partner. With a few camps joining Nadiv later than others, the partnering process was somewhat staggered. Additionally, this was a decentralized process in which all camps approached possible school partners, except in one case where a school approached the camp.

As with camp selection, funders and FJC developed preliminary criteria, which evolved over time, to characterize school partners that would fit with the spirit of Nadiv. In addition to the obvious need for "chemistry" between institutions and key leaders, the primary school criteria included:

- A diverse mix of school geographies and settings
- Capacity to sustain the partnership financially
- Community perception of leadership
- Record of collaboration
- Opportunity for educational growth and desire to integrate experiential education into school environment
- Readiness for change (e.g., institutional support and capacity; ability to measure outcomes)
- Ability to serve as a model for possible replication in the future

FJC played a significant behind-the-scenes support role in this process, leading group and one-on-one calls with camps to discuss the structure of the partnership, developing a generic job description for the Nadiv Educator and developing and communicating components that should be included in the memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the camp and school. There were common needs and challenges that could be addressed collectively with all camps, though partnerships had unique concerns and some required more support from FJC than others. When needed, the project manager helped camps identify school partners, pushing some to forge new relationships.

The URJ also played a significant role in the partnering process. For example, the URJ legal team wrote the language around the partnerships agreements, which was used by the URJ partnerships, and shared with the other three partnerships. And as the employer of record for the three URJ partnerships—half of the Nadiv partnerships—the URJ was an ongoing sounding board and resource for the other partnerships.

While schools found the model of a shared experiential educator compelling, they had initial concerns about the long-term financial commitment, particularly congregational schools for whom this comes at a higher relative financial cost. Given this, a few camps had a somewhat difficult time "selling Nadiv" to a school prospect. Camps also found that written materials about the grant and the Nadiv pilot were camp-focused and worried they would not help make a case for schools. In a few cases, camps developed their own materials.

As noted earlier, two camps initially selected were unable to find school partners, even with strong interest in the program and direct assistance from the Nadiv project manager and mentor. In one case, there was simply not a feasible school partner in a position to take on the cost of the Nadiv Educator, a factor that had not adequately been considered during the camp selection process. The other camp, due to a series of unforeseen events unrelated to Nadiv, was also unable to secure a school partner. When it became clear that these selected camps were not viable options for Nadiv, FJC and URJ returned to the process of identifying and considering additional camps. By virtue of joining later in the process, the two final camps selected to participate in Nadiv experienced a more rushed partnership process than the other camps.

Each camp experienced different realities during the partnership formation process. Some found partners more easily than others. Some camps considered multiple schools and others had one specific school in mind. Some had to overcome local community politics or denominational divides. And of course, communities faced a diverse range of financial realities. Finally, all camps and schools invested much time and effort in discussing and navigating their financial and legal obligations.

By spring 2012, however, six camps and schools had come together to form six unique Nadiv partnerships (Exhibit 3).

Exhibit 3

Nadiv Camp-School Partnerships

Camp	Camp Affiliation	School	School Affiliation	Total Campers (2012)	Total Students (2012)	Region/ Catchment Area
Herzl Camp	Independent	Heilicher Minneapolis Jewish Day School	Independent Community Day School	756	344	Minneapolis (Upper Midwest)
Camp Young Judaea Sprout Lake	Young Judaea	Solomon Schechter Day School of Bergen County	Schechter Day School Network	410	395	New York metro area (Northeast)
Camp Mountain Chai	Independent	San Diego Jewish Academy	Independent Community Day School	550	500	San Diego (West)
URJ Camp Coleman	URJ	Davis Academy	Reform Day School	796	610	Atlanta (Southeast)
URJ Crane Lake	URJ	Temple Shaarey Tefila	Reform Congregational School	623	610	New York metro area (Northeast)
URJ Camp Kalsman	URJ	Temple De Hirsch Sinai	Reform Congregational School	599	450	Seattle (Pacific Northwest)

Following guidance provided by FJC, each camp-school partnership wrote a memorandum of understanding (MOU) outlining the terms of their partnership. This clarified legal and human resources issues, such as the employer of record and terms of employment. Most importantly, it was the platform to come to a shared understanding on the role of the Nadiv Educator and the time division and cost sharing of the position. Some

partnerships deliberately carved out space in the MOU to discuss concerns as they arose or to finalize specific arrangements pending the hire. The MOU process was challenging for partnerships because it was a new process subject to time pressures for completing it, and it involved sensitive areas of financial risk that both parties were taking.

