

Committee Members: Adina Alpert, Eytan Apter, Rebecca Murow Klein, Natalie Lascar Lefkowitz, Yael Nagar, Dena Roth, Yigal Schleifer, Ben Solomon-Schwartz, Adam Szubin.¹

Recommendation: Since its founding in 2002, DC Minyan’s (“DCM”) policy has been to require a quorum of 10 men and 10 women for all parts of *tefilah* that require a *minyan*. The DCM leadership tasked us to explore that policy (“the 10-and-10 policy” or “the policy”) and to make a recommendation as to whether the policy, now, should be changed. After thorough study and analysis of the underlying *halakhic* (Jewish law) issues and related issues explained below, as well as consultation with a wide array of members of the community, the 10-and-10 Committee (“the Committee” or “we”) recommends replacing the 10-and-10 policy with a practice of counting 10 adult Jews, regardless of gender.

This recommendation is based on our assessment of the *halakhic* issues at stake, as explained further below, in counting people in a *minyan* (quorum), along with DCM policy issues and community impact. We believe that this change is warranted by our understanding of and commitment to *halakha*. Specifically, we conclude that *halakha* allows – and therefore in some ways requires – counting adult Jews regardless of gender towards a *minyan* – at least in contemporary times. Because we understand *minyan* as a question of obligation – an obligation to take certain ritual acts in the presence of a *minyan* – we conclude that it is incumbent on DCM to change the 10-and-10 policy. Given that we reach this conclusion based of our analysis of *halakhic* principles, we need not address whether our egalitarian principles would themselves warrant a change. (All of us agree that counting 10 people, regardless of gender, qualifies as egalitarian.) Consistent with this understanding, and in order to further demonstrate our commitment to *halakha*, we recommend additional practical steps that DCM should take together with a change to the 10-and-10 policy.²

I. Background

DCM’s current policy is to “count a *minyan* (quorum) of 10 men and 10 women as necessary for a community service.” More specifically, under DCM’s bylaws, DCM’s policy is to “wait for a quorum of ten women and ten men before reciting the central parts of the service (*d’varim sh’biqdusha*).”

¹ Until October 2017, Rebecca Gerr and Nicole Bodner participated as members of the committee in their respective roles as Gabbai Committee Chairperson and outgoing Steering Committee member. At that time, Rebecca stepped down from her role as Gabbai Committee chairperson, and Nicki stepped down from her role on this committee due to other commitments.

² Seven out of the nine committee members agree with the ultimate recommendation. The two remaining members would not recommend a change to the 10-and-10 policy. However, as set out below, there is much agreement among the entire committee regarding the issues that had to be considered in order to come to a final result.

The 10-and-10 policy emerged in 2002 from discussions by DCM's founders, who had been engaged in a series of study sessions led by Ethan Tucker – who subsequently was ordained as a rabbi – regarding the issue of women and *tefilah* (prayer). While all of the founders identified a basis in the traditional *halakhic* sources for women and men to lead all parts of the *tefilah* and read from the Torah, some of the founders felt that there was an insufficient *halakhic* basis to count women and men equally towards a *minyan* of ten. At the same time, all recognized that the counting of a *minyan* of ten men, in which the presence of women in the room was ignored, was highly exclusionary and offensive. As a result, the founders borrowed a practice from Jerusalem's *Shira Hadasha minyan*, which has a 10-and-10 policy. As described on DCM's website, "[t]his approach accommodates diverse opinions regarding the *halakhic* requirements for a *minyan* while at the same time ensuring an egalitarian service." While the justification for the 10 men in DCM's 10-and-10 policy was *halakha* and the justification for 10 women was the principle of egalitarianism, the founders believed that (a) both were bedrock principles for DCM and (b) that DCM must commit itself equally to both "10"s in practice, or this compromise would be a façade. The gabbaim of DCM have maintained this practice for 15 years without exception.

