



COMMUNITY PLANNING PROCESS FINDINGS EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Table of Contents

I. Introduction

- A. Leadership Team's Current Task
- B. Contents of This Information Packet
- C. Background
 - 1. Why now?
 - 2. Genesis and Origins of Project
 - 3. What This Process Is and Is Not

II. Listening Process Methodology

- A. Data Collection
- B. Interview Guide
- C. Exit Survey

III. Listening Session Results

- A. Whom Did We Reach?
- B. Comparison to Former Community Studies
- C. Listening Session Findings
 - 1. Content Analysis of Transcripts
 - 2. Analysis of Exit Survey: Benefits and Concerns
 - 3. Definitions and Examples
- D. Data Analysis
- E. Benefits
- F. Concerns

IV. Next Steps/Timeline

V. Dissemination of Data

VI. End Result

VII. Appendices

- Appendix A: Listening Session Tools
- Appendix B: Demographics
- Appendix C: Benefits
- Appendix D: Concerns
- Appendix E: Data & Learning Team Report (to come)
- Appendix F: Decision Making

I. Introduction

A. Leadership Team's Current Task

The Community Planning Steering Committee (CPSC) of the Jewish Federation of Greater St. Paul is transmitting this package of information to the Leadership Team for its consideration. The Leadership Team is charged with the responsibility of choosing the top three-to-five issues facing the greater St. Paul Jewish community. The Leadership Team should choose issues that are important to the health and growth of the community and that provide rich opportunities for constructive community improvement.

Table 1: What kinds of issues should the Leadership Team choose?	
1.	Issues that are important to the health and growth of the community – issues that really matter.
2.	Issues that provide rich opportunities for constructive community improvement – issues about which we can really “move the needle” with focused, concerted action and reasonable amounts of resources.

To give the Leadership Team data upon which to draw, the CPSC, with input and guidance from the Leadership Team, conducted a community listening process. The listening process, which is Phase One of the community planning work, is now complete.

Table 2: What are the phases of the Community Planning Process?	
Phase One	Listening process (complete)
Phase Two	Leadership chooses top issues facing community
Phase Three	In-depth research is pursued and concrete recommendations are developed on each issue by Research & Recommendation Panels “R&R Panels”
Phase Four	Implementation of results: Each organization in the Jewish community determines how to use reports of R & R Panels and Community Planning Process to serve its mission

With the transmission of this information to the Leadership Team, we are now entering Phase Two of the project.

B. Contents of This Information Package

This information package contains:

1. Executive Summary
2. [Appendix A: Listening Session Tools](#)
3. [Appendix B: Demographics](#)
4. [Appendix C: Benefits](#)
5. [Appendix D: Concerns](#)
6. Appendix E: Data & Learning Team: Comments to come
7. [Appendix F: Decision Making](#)

In essence, the Leadership Team is being presented with the data in three ways: Rainbow Research's analysis, the Data & Learning Team's analysis, and background data.

C. Background

1. Why Now?

Both within St. Paul and across the United States, Jewish communal life is being transformed by changing demographics, the nature of Jewish identity, migration, intermarriage and changing modes and degrees of affiliation. The Greater St. Paul Jewish community has undertaken a community planning process to understand what this means for our community and how we might respond.

The goal of this process is to set strategic priorities for the Jewish community which are informed by reliable data and input from across the community, in order to build, strengthen and sustain our community over the next decades. All St. Paul Jewish community agencies and organizations will be able to use the findings and recommendations from our Community Planning Process in their future planning.

2. Genesis and Organization of the Project

This strategic planning process, called the St. Paul Jewish Community Planning Process, was initiated in the spring of 2012 by the Board of Directors of the Jewish Federation of Greater St. Paul, under the leadership of then-President Jon Parritz. A Steering Committee was appointed to oversee the project. Chairing the Steering Committee is Randi Ilyse Roth, executive director of Philanthropy at the Otto Bremer Foundation, and Federation secretary. Serving on the Steering Committee since its inception are Wendy Baldinger, current St. Paul Federation president; Jon Parritz, Federation immediate past president; Mary Ann Wark, Federation vice president; and Eli Skora, Federation executive director. In January 2014, Susan Minsberg, Federation president-elect, joined the Steering Committee.

