

Needed — a New Institution

MORRIS LEVIN

Executive Director, United Jewish Community Centers, San Francisco, California

The Jewish community has changed. Individual Jews today are different from what they were like thirty years ago; Jewish institutions have changed probably less than their constituents. Some patterns of service delivery have evolved more out of the needs of the very service delivery system than out of appraisal of the nature of today's Jewish community and its changing institutional forms.

AMERICAN Jews as individuals and in their group life are in a continuous process of change. A national Jewish population study has given us a description of the Jews of today. We can, from previous studies and descriptions of Jews and Jewish communities validly state that there are wide differences between the Jews of a short 30 years ago and those of today. Indices which have commonly been used to describe such differences have been educational level, occupational characteristics, suburbanization, aging of community, intermarriage rates, mobility, religious affiliation and others.

How responsive have Jewish institutions been to these changes? We recognize that there is inevitably a gap between institutional change and the changes which occur to individuals and to small groups. This article will attempt to look at the changes that have occurred in Jewish communal institutional systems and the direction in which such institutions may continue to orient themselves.

My comments will be based on the Jewish community center, in which the writer had the major professional experience and knowledge. However, reference will also be made to the development of other Jewish communal institutions.

The Jewish community center has evolved into a Jewish communal agency rather than a social work agency. The

agency that was a host to the social group work discipline has changed to a multi-disciplinary agency; it has changed from a recreational informal educational agency to a multi-service agency. Many Centers provide a very wide range of services. The Center now is a major physical plant with a large membership and is used by both members and non-members. The Center belongs to its members to a far greater extent than it has in the past. Its constituents are more representative of the total Jewish community; its financing is more dependent on satisfying the needs of the majority of its members; and its governance is in the hands of the community to a considerable extent. The Center has moved from a major emphasis on service to its members toward extensive services to the Jewish community.

Centers have been the forerunners, together with synagogues, to reach out into newly emerging communities. They have often served as the key group to develop some form of Jewish community organization. Centers have also become more used by non-Jews of the community, both as members and non-members. Centers see themselves and are seen as closely related to other Jewish groups and they increasingly see themselves as "the arm" of the Jewish Federation.

There is no doubt that all of the changes so far noted are relative and

they have certainly not all occurred to each individual Center and certainly not in the same degree. The impact, however, is clear and unmistakable. The future appears to reinforce these trends as well as bringing others that we cannot see at this time. Changes which have occurred in other Jewish communal institutions very much influence the nature of the Jewish community center. Indeed, some may hold that the evolution of the Jewish community center has had direct implications for some other Jewish institutions and organizations. The Jewish community in a given city or suburb does not exist in a vacuum — what it does or does not do stimulates an interactional response. Certainly, this is true of smaller and intermediate communities — a strong case can be made for its application to large and metropolitan communities since the Jewish community even in major cities is decentralized and relatively small, ranging from 10,000 to 100,000 Jewish persons in size.

The synagogue remains the principal institution of Jewish affiliation. It has decreased in its influence and in its membership. Many synagogues today are much more concerned with meeting the needs of their membership than they are of assuming a community leadership stance. Their experience highlights the substantial needs of their membership to feel part of the synagogue family; to maintain the Jewish family; to find meaningful education for their children; and to seek support from the congregational family and from the rabbi in dealing with the day-to-day life problems which they, as well as all other members of the Jewish community, are experiencing.

Other Federation affiliated agencies such as family service agencies, child care agencies, hospitals, vocational agencies, bureaus of Jewish education,

and homes for the aged have expanded their range of service. Many have become multi-disciplinary agencies following trends similar to those noted for the Jewish community center. A sense of closer relationship to the Jewish community pervades these agencies as well. Again, the changes are not universal but they are prominent when one surveys the field as a whole.

Trends in social planning of United Ways and Jewish Federations have substantive import for the future of these agencies. These can be highlighted by describing a few of the more significant trends.

1. An increasing role of central planning rather than isolated single agency planning.

2. A concern for accountability with consequent interest in the evaluation of agency effectiveness and efficiency.

3. A concern to avoid duplication of service and to focus on communally determined priorities.

4. The reality of fairly fixed income accompanied by an awareness of increased need.

5. An increasing view on the part of Jewish Federations that the range of their concern extends beyond those agencies previously called "the Federation family." If Federations themselves do not feel this need, agencies that have been on the outside are bringing it to their attention.

6. The recognition that agency autonomy also carries with it agency vested interest, and this may or may not be functional in providing the best service.