While early concerns that the 10-and-10 policy would be unworkable or too difficult to maintain have proven to be wrong, DCM leadership has still found itself contemplating at various points whether to revisit the policy. In 2011, for example, prompted by the results and suggestions of the "[DC Minyan Dialogue](#)" – a report drafted after a series of community meetings that discussed DCM's mission, programming, and structure – DCM leadership discussed the possibility of initiating a review of the 10-and-10 policy. As the Dialogue report put it, "[t]he '10 and 10' policy...is a source of frustration for a number of DCM members." The DCM leadership at the time ultimately decided not to reopen discussion on the subject and instead chose to establish a formal process for considering and making such changes in the future.

In 2014, the DCM leadership engaged a third party, Measuring Success, to conduct a survey in order to learn more about DCM's demographics, the ways in which DCM serves the community, and opportunities for improvement. Coming out of that survey, a committee of members produced a [report](#) for DCM leadership, which shared some of the key findings of the survey and made a number of recommendations to the DCM leadership based on the survey results. The survey included questions regarding DCM's ritual and *halakhic* policies, including the 10-and-10 policy. Of the approximately 151 households who responded to the survey (a 74% responsiveness rate): 19% strongly supported the policy and 22% supported it, while 9% strongly opposed and 16% opposed the policy. 33% neither supported nor opposed the policy. The survey report noted that those who do not attend on *Shabbat* mornings expressed the strongest support

for the policy, and those who had served on the Steering Committee (“SC”) or Gabbai Committee (“GC”) expressed the strongest opposition to the policy.

Picking up where the 2011 discussion began, in late 2015, the DCM Leadership Council (“LC”) amended DCM’s bylaws to create a process for addressing a “specific *halakhic* or other long term policy issue” that the SC identifies.³ One goal of this new provision was to allow the SC some mechanism for tackling long term planning, without interfering with the SC’s work in running the day-to-day needs of DCM. The following summer, during the August 2016 annual community meeting, the idea of revisiting the 10-and-10 policy was raised and others expressed interest in pursuing this conversation. In light of the level of interest at the community meeting and in subsequent internal conversations, the SC convened an ad hoc committee to study the issue – under the new bylaws provisions introduced in late 2015 – and to consider whether to change the policy. The SC recruited committee members that would span a range of ages, genders, time spent as DCM members, and perspectives. The SC announced this ad hoc committee, its membership, and its task to the wider community in late December 2016, and the Committee began its work soon thereafter.

II. The Committee’s Process

The Committee was tasked with evaluating the 10-and-10 policy and making a recommendation to DCM leadership as to whether to maintain it. We set out to tackle these tasks in a number of ways: studying relevant *halakhic* sources and consulting with rabbinic authorities relied on by DCM (principally, Rabbi Ethan Tucker), researching the practices of other similar communities, conducting informal questioning of DCM members regarding the 10-and-10

³ Article VIII of the DC Minyan Bylaws provides:

8.1 At its discretion, the Steering Committee may convene an ad hoc advisory committee to investigate and make recommendations regarding a specific *halakhic* or other long term policy issue that the Steering Committee identifies. The ad hoc advisory committee shall consist of no less than two members in good standing, and its term shall not exceed a period of twelve months. The term of the committee may be extended an additional six months by approval of a majority of the Leadership Council, but in no circumstances shall the ad hoc advisory committee’s term exceed eighteen months. The Steering Committee shall invite the two immediate past Steering Committee members to join the ad hoc advisory committee. Should either or both immediate past Steering Committee members decline to join the committee, the Steering Committee shall select at least one former member of a permanent committee identified in paragraph 2.2 to serve on the ad hoc advisory committee.

8.2 Any recommendations of this committee shall be brought before the Steering Committee for review. The Steering Committee shall present any recommendations of the ad hoc advisory committee, along with recommendations by the Steering Committee regarding the advisability of the ad hoc advisory committee’s proposals, to the Leadership Council. The Leadership Council shall determine the application of the ad hoc advisory committee’s recommendations to the Minyan. Should the Leadership Council accept the ad hoc advisory committee’s recommendations, these bylaws will be considered amended to the extent necessary to allow for such *halakhic* or other decisions.

policy, and engaging in discussions within the Committee and amongst the community about the potential for a change and impacts of staying the course or changing policy.