To guide the Community Planning Process, Federation is working in consultation with Barry Cohen, Ph.D., executive director of Rainbow Research, Inc. Rainbow Research planned and implemented the Community Planning Process, has analyzed the data, and prepared a summary of the findings for this report. Now in its 40th year, Minneapolis-based Rainbow Research is nationally recognized for its qualitative studies and participatory approach to research and evaluation.

A Data and Learning team from our community was formed to help analyze data and advise leadership. It includes Chair Jean King, professor in the College of Education and Human Development at the University of Minnesota specializing in research and evaluation; Bob Perry, Ph.D. Statistics; Sandy Weisberg, professor, University of Minnesota School of Statistics; and Jay Baldinger, former project manager for Seagate Technology.

A Leadership Team consisting of area rabbis, agency executives and lay leaders was established to provide insight and advice, and to help shape the recommendations that will grow out of the process. The team consists of one rabbi from each St. Paul synagogue and

one leader from each local Federation beneficiary agency, plus a highly skilled and diverse group of lay leaders who were chosen based on nominations from agency and synagogue leaders (See Table 3 in Appendix A for [members of the Leadership Team](#)).

3. What This Process Is and Is Not

A. What this IS

In Listening Sessions, we wanted to hear what the Jewish community is thinking, what TOPICS are on peoples' minds – not necessarily what the participants thought the solutions should be (although some solutions were offered and recorded). In Phase Three of the work, the Research and Recommendations (R&R) Panels will propose solutions to the issues which the Leadership Team selects for more in-depth research and discussion. We wanted to hear from deliberately chosen segments of the community – certain age ranges, both affiliated and unaffiliated/loosely affiliated, religious streams, geographic areas, GLBTQ, disabled, etc. We succeeded in reaching almost 350 individuals from almost every group we sought to reach, though we were not as successful in reaching “unaffiliated” Jews as we would have liked.

We wanted to hear about and appreciate not only what our concerns are, but what we value about our community and should strive to protect and nurture. We came to this task from a belief that the St. Paul Jewish Community has been, and can continue to be, a warm, welcoming and vibrant community.

We hope that community belief in this work – in its broad-based input, in its unbiased approach to gathering data, in its inclusive approach to choosing and empowering leadership – will lead the community to have the drive and energy to act on the project's ultimate recommendations.

We hope that this work helps us see ourselves as ONE community with many segments, and helps us understand that every segment needs to be able to find Jewish nourishment under our big tent. We should look at this process as a way for us to build, and then together occupy and flourish under one big tent to grow a strong, vibrant, pluralistic Jewish community that embraces and celebrates different ways of living Jewishly.

B. What this is NOT

The Listening Process was not a Harris poll, or a survey allowing us to generalize the findings to all Jewish adults living in our community. The results do accurately reflect the views of those 350 people who participated in Listening Sessions.

In this process, we intentionally focused on the Greater St. Paul Jewish community. We did not seek out opinions about the greater Twin Cities Jewish community, Israel or the global Jewish community.

II. Listening Process Methodology

A. Data Collection

Interviewers: Twenty-five community volunteers were recruited as Listening Session note-takers and moderators. Rainbow Research prepared a job description detailing the skills and responsibilities involved and then trained the volunteers in four two-hour trainings that explained the process and facilitation techniques. Rainbow additionally offered a simulation to provide opportunities for them to practice (See Appendix A, [Item 1](#) and [Item 2](#) for Job Descriptions).

Many moderators, as a part of their training, observed a Rainbow-moderated group. Volunteer moderators and note takers believed they were well prepared for their Listening Session assignments and personally found them interesting and fulfilling.

Listening Sessions were held at sites throughout the community including:

- Synagogues
- Jewish organizations
- Coffee shops and restaurants
- Summer camp
- Community centers
- Homes
- Places of business

Listening Sessions were held at varied times and on different days of the week. In one instance, a person who was out of town but wished to participate, joined online via Skype. Groups ranged in size between six and 12 participants.