Of interest is that five of the six partnerships agreed on a 50/50 time- and cost-share agreement; funders had hypothesized that schools would pay a more significant part of the cost. The URJ is the employer of record for all URJ camp partnerships. Two of the three independent camps are employers of record. The one partnership that deviated from the 50/50 cost share agreed on 62% school / 38% camp, and in this case the school is the employer of record.

The Year 1 / Year 2 Funding Structure Miscommunication

The overwhelming majority of camp and school partnerships express concern about the year 1/year 2 funding structure. Camps and schools understood that the first year of implementation (summer 2012 and the 2012–2013 academic year) would be the fully funded year 1 articulated in the grant, yet funders considered year 1 to be the planning year and lead-up to implementation. In response, the funders adjusted the Year 2 funding structure; partnerships were required to pay 10% of year 2 rather than 20% as outlined in the grant.

While each partnership secured the necessary funding to cover the unexpected costs of the year 2 funding structure in their first year of implementation, most feel as though this unfortunate miscommunication was never appropriately addressed. Some wonder why the funders had not been more flexible about the timing of the funding.

> ***"As with any new program, there is a lack of clarity. That happened here. We expected that the first year was covered and then later found out that year 1 had passed… It wasn't a good way to start, but we were already in it by then."***
>
> —Camp/School Director

Recruiting Nadiv Educators

With signed MOU's, the newly formed partnerships, together with FJC, began recruiting Nadiv Educators.

FJC played a primary role in national recruitment efforts. Having crafted the idea of a Jewish educator role at camp and out of knowledge of both its camps and schools, the URJ also contributed to these efforts. The existing partnership between Camp George and the Leo Baeck Day School—the Nadiv prototype—provided many resources on the shared position, and based on the job description from that partnership, FJC drafted a generic Nadiv job description. This job description was then vetted by camp and school directors and members of the Advisory Council, and individual partnerships later adapted it to fit their needs.

> ***"It was good to have a generic job description to start with. It was good to have issues raised about what would make this work."***
>
> —Camp/School Director

Starting in late 2011, the project manager represented Nadiv at national events (e.g., rabbinic and Jewish education graduate school events; URJ biennial) and met with potential candidates (group and in-person interviews). Some of these national recruitment events occurred before the Nadiv partnerships were ready to begin their recruitment.

Applications started rolling in. Applicants selected the specific partnership region they were interested in. Some applied to and were considered by multiple partnerships, which resulted in two partnerships being interested in one particularly promising candidate. After screening applications, the project manager forwarded candidates to relevant partners. The national search ensured both quantity and quality of candidates, providing a broader cross-section of candidates than partnerships had expected.

Hiring

As with partnership formation, recruitment and hiring was also a staggered process in which each partnership experienced different challenges and realities.

In some partnerships, the school and camp worked together to develop a candidate short list. In others, the school and camp ranked candidates separately and then met about it, often finding that they had similar top preferences. Most partnerships conducted initial interviews on Skype with 5–8 candidates and then invited a few candidates for in-person interviews. Some partnerships had the same top choice, and others had to make more compromises. A few partnerships made offers that were not accepted and found themselves revisiting the original candidate pool. The timing of the hiring process was challenging because the Nadiv Educators were unavailable to begin as early as the partnerships would have liked.

"Hiring decisions needed to be made at the local level. The Nadiv Educators, once on site, needed to feel responsible to their supervisors and not some distant person."

—Key Stakeholder

There were also some tensions around salaries and benefits. Camps and schools have different salary practices and norms, and there are also cultural and geographic differences. For example, there were concerns around whether the Nadiv Educator salary might be too high for the camp culture yet too low for the stature of the position at school. And there were varying salary and benefits practices within each partnership that occasionally clashed, such as the kind of retirement plan to offer or the number of vacation days.