In addition to our regular internal deliberations and discussions, the Committee's work was punctuated by three major events over the course of 15 months.

Lunch and Learn. In October 2017, DCM hosted R' Micha'el Rosenberg, one of the co-authors of the recently published book, *Gender Equality and Prayer in Jewish Law*. At that lunch-and-learn, R' Micha'el guided approximately 100 attendees in study of *halakhic* texts pertaining to who counts in a *minyan* and presented his and R' Ethan Tucker's views on whether women count in a *minyan*. Nearly all attendees who later filled out a feedback form characterized it as either "useful" or "extremely useful."⁴ Nine people who filled out a feedback form reported to have read the book.

Parlor Meetings. In November and December 2017, the Committee organized a series of parlor meetings hosted in community members' homes in order to engage with and solicit views from community members about the 10-and-10 policy. Approximately 40 community members attended a total of four meetings that were held in the neighborhoods of Mt. Pleasant, Dupont Circle, Adams Morgan, and Shaw. Hosts engaged participants in a series of questions, which we also made available in a feedback form shared widely with the community. The questions covered several categories of issues, including people's personal experience with the 10-and-10 policy, DCM's history, *halakhic* considerations, and practical considerations. Examples of such questions were:

- If DC Minyan used another way to count a *minyan*, would that impact your participation in services, and how?
- DC Minyan defines itself as "a traditional egalitarian Jewish community." To what extent do you think the current policy demonstrates our identity?
- As members of the DC Minyan community get older, more members must say *kaddish* or have other service-related needs that can be challenging. Do you have any ideas for how to alleviate those challenges, outside of the way we count a *minyan*?

Community Meeting. At the regularly-scheduled DCM annual community meeting in February 2018, the Committee presented on the status of its work. Significant time was dedicated to a conversation about the history of the way DCM counts a *minyan* and gathering feedback from community members in attendance.

⁴ One respondent who characterized it as only somewhat useful noted that, while it was "informative," it likely "did not sway" anyone's opinion one way or another.

III. Community Perspectives

The Committee placed a high value on community members' ideas, concerns, and feedback. In addition to informal conversations with community members throughout the process, we received community members' feedback through notes taken during the four parlor meetings, feedback forms submitted, and notes taken during the annual community meeting. The following is a snapshot of the feedback we received.

A. Parlor Meetings

After the four parlor meetings, the Committee met to discuss and synthesize the various arguments and ideas that were brought up during each of the parlor meetings. The following 11 statements characterize the range of opinions expressed at the parlor meetings:

1. The 10-and-10 policy provides for an inclusive tent, in which both people who count 10 Jewish adults as a *minyan* and people who count 10 adult Jewish men can comfortably attend and pray with DCM.
2. If counting 10 people in a *minyan* is *halakhically* proper, DCM should change its current policy to reflect the *halakhic* views of the rabbis it customarily relies upon.
3. The 10-and-10 policy creates (or has created) significant logistical issues, including impeding participants from saying *kaddish*, denying additional opportunities for *minyanim* (weekday, *mincha*, etc.), and delaying our start time, and therefore the policy should be changed to 10 people.
4. As a self-described "traditional egalitarian Jewish community," DCM should change the 10-and-10 policy to 10 people, reflecting the idea that egalitarianism includes counting all people without any gender distinction.
5. The 10-and-10 policy is a good compromise for a self-described "traditional egalitarian Jewish community," reflecting both traditional *halakha* and egalitarian ideals as best we can.
6. The 10-and-10 policy can be off-putting or even exclusionary for people that do not (or wish not to) associate with a gender, or who think that a gendered focus is outdated and reductionist.
7. A change to the current 10-and-10 policy may result in the departure of members who have a more traditional (or perhaps Orthodox) background, which could make it more difficult to keep up a steady roster of highly-capable *daveners*, *leyners*, etc.
8. A change to the current 10-and-10 policy may attract those who currently do not attend DCM or those who do attend but are less involved because of the policy.
9. DCM should first define (or explain) the meaning behind "traditional egalitarian Jewish community" before undertaking a change to the current policy.