B. Interview Guide

Rainbow Research, based on the project goals, developed a set of 12 questions that were reviewed and revised in consultation with the Steering Committee, the Data and Learning Team, and the Leadership Team. Once the questions were approved, Rainbow developed a scripted interview guide for use by the moderators and note takers (See Appendix A, [Item 4: Interview Guide](#)).

Unlike a survey with pre-defined questions and choices in which people mark their individual responses, participants could respond as they wished to broad open-ended discussion questions read aloud to them. As in any conversation, they could join in, interject their own comments or just listen as they chose. Note takers documented instances in which participants, through nods, gestures and facial expressions, agreed or disagreed, and when a particular comment launched a chain of discussion.

The moderator's primary role was to ensure than anyone who had something to say would have the opportunity. Often to make their point, participants couched their observations and opinions in stories – funny, sad, anguished, ironic and poignant. These conversations were digitally recorded and transcribed providing documentation from over 70 hours of

conversation. Recording was done with permission of participants, all of whom remain anonymous.

C. Exit Survey

Participants were asked to fill out a two-sided pen-and-paper exit survey at the end of each listening session (See Appendix A, Item 5: [Exit Survey](#)).

They were asked three different sets of questions covering the following:

1. **Benefits and Concerns:** The three most important things the St. Paul Jewish Community has to offer to them and their family and, the three most important issues or concerns facing Jewish people in their community.
2. **Demographic Data:** participants' zip code; age; gender; marital status; number of children under 18 living at home; sexual orientation; national origin; household members who are or are not Jewish; member or not of a congregation or synagogue and if yes, what type, branch, denomination, and; income.
3. **Listening Session Evaluation:** Extent to which participants felt they had an opportunity to express their opinions, extent to which the moderator did a good job, and whether they would recommend attending a listening session to others. Participants could also offer their own comments.

It should be stressed that respondents' individual responses on benefits and concerns were analyzed separately from the analysis of comments in the Listening Session transcripts. Even if participants didn't have a chance to comment in the conversation, the exit survey allowed us to capture each individual's opinion. We could compare these findings with those in the transcripts to determine the extent to which they were consistent. We could also determine in our analyses if there was any relationship between benefits and concerns and demographic attributes, like for example, county of residence, age, gender, income or synagogue membership as requested by the CPSC.

Separate analysis of the demographics midway through the process allowed us to determine what, if any, segments of the community had been under-represented so we could organize additional groups to rebalance the sample and ensure their inclusion. We have completed exit surveys from 36 groups.¹

¹ There were some problems with a small sub-set of the data. One set of exit surveys was never transmitted to Rainbow encompassing responses of 6-8 participants. Their listening session transcript was available and analyzed. Another set of exit surveys from four of the groups that were held simultaneously was returned to Federation in an undifferentiated bundle and treated for analysis purposes as one group.

Since completing the forms was voluntary, a small proportion of individuals opted not to complete them, didn't turn them in or had to leave before the listening session ended and never had a chance to complete one. There are also instances as in any survey in which individuals accidentally skipped an item or deliberately refused to respond. The latter

III. Listening Session Results

A. Whom Did We Reach?

Between June and November 2013 we talked with almost 350 people in 37 Listening Sessions from a wide variety of segments of the St. Paul Jewish Community, including all synagogues and one or more Jewish-identified agencies and organizations. Participants included agency members, staff, clients, audiences, customers, volunteers, leaders and donors who learned about the process through one or more organizations in which they are involved (See Appendix B, Item 1: [Demographics of Participants](#)).

Participants live throughout the Greater St. Paul region, including the city and its surrounding suburbs. Our youngest participants were teenagers and our oldest were over 100, with representation from every age cohort in between. Participants were largely born in the United States and if born abroad, primarily in Israel and the FSU (former Soviet Union). They are also diverse in the areas in which they live, marital status and household composition, sexual orientation, income and synagogue membership. Efforts, however, to reach out to and include self-identified Jewish people who are either secular and/or unaffiliated with congregations or other Jewish organizations met with only limited success (See Appendix B, Table 4 for [List of Listening Session Groups](#)).