The six partnerships were looking for different kinds of educators, in skill sets, education and experience. Some partnerships initially intended to hire a Nadiv senior educator who could fill many high-level institutional needs, someone whose experience was commensurate with the generous salary and benefits package. Of these, a few were surprised that they did not receive applications from seasoned educators. A few, after realizing that year 2 of implementation entails financial obligations greater than initially anticipated (described above), chose to hire a less senior, less costly educator. Other partnerships, however, preferred an educator who "could be down-and-dirty on the floor with the kids." Unsurprisingly, partnerships that shifted their hiring expectations often experienced longer and somewhat more complicated hiring processes.

Another unexpected reality is that the positioning of the Nadiv Educator looks quite different within a camp and a school organizational hierarchy. The Nadiv Educator role at camp tends to be more senior than at school. Similarly, the Nadiv Educator role at a day school looks significantly different than at a congregational school.

Funders reflected on the new hires and the intention that this be a Senior Educator position. Less seasoned educators were hired than initially expected, and they therefore dropped the word "senior" from the program name to formally account for this change.

The Nadiv Educators were hired between late winter and spring 2012 and started between mid-April and two days prior to the opening of camp in June. With such staggered hire and start dates, orientation time greatly varied. Exhibit 4 provides information on the backgrounds of the first cohort of Nadiv Educators. All come to the position with Master's Degrees, almost all in Education. All have worked in both Jewish camp and school settings.

Exhibit 4

Nadiv Educators

Camp-School Partnership	Nadiv Educator Name	Prior Role	Master's Degree	Under-graduate School	Nature of Professional Experience
URJ Crane Lake Camp and Temple Shaaray Tefila	Sarah Lauing	Graduate Student	Hebrew Union College, Jewish Education	Middlebury College	Background in both camp and congregational schools; Family education; URJ background
URJ Camp Kalsman and Temple De Hirsch Sinai	Jordan Magidson	Associate Director of Education, Institute of Southern Jewish Life	Hebrew Union College, Jewish Education	Michigan State University	Background in both camp and school; URJ background (affiliated with National Association of Temple Educators)
URJ Camp Coleman and The Davis Academy	Sara Beth Berman	Associate Director, Storahtelling	Jewish Theological Seminary, Jewish Education, Informal & Communal Education	University of Florida	Background in both camp and school
Camp Mountain Chai and the San Diego Jewish Academy	Jeremy Toren	Temple Isaiah, Co-Director of Tiyul: Shabbat B'Yachad	American Jewish University, Education & Jewish Studies	Brandeis University	Background in both camp and school; Family education
Herzl Camp - Heilicher Minneapolis Jewish Day School	(Rabbi) Joseph Robinson	Rabbinical Student	American Jewish University, Rabbinic ordination	San Diego State University	Background in both camp and school
Camp Young Judaea Sprout Lake-Solomon Schechter Day School of Bergen County	Jessica (Jessie) Gindea	Student in Pardes Educators Program	Hebrew College, Jewish Education; Certificate of Advanced Jewish Studies; Certificate in Jewish Day School Education	Jewish Theological Seminary & Columbia University	Background in both camp and school

Logic Model & Evaluation Planning

The Jim Joseph Foundation and The AVI CHAI Foundation hired an evaluation partner in early 2012. The purpose of the evaluation is to inform Nadiv as it is being implemented, assess its early outcomes, and inform the ongoing work of the Jim Joseph Foundation, The AVI CHAI Foundation and FJC. The first component of the Nadiv evaluation was a logic model development process. In early 2012, key organizational stakeholders—funders, FJC and URJ—came together to collectively define the problems that Nadiv is setting out to solve, the strategies being employed, the target constituencies and the desired short- and long-term outcomes. Given that Nadiv is a partnership of several organizations, the iterative group process helped crystallize a shared understanding of the program's intentions. Specifically, ongoing discussions about Nadiv's expectations around camper acquisition and retention and school aspirations were an important part of crystallizing the program focus.

EARLY IMPLEMENTATION (SUMMER 2012–SPRING 2013)

In mid-June 2012, as Nadiv Educators began their first summer at camp, the partnerships continued to flesh out more deeply what the Nadiv Educator role at school will look like. Exhibit 5 outlines the different Nadiv Educators' roles across the six camp-school partnerships. It is important to note that these roles are preliminary and will continue to evolve. Each partnership is still navigating how the needs of the school and camp institutions might be best addressed by the skills and capacities of their Nadiv Educators.