10. DCM should change the 10-and-10 policy, and should further explore other opportunities to be more egalitarian, including getting rid of gendered-separated seating, gender-specific liturgy, or priestly lineage.
11. If DCM chooses to change the 10-and-10 policy to meet DCM’s vision of egalitarianism, it should not result in opening the conversation to include changes to liturgy, seating, priestly lineage, or other areas that may conflict with traditional *halakha*.

The conversations from the parlor meetings yielded many different ideas, and while the different meetings drew from different demographics within DCM, the Committee did not find that there were statements that were unique to only one specific demographic as opposed to others.

B. Feedback Forms

The Committee received 41 total feedback forms, including electronic and paper forms. A synopsis of the key quantitative data is below.

On a scale of 1-5 (1 being not transparent at all, 5 being extremely transparent), how transparent do you believe DC Minyan has been about the process to reevaluate the 10-and-10 policy?

- 10 responded 5
- 12 responded 4
- 7 responded 3
- 4 responded 2

To what degree do you support the current 10-and-10 policy?

- 11 responded “Strongly Support”
- 3 responded “Support”
- 6 responded “Neutral”
- 6 responded “Oppose”
- 11 responded “Strongly Oppose”

To what degree do you support a change to the 10-and-10 policy to count 10 Jewish people in a *Minyan*?

- 19 responded “Strongly Support”
- 4 responded “Support”
- 4 responded “Neutral”
- 3 responded “Oppose”
- 10 responded “Strongly Oppose”

The feedback forms included many open-ended questions that allowed members an opportunity to express their ideas, and we have taken account of those responses in crafting our recommendation.

C. Annual Community Meeting

The annual community meeting provided an opportunity for members to reflect upon the 11 statements captured from the parlor meetings and to add their own views of the current discussion. Attendees commented on each of the 11 statements and offered new views that were not expressed in those statements. Attendees presented diverse views on a variety of topics. Some questioned whether people would leave DCM - either if we changed the policy or kept it the same - and how the decision would affect people joining DCM in the future. Others asked about whether we have researched other comparable communities and how this affects the way DCM positions itself within the city. Some people shared their perspectives on the role of *halakha* in making the decision, i.e. asking about the *halakhic* basis of the decision or sharing their desire to see DCM maintain its commitment to *halakha*. People shared different perspectives on whether we should have opened the process of considering the policy in the first place - even aside from their perspective on the ultimate decision; some shared that they wished the SC had not raised it, while others said that it is critical to continue to examine the questions this process has raised and that they have been impressed by our community's handling of the Committee's process.

IV. Analysis: *Halakha* and Its Implications

Answering the question before us – whether to recommend changing our 10-and-10 policy – requires stopping and considering the nature of *minyan* and *tefilah*. We do that first, to explain the reasoning that leads us to recommend replacing our 10-and-10 policy with a policy of counting 10 adult Jews regardless of gender.

Our bylaws mandate waiting for 10 men and 10 women for *d'varim sh'biqdusha*, those public liturgical acts that require the presence of a *minyan*, such as *barchu* or *kaddish*. What, precisely, is the relationship of a *minyan* and *d'varim sh'biqdusha*? Reciting *d'varim sh'biqdusha* is an obligation that is incumbent on adult Jews, *halakhically*, when *davening* (praying) in the presence of a *minyan*. In those circumstances, we are obligated to say *barchu* and *kaddish* and repeat the *Amidah* and have a public torah reading. It is not something we can opt out of. This is important conceptually because counting people of any gender in a *minyan* is fundamentally a stringency, not a leniency. It is a stringency because, if we have a *minyan*, we are *halakhically* required to take certain actions.