In order to hear from people across the broad array of demographic groups in the St. Paul Jewish community, the CPSC, with the aid of Rainbow Research, developed an outreach plan, which was reviewed and refined by the Leadership Team. The groups reached were:

- Rabbis
- Leadership team lay leaders
- Agency executives
- Talmud Torah parents
- Jewish educators
- Hadassah/NCJW women
- Older adults living at Sholom
- Orthodox
- Conservative
- Reform
- Humanistic
- Adults 70-79+
- Adults 60-69
- Adults 40-59
- Adults 30-39
- Adults 20-29 (small number)

appears to be the case, for example, with annual household income even the though the survey was anonymous and respondents could choose from ranges of income.

- Teens (small number)
- East metro – 3M meeting
- South metro – Eagan meeting
- Empty nesters
- GLBTQ
- Russian Americans
- Holocaust survivors
- Low income older adults

There were demographic groups for which we heard from only a small number of people, despite extensive efforts to reach them. We had hoped to reach more. Still, the information provided by those we talked to was very useful and appreciated. They included:

- Unaffiliated
- Interfaith families
- Low income
- People with disabilities
- Teens
- Young adults
- People who moved to Minneapolis from St. Paul
- University students and faculty
- People who know JFS services

Though not a random sample, efforts were made to reach out to and include as broad a cross-section of the Greater St. Paul Jewish community as possible. Invitations were extended through public announcements and advertisements as well as by invitation through the newsletters of synagogues, the Federation and beneficiary agencies that also hosted sessions. Flyers were distributed at synagogues and beneficiary agencies and posted in public places.

B. Comparison to Former Community Studies

When compared to past community surveys, the demographics of Listening Session participants were roughly proportional to those of survey participants in terms of place of residence, marital status and households with children under 18. Over represented are members of Conservative synagogues, higher income households and people in their middle years 40-50 and 50-60. Under represented are youth as well as members of Reconstructionist and Humanist congregations and households with non-Jewish members including persons who are inter-married.

The largest under-represented group is members of the St. Paul Jewish community who are unaffiliated with a synagogue. Efforts to reach out to them, including informal channels and personal contacts, were largely unsuccessful.

C. Listening Session Findings

1. Content Analysis of Transcripts

Listening Session findings were first analyzed qualitatively using a technique known as content analysis to categorize thematically what they discussed. The process is labor intensive. Participants' comments regarding their concerns and what they value (Questions 4 & 7) were digitally extracted from the transcripts by converting text to tables and dropping every discreet statement in an excel spreadsheet row coded by the group in which the comment was made. In an inductive process, with no preconceived categories, phrases were then grouped by research analysts by bringing together in adjacent cells, phrases that were conceptually related and/or used the same term or phrase, until all but unrelated terms were in categories.

Once grouped, categories were sometimes realigned. Two categories were sometimes combined if there was no meaningful distinction between them. Conversely, large categories were sometimes subdivided into mutually exclusive subsets when there were important and useful distinctions between them. Individual phrases were also moved between categories where conceptually there was a better fit.

Throughout the process, analysts assigned categories temporary labels using terms and phrases that appear in the narrative and developed working definitions as close to what they could discern was the respondents' intent. Once categories were exhaustive and mutually exclusive, they were fixed and each phrase coded for the category to which it was assigned. Codes were used to sort the data into categories for analysis. We could get a count of the number of times each issue or benefit was mentioned, in how many groups it was mentioned and, within groups, how many times it was mentioned.

Reliability of the coding was checked by having a second analyst review while preparing a code book. Where she disagreed or had questions she flagged the comments, and the two analysts then revisited and made adjustments where necessary. They were largely in agreement and there were few adjustments.

2. Analysis of Exit Survey Benefits and Concerns

On paper exit surveys, respondents could write down what they considered their three most important concerns and the three things they most valued about the community. These data were entered in a spread sheet, along with the demographic data respondents provided about themselves, as well as a code for the group in which they participated. Their open-ended responses were then coded using the categories created from the analysis of the transcript. In instances in which there wasn't a fit, new categories were created to accommodate statements that were made by two or more respondents. Single, unrelated comments were listed separately and considered miscellaneous.

