

CONGREGATION SHAAREI TEFILLAH

MEMBERSHIP SURVEY

SPRING, 1986

I. Background Information

1. How old are you? (58 respondents)

<u>3(5%)</u> 20-30	<u>10(17%)</u> 31-35	<u>15(26%)</u> 36-40	<u>7(12%)</u> 41-45	<u>10(17%)</u> 46-50	<u>13(22%)</u> Over 50
-----------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

2. How long have you lived in Newton? (58 respondents)

<u>9(16%)</u> 0-2 Years	<u>11(19%)</u> 3-5 Years	<u>15(26%)</u> 6-10 Years	<u>23(40%)</u> More Than 10 Years
----------------------------	-----------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------------------

3. In which calendar year did you join Shaarei Tefillah?  
(61 respondents)

<u>36(59%)</u> 1983	<u>14(23%)</u> 1984	<u>11(18%)</u> 1985	<u>0(0%)</u> 1986
------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	----------------------

4. Are you male or female? (68 respondents)

<u>35(51%)</u> Male	<u>33(49%)</u> Female
------------------------	--------------------------

5. Are you married? (65 respondents)

<u>65(100%)</u> Yes	<u>-</u> No
------------------------	----------------

6. If yes, is your spouse filling out a separate questionnaire? (63 respondents)

<u>50 (79%)</u> Yes	<u>12(19%)</u> No	1(2%) - don't know
------------------------	----------------------	--------------------

7. How many children do you have living at home?  
(58 respondents)

None	17(29%)
1 child	12 (21%)
2 children	9 (16%)
3 children	15 (26%)
4 children	5 (9%)

8. How old is your oldest child living at home? \_\_\_\_\_

How old is your youngest child living at home? \_\_\_\_\_

9. Which synagogue were you affiliated with prior to joining Shaarei Tefillah? (59 respondents)

Beth El	47 (80%)
Other	12 (20%)

10. How far do you live from:

	<u>Furber Lane</u>	<u>35 Morseland</u>
0.1 Mile	2 (4%)	-
0.2 Mile	1 (2%)	2 (4%)
0.3 Mile	5 (9%)	6 (11%)
0.4 Mile	1 (2%)	4 (7%)
0.5 Mile	11 (20%)	7 (13%)
0.6 Mile	4 (7%)	6 (11%)
0.7 Mile	2 (4%)	2 (4%)
0.8 Mile	15 (28%)	13 (24%)
0.9 Mile	-	2 (4%)
1.0 Mile	6 (11%)	11 (20%)
1.2 Miles	4 (7%)	1 (2%)
1.3 Miles	2 (4%)	-
1.4 Miles	1 (2%)	-

11. What is the farthest distance you would be prepared to walk to synagogue? (56 respondents)

0.5 Mile	0.7 Mile	0.8 Mile	0.9 Mile	1.0 Mile	1.2 Miles	1.3 Miles
1 (2%)	1 (2%)	3 (5%)	1 (2%)	24 (43%)	4 (7%)	7 (13%)
1.5 Miles	1.6 Miles	2.0 Miles	2.5 Miles			
9 (16%)	1 (2%)	3 (5%)	2 (4%)			

II. Everyone's favorite subject: Buildings

12. Which development of 35 Morseland would you prefer?  
(67 respondents)

- 6 (9%) Option 1 - Demolish the existing building and construct a new building (highest cost option but most flexible one, but least palatable to aldermen/neighbors)
- 43 (64%) Option 2 - Preserve the existing building and construct a new sanctuary attached to it (moderate in cost and likely to be more acceptable to aldermen/neighbors than Option 1, but less flexible)
- 8 (12%) Option 3 - Keep the existing building but renovate and enlarge it (least cost and likely the most palatable option to aldermen/neighbors, but least likely to accommodate large-scale present needs and long-term growth)
- 8 (12%) None. Develop a better alternative
- 2 (3%) Options 2&3.