Because *minyan* is a threshold condition for certain of our communal *tefilah* obligations, the question more precisely asked, if we have 10 Jewish, adults, regardless of gender, are we, as a result, obligated in saying *d'varim shebiqdusha*? After thorough study and analysis, we

conclude that, yes, *halakha* allows – and therefore in some ways requires – counting adult Jews regardless of gender towards a *minyan* – at least in contemporary times.

These conclusions rest on the several sources that the Committee has reviewed: (1) reading R' Micha'el Rosenberg and R' Ethan Tucker's *Gender Equality and Prayer in Jewish Law*, (2) attending R' Micha'el's lunch and learn in October 2017, (3) discussing our work with R' Ethan, and (4) watching the video of the book launch of *Gender Equality and Prayer in Jewish Law*, with panelists R' Judith Hauptman, R' Aryeh Klapper, and R' Joanna Samuels. Having reviewed those materials, we are convinced by the analysis presented by R' Ethan and R' Micha'el. Although we do not walk through those sources here, a few contextual points bolster this conclusion:

- DCM looks to R' Ethan for all *halakhic* issues, and he has set out powerfully his conclusions. It is consistent to follow him on this issue as well.
- Even though the *halakhic* issues of leading *davening* and counting in a *minyan* are distinct, counting people of all genders in a *minyan* is most consistent with our longstanding practice of having no gender bar for leading *davening/leyning/etc.* This assessment is confirmed by the absence of other communities with our current combination of practices.⁵
- When Ethan Tucker began teaching these sources to our community more than 16 years ago, he was not yet a rabbi. Since then, both he and R' Micha'el Rosenberg received *semicha* (ordination) from the Chief Rabbinate of Israel. Today, R' Ethan is Rosh Yeshiva and co-founder of the Hadar Institute and R' Micha'el is a professor at Hebrew College. These developments put us in a materially different position than at the time of DCM's founding.
- R' Micha'el was asked in our lunch and learn about the relative strength of the arguments in the book, and we take that response seriously. Asked the question about whether “part 1” (*tefilah*) is stronger than “part 2” (*minyan*), he explained that he understands “part 1b” (leading *tefilah*) and “part 2” (*minyan*) as equally strong. (He understands part 1a (obligation of everyone in *tefilah*) to be even stronger, and perhaps should be considered as indisputable.) In R' Micha'el's view, then, just as since our founding we have allowed anyone to lead, so too should we count people of all genders in a *minyan*.

Some Committee members would emphasize that *halakha* is developed through institutions and manifest through lived realities. Accordingly, they would emphasize the importance of, during the past 15 years, the flourishing of the Hadar Institute and the independent *minyan* movement, including a cohort of thriving traditional egalitarian

⁵ Ten-and-ten policies are more prevalent in “partnership” minyanim where public liturgical roles are limited by gender.

communities. In other words, it is relevant to our analysis that we are not standing alone on the precipice.

Taken together, we are convinced that there is a strong *halakhic* argument for counting all adult Jews in a *minyan* regardless of gender. Some of us believe that is in fact the **best** understanding of *halakha* for 2018—at least in communities like ours in which people are engaged with professional, liturgical and communal responsibilities regardless of gender—is that all Jewish adults count in a *minyan*. That is, given our facts on the ground, women ought to be counted. But at a minimum, we together conclude that counting people regardless of gender is a *halakhic* conclusion that is most consistent with our other *halakhic* decisions, such as who leads parts of our services.

In light of the understanding set out above – that this is a question of *obligation* – upon reaching the conclusion that women ought to be counted in a *minyan*, we conclude that it is incumbent on us to change DCM’s policy. Because we reach this conclusion based on our analysis of *halakhic* principles, we need not address whether our egalitarian principles would themselves warrant a change. (All of us agree that counting 10 people, regardless of gender, qualifies as egalitarian.) Accordingly, without addressing the scope or implications of our egalitarian principles, we recommend replacing the 10-and-10 policy with a practice of counting 10 adult Jews, regardless of gender, as a *minyan*.