The exit survey data was analyzed quantitatively. Analyses were done to determine the extent to which rankings of concerns and benefits varied between what respondents said in Listening Sessions and, after hearing the conversations, what they filled in on the exit

survey. At the request of the Steering Committee, analyses were done to determine, e.g. if there were any significant differences in concerns/benefits by age and by place of residence. Such analyses will be of use when the Research and Recommendation Committees delve into their study of specific concerns.

3. Definitions and Examples

In Appendices [C \(Benefits\)](#) and [D \(Concerns\)](#) there are documents with definitions of each of the content categories with examples from the transcribed narrative of what the analysts coded in each category. Rainbow Research has saved the content analysis for independent review by the Data and Learning Team to audit Rainbow Research's procedures and validate the findings reported here and throughout this document. All transcripts and recordings are digitally archived and available, if necessary, for independent reanalysis or audit.

D. Data Analysis

Much of the data is qualitative in nature. Counting how many times a word or phrase was used, as a basis for identifying people's most important concerns or values, has certain limitations. Some people are more talkative and others more listeners. One person may have spoken at length limiting the amount of time for others to raise their concerns. The difference of one or two mentions in a group may or may not mean very much when assigning the comments to a rank-order.

Another way to rank order concerns and benefits is not only the relative frequency with which they were discussed, but perhaps more importantly, in how many groups they surfaced. Irrespective of who moderated the conversation, the location, the numbers of people who participated, participant attributes, the person coding the comments, that the same concern emerges increases the likelihood that this a broad-based issue and not an artifact of some other factor. Called *triangulation* or *cross-validation*, it increases our confidence in qualitative research that what we've documented is a valid observation.

Not surprisingly, participants will make statements that they believe to be so, but that are inaccurate. For example, in one conversation at least three different participants understood that Talmud Torah of Saint Paul is closed. Such findings are in themselves important.

What people define in their situation as real, is real in their consequences. They will behave as if it is so and act accordingly. Misunderstandings and erroneous perceptions and beliefs will be important data for agencies, synagogues, schools and other organizations to consider as they review the findings. These could have an important impact on membership and service utilization and inform investment in improved marketing, communications and outreach.

The findings in Synopsis 1: Benefits on page 11 and Synopsis 2: Concerns on page 13 organize the participants' perceived benefits and concerns into related categories labeled under a rubric proposed by Rainbow Research and approved by the Steering Committee. In Appendices [C \(Benefits\)](#) and [D \(Concerns\)](#) are rankings of benefits and concerns based on

numbers of comments across groups extracted from transcripts and listed on exit surveys. These data are indicators of relative levels of concern or benefit. Not included in the findings are comments or exit survey responses of single respondents.

E. Benefits

([See Appendix C-Benefits](#) for detailed data on what the community values)

As members of the St. Paul Jewish Community, Listening Session participants find much to value. They see many good things about their lives here and feel that they, their family and friends have benefited in many ways from what the community has to offer. Below is a summary of the benefits and aspects of the community that the participants value. The synopsis which follows describes the frequency and proportion of groups in which they were raised.

Inclusive and caring community: Above all, participants find our community is inclusive and caring with institutions that are welcoming and supportive and that bring together people of diverse interests and backgrounds. They say we are closely knit with opportunities to develop lifelong friendship and a wide circle of relationships. They find in St. Paul many opportunities for us to volunteer and engage with our community and see this as a good place to settle, raise our children and stay when they retire.

Quality and affordable Jewish education and services: Participants speak well of Jewish education, social services and cultural activities which they find to be of good quality, accessible and affordable. They appreciate the religious education options available to them and name Talmud Torah in particular. They see the St. Paul JCC as a community hub and value the accessibility and affordability of its programming. Participants speak generally of quality services that meet community needs and name those provided by Sholom and Jewish Family Service. Also noted is the availability of widely varied cultural, athletic and educational activities, as well camps and programs for children.