Please explain your choice, and, if you chose the fourth option, please suggest alternatives to the development of 35 Morseland:

QUESTION 12

COMMENTS:

OPTION 4:

- . status quo (2)
- . options not adequate for long term and should seek alternative site (4)
- . not desirable to have 2 orthodox synagogues on same street (1)
- . need to consider Beth El in long term (1)

OTHER:

- . opt #2 politically more likely to succeed in aldermanic process; financially more feasible (7)
- . opts 2&3 are best since we'd outgrow them before long (3)
- . would prefer opt #1 if no constraints but voted for opt #2 (2)
- . need to stay flexible for long term needs (3)
- . preserve house-like aspects of 35 Morseland (1)
- . use existing shul (35 Morseland) for daily services; use new sanctuary for Shabbat and Yom Tov (1)
- . opt #2 might provide living quarters for a Rabbi (1)
- . renovating won't provide enough room (1)
- . need a home now we can afford (1)
- . building should not be primary focus (1)
- . for opt #3 use 2 minyanim (1)
- . unlikely to receive aldermanic approval in any case (1)

13. A. If the aldermen voted to permit Option 1, how would you feel about such a project? (63 respondents)

16 (25%) It's very adequate and we should go ahead

28 (44%) It's terrible and we should not go ahead

19 (30%) It's the best available option and we should go ahead

B. If the aldermen voted to permit only Option 2, how would you feel about such a project? (64 respondents)

27 (42%) It's very adequate and we should go ahead

7 (11%) It's terrible and we should not go ahead

29 (45%) It's the best available option and we should go ahead

1 (2%) - 1st and 3rd.

C. If only Option 3 were permitted, how would you feel about such a project? (66 respondents)

7 (11%) It's very adequate and we should go ahead

26 (39%) It's terrible and we should not go ahead

33 (50%) It's the best available option and we should go ahead

QUESTION 13C

COMMENT:

- . depends upon renovation plans (1)

14. On an average shabbat, roughly 85 men and 65 women attend morning services. On the high holidays, we sold 140 tickets to men and 120 tickets to women. Based on the foregoing information (but with whatever assumptions concerning future growth you feel are appropriate) would you like to see the seating capacity of the congregation's sanctuary (whether at 35 Morseland or elsewhere) be: (66 respondents)

<u>6 (9%)</u>	<u>13 (20%)</u>	<u>16 (24%)</u>	<u>30 (45%)</u>	<u>1 (2%)</u>
Less than 200	200-250	250-300	300-400	More than 400

15. How important is it to you that the synagogue's function room be of sufficient size to accommodate fairly large social functions (defined as 150-200 people)? (68 respondents)

<u>0</u>	<u>21 (31%)</u>	<u>42 (62%)</u>	<u>4 (6%)</u>
Critical	Very Important	Nice to have, but I could live without it	Unimportant

16. What other facilities at 35 Morseland are of importance to you in a proposed development? (please try to list in order of priority)

QUESTION 16:

- . place for children's activities/ services (19)
- . study room(s)/ library (17)
- . social/ function room (11)
- . kitchen (9)
- . office (6)
- . beit medrash (2)
- . space for a succah (2)
- . a mechitzah to satisfy the most observant element of the congregation (2)
- . good acoustics (3)
- . attractive ambiance - not fancy, good taste (3)
- . no fixed seating (1)
- . mezzuzot (1)

17. Assuming that (1) we have already invested approximately \$300,000 in 35 Morseland, and (2) we have netted \$100,000 (including our initial investment) from the sale of 841 Commonwealth, and (3) the congregation will continue to grow at a moderate rate over the next few years, what is the maximum amount that should now be invested in development of 35 Morseland (in addition to the initial \$300,000 investment)? (55 respondents)

<u>11 (20%)</u>	under \$100,000 (resulting in annual mortgage payments, including the existing mortgage on 35 Morseland, of approximately \$30,000)
<u>30 (55%)</u>	\$150,000-300,000 (resulting in annual mortgage payments, including the existing mortgage on 35 Morseland, of between \$35,000 and \$50,000)
<u>14 (25%)</u>	\$300,000-500,000 (resulting in annual mortgage payments, including the existing mortgage on 35 Morseland, of between \$50,000 and \$75,000)
<u>0</u>	More than \$500,000

18. Would you be in favor of a minimum building fund assessment for each member, in order to raise development funds? (67 respondents)

Yes 36 (54%) No 31 (46%)

If "yes", how much would you be prepared to pledge over a 5 year period? (35 respondents)

\$1-2,000	<u>26 (74%)</u>	\$3-4,000	<u>4 (11%)</u>	\$5,000 <sup>2</sup>	<u>2 (6%)</u>	More than \$5,000 <sup>3</sup>	<u>3 (9%)</u>
-----------	-----------------	-----------	----------------	----------------------	---------------	--------------------------------	---------------