In turn, such a change would have benefits for our religious life. It would allow us to say mourner’s *kaddish* whenever 10 adult Jews are in the room. It would enable us to *daven* more often. Below we recommend specifically committing to such practices.

V. Other Factors Considered

There were a number of other factors considered when reaching our ultimate recommendation, factors that pulled the Committee in both directions. While the recommendation is primarily made based on *halakhic* considerations, these factors were weighed as well. A brief discussion of some of these factors follows here.

A. Membership and Attendance

The Committee heard concerns from various community members about the impact that a change or lack of change in the 10-and-10 policy would have on DCM membership, both of current and future members. Regarding current members, there were concerns that either choice would lead to segments of the community leaving DCM. After investigating this possibility by asking many community members and soliciting feedback in parlor meetings, at the annual community meeting, and through the feedback forms, we feel confident that this will not be a

significant issue. Almost everyone we heard from said that while they feared others might leave, they themselves would continue to attend DCM regardless of the policy recommendation.

The question must be asked for future DCM members as well: if we change, who will be likely to walk in the door in the first place? Some community members stated that they would not have initially joined if not for the 10-and-10 policy because they came from more traditional backgrounds. At the same time, we heard from others with friends who are not currently members because the 10-and-10 policy is counter to their view of egalitarianism. Still others note that a change in our policy would make our community more welcoming to those people that are transitioning or are non-binary in their gender identity. A policy recommendation in either direction will therefore have an unavoidable impact on future membership, but for the *halakhic* and other social reasons already stated, the Committee concludes that the gains from a change in policy outweigh the costs.⁶ That being said, strategies to mitigate these costs should still be considered, such as maintaining quality of services and remaining faithful to our traditional roots. And fundamentally, efforts to be welcoming to those of all stripes should be our first line of defense in maintaining the fullness and vibrancy of DCM.

Questions about attendance were also raised. Namely, if DCM changes the 10-and-10 policy, there is a concern that women will no longer feel motivated to arrive at the start of *davening* because women are no longer explicitly needed for their “woman-ness.” Some also expressed this concern in the reverse, though less commonly. Apart from that, there is a concern that a change in the 10-and-10 policy would result in overall fewer people arriving at the start of *davening*, leading to a reduced spirit in the room. While we cannot yet know how a change would play out, these are real concerns, and therefore the Committee’s recommendation is coupled with strategies for engaging members of the community from a diversity of backgrounds and genders to ensure a truly vibrant – and voluntary – community.

B. Quality of *Davening* and *Leyning*

Some community members also expressed concerns that a change in policy might result in a membership as a whole that is composed of fewer people from traditional backgrounds, and therefore, those community members are concerned that such a change would negatively impact our steady roster of highly-capable *daveners* and *leyners*. Some members of the Committee shared this concern as well, while others felt that it was not borne out by the evidence of the actual makeup of our regular participants now. Regardless, steps can be taken to mitigate this potential issue. For one, DCM’s *chinuch* (education) and gabbai committees can proactively offer opportunities for new or rusty *daveners* and *leyners* to build and strengthen their skills. In

⁶ As noted above, two members of the Committee would not recommend changing the 10-and-10 policy. They would not conclude that the benefits of a change outweigh its costs.

addition, we can find other ways to engage and draw members from more traditional backgrounds, such as meeting for services more regularly and offering learning opportunities.

C. Gender Identity

Gender identity and people's experiences of gender have evolved significantly even in the 16 years of DCM's existence. Not only have these experiences evolved, but their place in public discourse has also evolved. As a result, questions of gender identity emerged both in discussions within the Committee and with the broader community, including the parlor meetings. Indeed, some of us feel that changing the 10-and-10 policy would be a positive step forward toward making DCM more inclusive and respectful to all, particularly those who are transitioning genders or identify as non-binary, and all of us understand this as a serious issue.⁷