Support for Jewish values and beliefs: Participants speak generally about our community's support for Jewish practices, traditions, beliefs and values. They see this in the positive influence the community has on people's life course, and in building Jewish identity and pride. Our community, they recognize, has a large Jewish presence and infrastructure as well as dedicated rabbis and synagogues. Participants also value our community's connections with Israel.

Cooperation between Jewish Organizations: Participants acknowledge the cooperation and collaboration taking place between our community's Jewish organizations and synagogues.

SYNOPSIS 1: THE SAINT PAUL JEWISH COMMUNITY [WHAT LISTENING SESSION PARTICIPANTS VALUE*](#)

Inclusive and Caring Community with Welcoming and Supportive Institutions (62%)

- Closely knit, inclusive and caring community with opportunities to build longstanding friendships and broad relationship networks (29%)

- Community institutions that are welcoming, accepting and supportive (13%)
- Many opportunities for volunteering, for community engagement and for social justice-related activities (12%)
- Good place to raise children, grow up or retire (5%)
- Brings together people of diverse interests and backgrounds (3%)

Quality, Affordable and Accessible Jewish Education, Cultural Activities and Social Services (23%)

- Good quality religious education options, particularly Talmud Torah (8%)
- JCC is valued as a hub of community connection and for its accessible and affordable programs and services (5%)
- Wide variety of cultural, athletic and learning activities appealing to a range of ages and interests (4%)
- Array of high quality services that meet people's diverse needs including services of Sholom and Jewish Family Service (4%)
- Access to Jewish camps and programs for children (2%)

Support for Jewish Values, Beliefs and Identity (13%)

- Sustains and supports Jewish practices, traditions, history and values (3%)
- Positive influence on people's direction in life including educational and vocational choices (3%)
- Builds and affirms Jewish identity and pride (3%)
- Large Jewish community presence and infrastructure (2%)
- The community has dedicated rabbis and great synagogues (1%)
- Community connections with Israel through travel and funding (1%)

Cooperation Within and Between Jewish Organizations (2%)

- Cooperation and collaboration among Jewish organizations and synagogues (2%)

*N=448 discreet comments in listening process transcripts in response to 2 questions: What in your opinion are the good things about St. Paul's Jewish community and what it has to offer to people like you who live here? In what ways have you, your family and friends benefited from what our community has to offer? In what ways has our community made a difference in your lives?
%=proportion of 448 comments

F. Concerns

([See Appendix D](#)-Concerns for detailed data on community concerns)

As members of our St. Paul Jewish community, participants spoke about some of the things that are of concern to them, their family, friends and/or neighbors and noted these again in their exit surveys. Below is a summary of the issues and concerns that they raised. The synopsis which follows describes the frequency and proportion of groups in which they were raised.

Jewish Education and Social Services: Participants expressed concerns about the availability, quality and responsiveness of Jewish education and social services. In the education sphere they are specifically concerned about the small and declining enrollment at

the Talmud Torah, and are in addition, concerned about lack of age-specific Jewish educational options, particularly pre-K and adults. Concerns about agency service delivery cover a range of issues including quality, cost and limited availability. This includes the availability and support of care for the elderly and other vulnerable groups including the poor, victims of abuse and immigrants. Employment and service to mostly non-Jewish people by Jewish organizations was another concern.

Assimilation and Changing Jewish Values, Beliefs and Practices: Participants expressed concern about our community becoming increasingly more secular and with that, both declining synagogue affiliation and more use of services outside of those supported by the Jewish community. Related is the concern by participants that our community's young people are less likely to participate in organized Jewish community life and to affiliate with a synagogue, and that finding, recruiting and new and young leaders is a challenge. A less frequently mentioned concern is the continued increase in intermarriage and interfaith families with children. A community-level concern is the decline in number and variety of Jewish-oriented organizations, institutions and businesses that participants feel helped give the community its physical identity in the past.