QUESTION 18

COMMENT:

- . \$350 per family per year (1)

19. What other specific means of obtaining funds for the building would you suggest?

- QUESTION 19:
- find philanthropist(s)/ foundation(s) (10)
  - donor dinners (7)
  - raffle (6)
  - concerts/ shows (3)
  - raise ticket prices (2)
  - raise dues (1)
  - go slow in building; spend several years raising money (1)
  - hire rabbi who knows how to raise money (1)
  - yard sales (1)
  - excursions (1)
  - day care center (1)
  - lease space to small non-profit organizations (1)
  - rent out for social functions (1)
  - cookbook (1)
  - wine sale for Pesach (1)
  - Yahrzeit fund (1)
  - ad book (1)
  - appeals (1)
  - sell alliyot (1)
  - dedicate parts of shul (1)
  - auction (1)

20. How well do you feel the congregation has handled the aldermanic/land use approval process to date? (55 respondents)

Very well 4 (7%) Satisfactorily 21 (38%) Unsatisfactorily 30 (55%)

Why do you feel that way?

QUESTION 20

COMMENTS:

- SATISFACTORY:
- congregation did best it could (4)
  - tried hard but misread aldermen (2)
  - touched all bases (2)
  - false sense of optimism (1)
  - well organized (1)
  - enormous effort was expended (1)

- UNSATISFACTORY:
- bad attorneys (9)
  - projected adversarial atmosphere (6)
  - not well organized; poor reading of aldermen (6)
  - naive, unrealistic, sophomoric approach; no real understanding of law and political processes (4)
  - too much time wasted trying to appease neighbors and city officials (1)
  - poor public relations (1)
  - poor leadership (1)
  - no overall plan (1)
  - mistreated aldermen (1)
  - too much effort (1)

- OTHER:
- Chevra Shas has apparently taken away effort needed to pursue aggressively the land-use issue (1)

21. If we fail to obtain acceptable aldermanic approval of use of 35 Morseland, should we: (58 respondents)

42 (72%) Appeal to the courts

5 (9%) Sell 35 Morseland and continue to search for a site

3 (5%) Sell 35 Morseland and merge as individuals with Beth El

1 (2%) Sell 35 Morseland and merge as a congregation with Beth El

QUESTION 21

COMMENTS:

- 3 (5%) Other
- 4 (7%) 1 and 2
  - would like assessment of chances and cost of appeal (1)
  - why could Beth El merge?; what's in it for Beth El? (1)
  - develop long-term alternative by forming alliance with other Jewish groups in Newton (1)
  - continue renting (1)

III. Rabbinics/Halachic Questions

22. What do you view as the most satisfactory method of dealing with community halachic questions? (67 respondents)

26 (39%) Rabbinical committee

25 (37%) Hire a rabbi

13 (19%) Retain a single outside rabbinical advisor

3 (4%) rabbinical committee / retain single outside rabbinical advisor

QUESTION 22

COMMENTS:

- . #1 depending on rabbis (1)
- . #2 only because rabbinic committee doesn't seem to be working well (1)

23. Would you like to see the congregation hire a rabbi at some point in the near future? (68 respondents)

Yes 29(42%) No 27 (40%) I'm not certain 12 (18%)

24. How do you presently deal with personal halachic questions? All respondents ask rabbis, who are friends, members of Shaarei Tefillah, or rabbis in other communities.

25. For the immediate survival of the congregation, which do you feel is most important? (66 respondents)

39 (59%) Constructing a permanent home

7 (11%) Hiring a rabbi

16(24%) Other priority (specify) 2 (3%) constructing a permanent home & other

2 (3%) constructing a permanent home and hiring a rabbi

26. For the long-term survival of the congregation, which do you feel is most important? (64 respondents)

38 (59%) Constructing a permanent home

14 (22%) Hiring a rabbi

9 (14%) Other priority (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

3 (5%) constructing a permanent home & hiring a rabbi

QUESTIONS 25 & 26

COMMENTS:

- . decrease bickering and dissention; develop long term achievable goals (11)
- . establishing a place to daven (2)
- . neither important (2)
- . wait until R. Koolyk leaves and then merge with Beth El (2)
- . (#25) reestablishing halachic committee (1)
- . settle with Chevra Shas (1)
- . most serious issue is whether we're a spiritual center or a community center (1)
- . (#25) discontinue use of Furber Lane (1)
- . acting like an orthodox congregation and not a Shabbat morning davening society (1)
- . need understanding of our goals (1)