Exhibit 5

Preliminary Roles of the Six Nadiv Educators

Partnership	Camp Role	School Role	Notes
Herzl Camp and the Heilicher Minneapolis Jewish Day School	***Rav HaMachaneh***. Serve in an advisory role; Integrate and enrich Judaics in an advisory role.	**Lead *Tefillah*** with the Upper school; Lead experiential education with the VOICE program (Volunteer Opportunities in Communal Education); No formal teaching.	• Started role as camp began; limited role at camp this year • Camp role is not yet clearly defined
Camp Young Judaea Sprout Lake and Solomon Schechter Day School of Bergen County	**Responsible for all Jewish Education** at camp. This includes *tefillah*, staff enrichment, working with the education team.	**Coordinator of Jewish Life** which includes classroom instruction in the upper school, coordination of *chesed* projects in the middle school and, eventually, teaching Judaics in the upper school.	• Started role as camp began; limited role at camp this year • Nadiv Educator will have wide latitude at school
Camp Mountain Chai and San Diego Jewish Academy	**Lead Jewish Education** including plan and implement unit-wide educational activities; Lead and coordinate *tefillah* and *B'nai Mitzvah* tutoring.	**Teach** 6th grade *chumash*; Help lead twice-weekly *tefillah*; Develop upper grade elective; Plan holiday celebrations.	• Nadiv Educator will have wide latitude to embed experiential education at school • New School Director
URJ Camp Coleman and the Davis Academy	**Program Director**. Supervise 7–8 unit 'programmers,' to develop, strengthen and implement Judaic content; Lead *tefillah*; Teach electives.	**Support *tefillah* program**; Enhance holiday celebrations and special events; Deepen family education.	• School plans are still developing • Nadiv Educator will have wide latitude at school
URJ Crane Lake Camp and Temple Shaaray Tefila of New York City	**Primary point person** for *tefillah* and Jewish Life; Supervise 2 co-directors of education (eventually); Implement *limmud* with faculty and co-educational directors.	**Coordinator of Upper School**, which includes supervision of 15 teachers; Lead Sunday family education program; Support temple youth programs; Help 'connect the silos' at school.	• Nadiv Educator will work for camp from camp office one day a week • Nadiv Educator will have wide latitude at camp
URJ Camp Kalsman and Temple De Hirsch Sinai	**Director of Education**. Supervise 4 'programmers,' each assigned to an age group; Coordinate faculty (visiting rabbis, cantors and educators); Create content for *shiurum*. Primary point person for *tefillah*.	**Coordinator** for grade 4–5 program; Supervise K–3 program; Lead Hebrew program.	• Both institutions undergoing significant changes this year • Working from the Bellevue satellite school

Concurrently, FJC continued to build and implement partnership supports. During the first summer, the project manager and mentors visited all six partnership camps to meet with camp and school leadership and the Nadiv Educator. As of this writing, FJC continues planning Nadiv's ongoing structure. FJC began convening the community of practice, with the first meeting held in July. The Advisory Council will continue serving as a key source of guidance during implementation. Additionally, FJC is planning for a November 2012 in-person Nadiv Community of Practice Seminar, which will include Nadiv Educators, camp and school partners, mentors, funder representatives, a URJ representative, key FJC staff, and the Nadiv project manager.

As Nadiv continues with implementation, the funders—who were highly involved in visioning and designing the model—are stepping back from day-to-day involvement. They expect that the Advisory Council will take a larger lead in supporting implementation, though the exact role of the funders going forward and their interface with the Advisory Council is not yet crystallized.

Meanwhile, stakeholders have written about the Nadiv model in a variety of forums (e.g., URJ website, AVI CHAI Web site) and there is a sense that Nadiv's innovative model is creating a positive buzz in the field of Jewish education.

CONCLUSION

As Nadiv continues with implementation, new chapters in the Nadiv story will be written as the roles of Nadiv Educators and the Advisory Council solidify, as the community of practice evolves, and as the very identity of Nadiv in each partnership continues taking shape. We appreciate the interest in documenting the early development process and highlighting similarities and differences across partnerships, not only for understanding Nadiv's roots but also to help inform future institutional partnerships.

A second memo accompanies this story, which moves away from *what happened* to *what did and did not work*. Together, we hope this early story of Nadiv and the accompanying lessons will inform the work of Nadiv and many others.