Community Exclusivity and Unsatisfactory Outreach: Participants are concerned about what they see as insufficient outreach by our community to newcomers, the unaffiliated, youth and diverse segments of the community including persons who are GLBTQ and secular Jews. A related concern is we haven't done enough or are not very effective in marketing and communicating about our community's Jewish organizations, institutions and groups, and what they have to offer. Participants are also concerned that because life-long residents of our community travel in narrow and exclusive social circles, newcomers and persons raised elsewhere feel left out and unwelcome.

Lack of Cooperation Between Jewish Organizations and Communities: Participants expressed concern about duplication of services and the need for greater collaboration between and among St. Paul synagogues and Jewish agencies, as well as between St. Paul and Minneapolis organizations. Though some comments indicate participant concern about our community losing its identity through increased collaboration with Minneapolis, there are many more comments expressing their concerns about the need for greater cooperation and collaboration between Minneapolis and St. Paul as well as the perception there is a duplication of services between them.

Changes in Jewish Population: The single concern about which participants most often commented is changes in the size, composition and mobility of our community's population. The concern is in regards to the impact these changes will have on our organizations and institutions given the decline in community concentration due to movement to suburbs, continued increase in the size of our elderly population and steady decline in the average number of children per household.

High Costs of Tuition, Membership and Service: Participants are concerned about the high cost of adhering to Jewish traditions, synagogue memberships and tuition for camps and schools. A related concern is the financial sustainability and stability of our community's Jewish organizations and institutions.

Strategic Planning and Fundraising: Participants are concerned about how our community raises funds, the number who contribute and declining commitment to giving. They also are concerned about the adequacy of strategic planning, including accurate assessments of community change and measurement of success.

Perceptions of Prejudice and Discrimination: Participants said very little about any recent experience they have had in our community with anti-Semitic acts or language or any recent experience with prejudice or discrimination directed at them as Jews.

SYNOPSIS 2: LISTENING SESSION PARTICIPANTS' ISSUES AND CONCERNS

Proportion of All Concerns Mentioned* (N=349 discrete comments)

Availability, Quality and Responsiveness of Jewish Education and Social Services (24%)

- Small and declining Talmud Torah enrollment and lack of Jewish educational options for different age groups particularly pre-k and adults. (10%)
- Agency service delivery issues related to e.g. quality, cost and limited availability (7%)
- Caring for the elderly and other vulnerable groups (poor, victims of abuse, immigrants) (5%)
- Jewish organizations employing and serving mostly non-Jewish people (2%)

Community Exclusivity and Unsatisfactory Outreach to Other Jews (22%)

- Insufficient and ineffective outreach to newcomers, the unaffiliated, youth and diverse segments of the community (11%)
- Narrow, exclusive social circles of life-long residents from which newcomers feel left out and unwelcome (7%)
- Insufficient and ineffective marketing, communication and education about Jewish organizations, institutions and groups and what they offer (4%)

Assimilation and Changes in Jewish Values, Beliefs and Practices (20%)

- Secularization, declining affiliation and more utilization of greater community services (10%)
- Declining participation/affiliation of young people (7%)
- Decline in number and variety of Jewish-oriented organizations, institutions and businesses that give a community its identity (1%)
- Finding, recruiting and mentoring new and younger leaders (1%)
- Increase in intermarriage and Interfaith families with children (1%)

Division and Lack of Cooperation between Jewish Organizations and Communities (13%)

- Limited cooperation and collaboration between Minneapolis and St. Paul Jewish communities and perceived duplication of services between them (8%)
- Lack of cohesion within the St. Paul community and respectively silos separating its agencies and its synagogues (4%)
- St Paul losing its identity through increased collaboration with Minneapolis (1%)

Changes in Jewish Population Size, Attributes and Mobility (12%)

- Aging, declining birth rate and geographic dispersion of the Jewish population (12%)

High Costs of Tuition, Membership and Services (6%)

- High cost of adhering to Jewish traditions, synagogue membership, and tuition for camps and schools (4%)
- Financial sustainability and stability of Jewish organizations and institutions (2%)

Strategic, Planning and Fund Raising (4%)