27. Do you think that there are important women's issues that have not yet been effectively addressed by the congregation? (58 respondents)

Yes 24 (41%) No 33(57%) 1 (2%) don't know

If "yes", what are the most important ones? \_\_\_\_\_

QUESTION 27

COMMENTS:

- . maximize women's participation within halachah (4)
- . young girls participation in services (4)
- . bat mitzvah (2)'
- . women speakers at services (2)
- . arrange for the maximum involvement of women within a "creative" reading of halachah (1)
- . what egalitarian aspects of davening and decision-making the congregation is addressing (1)
- . women's tefillah groups (1)
- . women's participation in Simchat Torah (1)
- . tolerance, acceptance of procedures already established (1)
- . no important women's issues cannot be addressed by orthodox tradition and halachah (1)
- . should not be pressured into inappropriate decisions by a certain group of women (1)
- . only a few more outspoken feminists have defined issues; would like more education classes for men and women in this area (1)

28. Have you attended meetings of the "women's issues committee"? (66 respondents)

Yes 22 (33%) No 44 (67%)

If "no", would you like to be involved in those meetings in the future? (44 respondents)

Yes 3 (7%) No 41 (93%)

V. Miscellaneous

29. Have you attended 50% or more of the general congregational meetings in the last 6 months? (66 respondents)

Yes 34 (52%) No 32 (48%)

If "no", why have you not attended more meetings? (check one or more responses)

22 My schedule conflicts with the meeting times

5 I'm not interested

6 I believe that decisions have already been made before the meeting

6 No one will listen to my point of view anyway

7 I feel that there is a good chance that I would be intimidated in public by those disagreeing with my opinions

4 I have expected the decisions to be what I have wanted anyway

10 Nothing ever happens, and the meetings are a waste of time

12 Other reasons (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

30. Have you actively participated on any Shaarei Tefillah committees? (68 respondents)

Yes 45 (66%) No 23 (34%)

31. If you have not been an active participant on one or more committees, why not? (check one or more responses)

7 I haven't been invited to participate; I feel unwelcome

9 My schedule conflicts with meeting times

4 I'm not interested

1 I believe that decisions have already been made before the meetings

4 I feel that committee members would not welcome what I have to say, and that my participation would have no bearing on decisions

4 Committee meetings are simply not productive, so why bother

10 Other reasons (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

32. Do you feel that decision-making is concentrated in the hands of a few people? (60 respondents)

Yes 40 (67%) No 20 (33%)

33. If "yes":

(A) What makes you feel that this is the case? \_\_\_\_\_

QUESTION 33A

COMMENTS:

- . nature of organization for a few to be deeply involved & active (9)
- . people want to run their own show; people operate on their own agendas (5)
- . results/ observation (6)
- . decisions made/ actions taken without congregation's knowledge (50)
- . decision-making process; little or no decision-making (3)
- . many committees and committees in name only (3)
- . votes are ignored/ not carried out (3)
- . people are not invited to participate; other opinions are ignored (2)
- . too few people offer comments, attend meetings (3)
- . enthusiasm for building a new shul (1)
- . never know what's going on until come to a meeting; at that time the information is too new to assimilate quickly (1)
- . young and inexperienced congregation (1)
- . grew too big, too fast (1)
- . mishandling of various issues (1)

(B) What has caused that condition to exist? \_\_\_\_\_

QUESTION 33B

COMMENTS:

- . outcome of few deeply involved people; human nature (7)
- . apathy (3)
- . people have their own agendas (3)
- . nature of organization (3)
- . usual shul politics (2)
- . refusal to share power (2)
- . reaction to Beth El situation (1)
- . lack of decision-making procedures (1)
- . difficulty in breaching the inner sanctum; unwillingness to include others in decision-making process (1)
- . too many people have too much to say (1)
- . contempt for participatory process (1)
- . small group of people who know what's best for the shul (1)
- . too many people don't participate (1)
- . conceit (1)

(c) Are the "decision-makers" of the congregation responsive to issues and comments made by "non-decision-makers"? (53 respondents)

Yes 26 (49%) No 19 (36%) 8 (15%) don't know.