D. Character of the *Minyan*

Finally, a concern raised numerous times was that a change to the 10-and-10 policy would initiate a series of changes – causing DCM to fall down the so-called “slippery slope” – that would ultimately leave DCM unrecognizable. Many spoke fondly to the Committee about the quirky mix of traditional and egalitarian practices that make DCM unique, and fear that the character of DCM as a big-tent community of compromise could be lost. This was a fear that many of us shared as well. But as a group, we are comforted by a number of factors. First of all, given the seriousness and consideration with which this endeavor was undertaken, we can rest assured that any future changes would be considered with the same level of care – and sufficient time allotted. More importantly, the Committee believes that the true character of DCM is not limited to the structure of its prayer space, but the makeup of its members. We have, resoundingly, been encouraged by the engagement we have received over the course of the Committee's work. We have all come out of this experience feeling proud to be part of such a thoughtful, committed community, and our sincere hope is that DCM's character will not change due to this or any future policy change.

VI. Recommendations for Implementation and Community Engagement

Many of us had a significant concern about a change reflecting, in substance or perception, that DCM has a lighter commitment to *halakha*. For a minority of the Committee, those concerns are so substantial that they militate against a change to the 10-and-10 policy. For the majority of us, we recommend a change, conscious of these risks. For all of us, we are concerned that a change could reduce the number of people at the beginning of *davening*, which we see as a significant risk. We therefore recommend that DCM undertake a major effort to

⁷ Many have noted during our process that DCM's separate seating policy raises related questions, but that policy is outside of the Committee's limited mandate.

commit to keeping numbers up at the beginning of *davening*. And, for all of us, we see it as important, if not imperative, that a change in the 10-and-10 policy be accompanied by additional steps that demonstrate that we have not moved away from our commitment to *halakha*, learning, or *davening*. To the contrary, a change to the policy should stem from a commitment to *halakha*, and we recommend steps that will exemplify that commitment.

As with the Committee itself, there will be some community members who disagree with the decision reached and could feel alienated by the ramifications of such a change to DCM's identity. DCM leaders should reach out personally to those members (proactively where possible, reactively when necessary) to engage with them about their continued participation in DCM. Substantively, the Committee recommends that DCM take steps to continue to be an attractive community and *davening* location for Jews who consider themselves more traditionally Orthodox. It may be a challenge to maintain the big tent that has come to characterize DCM for over 15 years, and so we must actively work to maintain this atmosphere.

The Committee further recommends adding more opportunities for *davening* to DCM's annual calendar. We recommend that, should the SC and LC agree with our recommendation regarding the 10-and-10 policy, any announcement to the community about a policy change should be accompanied by a commitment by DCM leadership to expand DCM's schedule of services. This may help allay some of the concerns about the change as well as ensure that DCM continues to devote itself to providing its members as many opportunities as possible to *daven* together for *Shabbatot*, holidays, and other important occasions. The Committee believes DCM's schedule can and should be expanded to include, for example, *Shabbat mincha*, the first night of *Rosh Hashanah*, first days of *Pesach*, *mincha* at *Tashlich*, *Selichot*, *Taanit Bechorot* on *Erev Pesach*, *Rosh Chodesh*, and more. Further, when DCM hosts events or meetings during a *davening* time, such as the annual community meeting or the *Chanukah* candle lightings, we should hold *davening* for those in attendance.

We strongly encourage the DCM leadership to continue to prioritize maximum participation in *davening* starting at the beginning of services. Specifically, we recommend that the SC and GC work together to ensure that there is a *minyan* at the start of *Shabbat* morning services at 9:15 a.m.⁸

Finally, given the feedback the Committee has heard over the past year and the passions this discussion has inspired, it is imperative that DCM continue to be forthright and transparent about the culmination of this process and formal recommendation. The Committee recommends that this document be shared with the entire community, and we are eager to answer questions and speak to community members about its contents in formal and informal settings.

⁸ Doing so would not only enable any mourners present to say *kaddish* but would also help to ensure a critical mass and spirited *davening* for the duration of *tefilah*, as well ensure that *davening* proceeds smoothly once it begins.