- Fundraising related concerns including how money is raised, the number who contribute and declining commitment to giving (2%)
- Concerns about adequate strategic planning including accurate assessments of community change and measurement of success (2%)

Perceptions of Prejudice and Discrimination (1%)

- Anti-Semitic acts or language or recent experience with prejudice or discrimination directed at Jews (1%)

E. Next steps/Timeline

In Phase Two, the Leadership Team will meet to discuss the data and to choose the top three to five issues to focus on. The work of Phase Two will happen in three steps:

Phase One	Listening Process (complete)
Phase Two	Leadership chooses top issues facing community
Phase Three	Research is pursued and recommendations are developed on each issue by “Research and Recommendations Panels”
Phase Four	Implementation of results: each entity in the Jewish community determines how to use R&R to serve its mission

1. **First Meeting** (February 19, 2014): Entire Leadership Team will meet together. Rainbow Research will present the data and answer questions.
2. **Second Meeting.** Each segment of the Leadership Team will meet separately with Rainbow Research (rabbis will have their own meeting; agency leaders will have their own meeting; lay leadership will have their own meeting). These meetings will be:
 - a. Lay leaders: Tues., Feb. 25 at 7 p.m. at Federation office
 - b. Agency execs: Thurs., Feb. 27 at 12 p.m. at Federation office
 - c. Rabbis: Thurs., Feb. 27 at 1:30 p.m. at Federation office
3. **Third Meeting** (Currently determining date/time through Meeting Wizard): Entire Leadership Team will meet together. Rainbow Research will lead the group in making the choices of the top three to five issues. Details will be explained about

how Research and Recommendation Panel (R&R Panel) members will be nominated and chosen, and how their work will be structured.

Once the issues are chosen, Phase Two will be complete.

Then we will begin Phase Three. In Phase Three, R&R Panels will convene to analyze each of the chosen issues. The tasks of each panel will be to answer two questions relative to the issue.

Table 6: What are the tasks of each Research and Recommendation (R&R) Panel?		
To answer two questions based on broad, deep research and on input from the local community and beyond.		
	Task	Question to Answer
1.	Formulate Recommended Goal.	What should our community's realistic aspirational goal be on this issue?
2.	Formulate Recommended Path.	What is the Panel's recommendation about a path for achieving that goal?

Each panel will need to engage in research on its issue. What approaches to the issue have been tried in other similar communities? What has that work shown? Is there any academic or popular literature addressing the issue? Are there experts who the Panel can hear from? Are there practitioners in our local community or our region who can provide testimony about what does or doesn't work?

F. Dissemination of Data

Here is the schedule for disseminating the data in this package.

- Feb. 19: First Leadership Team meeting to discuss data
- Feb. 20: Send data to St. Paul Jewish Federation board
- Feb. 26: St. Paul Jewish Federation Board discusses data
- Feb. 27: Data available on St. Paul Jewish Federation website and distributed widely

G. End Result

In the end, the importance of this work will be judged by how the Federation, the agencies, and the synagogues choose to act on what we will have learned. There are seven outcomes we hope to accomplish:

- The community believes that the process used here was inclusive, and that nearly everyone had a chance to participate and contribute his or her thinking;
- The community believes that the data unearthed thinking that is broadly representative of the community;

- The data is shared broadly so that each agency and synagogue can use it for its own purposes;
- The community believes that the Leadership Team chose an important set of issues to focus on, and that those issues are ripe with opportunity for community advancement;
- The community believes that the work of the R&R Panels brought us the best thinking in the country on these issues, and listened carefully to learn how the issues impact us on our local level;
- The community further believes that the R&R Panels recommended important, attainable community goals;
- The community further believes that the R&R Panels recommended viable paths to reach those goals.

If all seven of these things happen, we will have hit the jackpot. Then there would be broad community belief in a valid process that used inclusive, thoughtful, fair, evidence-based data and deliberations to make recommendations for how our community might realistically improve itself in important ways. If all of these seven things happen, we can expect our Federation, our agencies, and our synagogues to embrace the data and these goals and these recommended paths, and to work together in synchronicity to make St. Paul the best, most vibrant Jewish community it can possibly be.