34. Do you feel excluded from the congregation's decision-making processes? (64 respondents)

Yes 25 (39%) No 37 (58 %) 2 (3%) don't know

35. Would you like to be more involved in the decision-making processes? (56 respondents)

Yes 18 (32%) No 34 (61%) 4 (7%) unsure

QUESTION 35

COMMENT:

- . don't know that there is a decision-making process (1)

36. In general, what do you think would cause you and other members of the congregation to be more involved in the decision-making process?

QUESTION 36

COMMENTS:

- . don't renege on decisions; let decisions happen (3)
- . make decisions instead of talking every issue to death (3)
- . more business-like meetings with less parliamentary maneuvering (3)
- . less hostility at meetings; greater respect for each person's point of view (4)
- . warmer feeling about congregation (1)
- . a set of procedures (1)
- . more substance, less posturing (1)
- . fewer but more productive meetings (1)
- . being invited to participate (2)
- . a slower pace, less emphasis on building; a chance to grow as a community with a stronger sense of religious purpose (1)
- . a feeling it could make a difference (1)
- . delegate tasks to each member (1)
- . change in leadership (1)
- . representative democracy (1)
- . ability to speak at meetings without being insulted (1)
- . being allowed (1)
- . need more time and energy (1)

37. In particular, how would you suggest we might cause "newer" members of the congregation to become more involved in decision-making and other congregational activities?

QUESTION 37

COMMENTS:

- . seek them out personally; ask each to serve on a committee (18)
- . be friendly (3)
- . let congregational decisions be implemented (2)
- . hold small group meetings (2)
- . stop holding a grudge against Beth El; new members are disinterested (1)
- . social activities (1)
- . invite broader range of people to participate (1)
- . stop congregational meetings where every issue is filibustered (1)
- . listening to people (1)
- . change in leadership (1)
- . different tone at meetings (1)
- . committees that meet (1)
- . restore atmosphere of peace rather than confrontation (1)
- . hiring a rabbi (1)

38. Rate the following features of the congregation's current by-laws. Are they: (check one or more responses)

<u>Features</u>	<u>Efficient</u>	<u>Inefficient</u>	<u>Largely Ignored</u>	<u>In need of Amendment</u>
Open Committees (40 respondents)	17 (43%)	4 (10%)	7 (18%)	4 (10%)
Executive Committee made up of committee chairpeople (41 respondents)	2 (5%) inefficient & largely ignored	4 (10%) inefficient & in need of amendment	2 (5%) inefficient, largely ignored & in need of amend.	
Numerous congregational meetings (43 respondents)	25 (61%)	9 (22%)	3 (7%)	4 (10%)
Key congregational decisions made by congregation as a whole (42 respondents)	8 (19%)	23 (53%)	5 (12%)	3 (7%)
	1 (2%) inefficient & largely ignored	3 (7%) inefficient & in need of amendment		
	18 (43%)	11 (26%)	6 (14%)	4 (10%)
	1 (2%) inefficient & largely ignored	2 (5%) inefficient & in need of amendment		

QUESTION 38

COMMENTS:

- . no decision-making goes on here (2)
- . by-laws are useless (1)
- . exec. comm. needs better attendance and involvement (1)
- . too many are disenfranchised from congregational meetings (1)
- . committees and exec. bd. must have areas of authority and responsibility spelled out (1)

39. If you feel that the congregation's formal structure (i.e., the by-laws) is in need of amendment, what key changes would you suggest?

QUESTION 39

COMMENTS:

- . greater delegation of authority (5)
- . need vice-president (4)
- . increase authority of exec. comm./ board; not taken seriously (3)
- . drop by-laws (3)
- . get rid of current committee and organization structure (2)
- . better committee structure and selection of chairpersons (2)
- . appoint permanent committees (2)
- . immediate past officers should be members of exec. comm. (2)
- . more powerful executive (2)
- . streamline, fewer meetings (2)
- . less process/ make by-laws more flexible (2)
- . need asst. treasurer (1)
- . abstentee ballots (1)
- . need halachic comm. with total power in halachic area (1)
- . broaden range of participants on committees (1)



40. What is the maximum size you would want the congregation to grow to (congregation's current size is approximately 80 families)? (66 respondents)

- 3 (5%) 80 families
- 1 (2%) 90 families
- 11 (17%) 100 families
- 11 (17%) 125 families
- 3 (5%) Other
- 37 (56%) I see no reason for a limit on the congregation's size

41. How would you describe your feelings about the amount of money which you are asked to contribute to the congregation through dues, purchase of seats and other fund-raising efforts? (67 respondents)

<u>43 (64%)</u>	<u>12 (18%)</u>	<u>10 (15%)</u>
About Right	Too High	Could be somewhat higher, if necessary

2 (3%) about right/ could be somewhat higher if necessary

42. What are some of the accomplishments and characteristics of the congregation about which you are most proud?

QUESTION 42

- . services (17)
- . classes/ lectures; education program (12)
- . friendly/ good people (12)
- . divrei Torah (incl. women's) (9)
- . self-supporting services/ independence (6)
- . youth/ youth participation in services (4)
- . women's Simchat Torah service (2)
- . women delivering divrei Torah (2)
- . high intellectual level (2)
- . fairly open-minded (2)
- . membership growth (2)
- . tzeddakah (2)
- . democratic procedures (2)
- . high contribution of volunteer time and work (2)
- . fundraising events (2)
- . social functions (2)
- . no rabbi (1)
- . High Holidays (1)
- . showed people there is an alternative to Beth El (1)
- . joint youth programs with Beth El (1)
- . creating a congregation open to people of diverse religious backgrounds (1)
- . youth program (1)
- . Gemarah class for women (1)
- . have a chessed committee (1)
- . women's issues dealt with as a congregation (1)
- . efforts of the gabbaim (1)
- . good real estate deals (1)
- . daily minyan (1)
- . sense of community (1)

43. What are some of the failings and characteristics of the congregation about which you are most unhappy?

QUESTION 43

- . decorum during davening (9)
- . lack of trust and feelings run too high; hostility among members (9)
- . lack of friendship and hospitality (4)
- . smugness, self-righteousness/ arrogance (4)
- . weak commitment to daily minyan (4)
- . not gotten out of Furber Lane (3)
- . meetings (3)
- . decision-making process (3)
- . people too concerned with noise of children (3)
- . inadequate concern with social issues (2)
- . education programs (3)
- . lack of appreciation of those who bear the burden of office (2)
- . organizational anarchy (2)
- . divrei Torah often inappropriate in tone (2)
- . conflict with Chevra Shas (2)
- . waiting for certain members to finish prayers; deification of some people (2)
- . lost sense of purpose; commitment to basic goals (2)
- . leadership needs to be more managerial (1)
- . poor treatment of youth committee (1)
- . better homework on political process and acquisition of land (1)
- . some members have a big chip on their shoulders (1)
- . Shabbat davening has lost its intensity (1)
- . political power games and in-fighting (1)
- . editorial comments instead of announcements (1)
- . emphasis on building (1)
- . seeking instant gratification (1)
- . grumbling about perceived grievances without positive effort to affect change (1)
- . hostility toward Beth El (1)
- . no direction religiously; need a rabbi (1)
- . greater congregational musical response (1)
- . not establishing a sense of community (1)
- . since bought property have been consumed with material problems and have ceased to exist as a spiritual institution (1)
- . lack of participation of many members (1)
- . mixed swimming at shul picnic (1)
- . poor planning (1)
- . orientation to reorganization and restructuring rather than trying to work on group cohesiveness and restatement of original goals (1)
- . poor attendance at education functions (1)
- . speed of services (1)
- . not hiring a rabbi (1)
- . emphasis on externals and not essentials of Jewish practice (1)
- . no permanent home (1)
- . dissolution of halachic committee (1)

44. How would you rate the congregation's present performance with respect to the following matters? (1 is best, 5 is worst)

Place a check mark in the column that best reflects your rating

	1	2	3	4	5
(A) Shabbat and holiday services (65 respondents)	27(42%)	27(42%)	9(14%)	-	2(3%)
(B) Speakers at shabbat and holiday services (65 respondents)	20(31%)	19(29%)	21(32%)	4(6%)	1(2%)
(C) Daily services (44 respondents)	12(27%)	19(43%)	6(14%)	3(7%)	4(9%)
(D) Adult education (63 respondents)	13(21%)	18(29%)	21(33%)	10(16%)	1(2%)
(E) Youth programs (45 respondents)	5(11%)	12(27%)	14(31%)	10(22%)	4(9%)
(F) Women's issues (46 respondents)	8(17%)	14(30%)	13(28%)	6(13%)	5(11%)
(G) Social programs (54 respondents)	6(11%)	15(28%)	14(26%)	17(31%)	2(4%)
(H) Halachic guidance/ decision-making (59 respondents)	9(15%)	13(22%)	14(24%)	9(15%)	14(24%)
(I) Fund raising (55 respondents)	14(25%)	18(33%)	14(25%)	8(15%)	1(2%)
(J) Non-congregational tzedakah (46 respondents)	8(17%)	16(35%)	10(22%)	11(24%)	1(2%)
(K) Involving new members in shul programs (40 respondents)	2(5%)	9(23%)	11(23%)	12(30%)	6(15%)

What suggestions would you make to improve the congregation's performance with respect to any of the matters listed above?

QUESTION 44

COMMENTS:

- . need a rabbi or paid professional (6)
- . standards for speakers (3)
- . (c) stronger commitment from adult members for daily services (2)
- . daily services not necessary at all; should be joint venture with Beth El like youth programs (2)
- . restructure organization and leadership (1)
- . broader range of adult education (1)
- . create "buddy" system for new members with existing members (1)
- . committee chairpersons should call and invite people to join committees (1)
- . agenda items should be placed in newsletters and input of ideas encouraged (1)
- . regular "rabbi's class" on Shabbat (1)
- . strengthen powers of elected officials (1)
- . getting into a regular shul (1)
- . slow pace of daily services (1)
- . adult education needs to be more sustained (1)
- . need strong youth committee with appropriate budget (1)
- . need strong budget committee (1)
- . (i) send out bills and notices of yahrzeit; better method of appeals at yizkor (1)
- . should have minchah/ maariv (1)
- . halachic committee was quite good in its original form (1)

45. How often do your children attend Bnei Akivah? (63 respondents)

<u>26(41%)</u>	<u>7(11%)</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>3(5%)</u>	<u>27(43%)</u>
Regularly	Occasionally	Rarely	Never	Not applicable - I have no children of Bnei Akivah age

46. If you are male, how often do you attend daily minyan?  
(66 respondents)

<u>13(20%)</u>	<u>9(14%)</u>	<u>5(8%)</u>	<u>8(12%)</u>	<u>1(2%)</u>	<u>30(45%)</u>
More than once per week	At least once per week	At least once per month	Less than once per month	Never	Not applic- able - I am female

47. Should the congregation seek to establish stricter standards concerning people who are asked to speak at shabbat morning and holiday services? (68 respondents)

Yes 27 (40%) No 34 (50%) Don't know 7(10%)

Should the congregation seek to establish stricter standards concerning people who are asked to daven at shabbat morning and holiday services? (67 respondents)

Yes 18 (27%) No 41 (61%) Don't know 8 (12%)

QUESTION 47A

COMMENTS:

- . less strict standards (1)
- . guidelines should be established as to what is appropriate in tone and content (1)

48. (A) Have you been a member of the congregation for less than two years?

Yes 16 No \_\_\_\_\_

(B) If "yes":

(i) Have you been made to feel a part of the congregation?

Yes 12 (75%) No 3 (19%) 1(6%) somewhat

(ii) What would have made you feel more welcome?

QUESTION 48

COMMENT:

- . break down wall between "in-group" and "out-group" (1)

49. What is your attitude toward merging with Beth El?  
(63 respondents)

1. 1 (2%) We should merge now, at all costs
2. 23 (37%) We should never merge
3. 25 (40%) We should merge only if Beth El's present leadership changes
4. 5 (8%) We should merge only if we can have separate services (including bar mitzvahs and speeches, etc.)
5. 5 (8%) We should merge only if Beth El's leadership changes and we can have separate services

1 (2%) 2-5 1 (2%) 2&3 2 (3%) 3&4

50. Which of the following statements best describes your present attitude toward Shaarei Tefillah? (63 respondents)

1. 17 (27%) It has been an exciting experience, and I feel that we are building something important
  2. 30 (48%) It is not as good as we once dreamed, but it's still something positive and worth working for
  3. 8 (13%) No matter how hard you try, things always turn out the same; our shul is like any other
  4. 1 (2%) This has been a waste of time; we should have simply stayed at Beth El
- 5 (8%) 1&2  
2 (3%) 2&3