Perhaps the most significant change has been in the socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of the Jewish community. While much has been made of the mobility of the general population and the Jewish population in particular, it should be recognized that the national Jewish population study in-

dicates that mobility, at least for Jews, remains essentially a mobility within the same state. And we infer from this that people move to places within the same general area in which they previously lived. Such mobility has caused a growth in suburban areas with a greater scatter of Jewish population than existed in the older areas. Consequently, there is less sense of Jewish community and certainly less accessibility to Jewish communal institutions.

Given all the foregoing, how have Jewish communal institutions responded to providing services to the present Jewish community?

1. One response has been the expansion of roles and services on the part of individual agencies. The single agency system has become more complex. Agencies have moved into hitherto unexplored areas or have utilized new methodological approaches to work.

2. Agencies have recognized the inter-relationship of individual, family, community, and institutional needs.

3. Agencies are more aware of, and more sensitive to, their dependency on total community support.

4. Agencies perceive service roles with "Jewish eyes" to a greater extent than they have heretofore.

5. Some agencies have recognized the newly emerging communities and have decentralized their services. They have, in some few cases, seen the need for full decentralization in provision of service and community governance.

Has this initiation by a single agency of a planning process been good for the Jewish community? Perhaps we need to assume that it has, if it has extended services to the previously unserved, and if it has more fully served people by recognizing the inter-relationships of their needs. It has been good for the Jewish community to the degree that agencies have refocused service to Jews

and toward serving them as Jews. It has been a favorable development if agency experimentation in new areas of service has resulted in creative experimentation within the agency with consequent positive results.

The entry of agencies into someone else's "turf" or the utilization of someone else's "methods" could have resulted beneficially in a re-thinking of its traditional approach by the agency originally assigned that "turf." The "war on poverty" clearly helped many traditional agencies to re-think the way in which they were working.

If experimentation and planning by a single agency have substantive benefits, they may also have shortcomings. To venture into the new because we have been disenchanted with the old may be quite valid if we are certain that we have explored all the reasons for our lack of success. Often it is not that the need no longer exists, but rather the way in which we have addressed ourselves to the need is no longer appropriate.

Wasteful, competitive, and duplicative services are an obvious negative in the concept of the "free marketplace" system of providing Jewish communal services. Such terms are harsh and as such they have their own powerful effects. Very often simply implying that an agency is guilty of "duplication" may be sufficient without even needing to prove the duplication does in fact exist. If, however, we apply more objective criteria in evaluating what agencies have done, it may be proven that duplication is not necessarily bad. If we see that there is a significant scope of need that goes far beyond our present services, and if we see other methods as possible and our own methods by no means "the last word," then we approach the question of duplication in an entirely different way. Methods of work are not the sole province of any one agency. Even

specific populations have multiple needs, and what may be innovative experimentation in one agency's service system may in another agency represent a very traditional approach to work.

Certainly there is destructive competition, costly overlap of services and less effective service than could be provided by sound, coordinated planning. The balance between permitting and encouraging innovation and the constraints to limit efforts to potentially effective results is a most delicate one. The responsibility for seeking this balance is that of both the individual agencies and the social planning body. Even without a highly developed city-wide social planning apparatus, the individual agency which is considering entrance into a new area has the responsibility to contact and deliberate with those agencies that would be affected by its action.

Nor is the "freedom" for each agency to do as it wishes as free as it seems. Experimentation costs money and social planning and budgeting processes exercise constraints both on what is permissible and what is feasible. However, accountability is so loose that very often pragmatic substitutions take place. Foundations are approached and a system of financing these services may have been established without a full view of its long-term consequences.

The single agency "free" system of planning and program expansion seems to be the predominant way in which agencies have responded to today's changing needs. It would appear that this system has worked relatively well in that more services are presently being provided to more people in a more varied manner than has been the case heretofore. One approach which might be taken is to consciously support this way of work on the theory that multiple approaches to service will result in more effective and more sensitive instruments of help. Of course, the price for encour-

aging this approach may be possible conflicts among agencies, duplication of services, and often poorly executed experimentation. Nevertheless, given the present structure of the Jewish educational and welfare systems, the single agency system, with a primary target client group and a principal methodological approach, will probably remain a key way in which Jewish communal services will be delivered.

There are emerging alternatives and additional agency service structures beyond the single agency service system. At the present time we can identify several models.

The Collaborative Model

The collaborative structure moves beyond simple referral, consultation and joint agency staff meetings to the placement of one or more staff members of other agencies in a Jewish community center or another Jewish communal agency. The purpose is to provide special help to the clients or members of the host agency. Examples would be a full-time caseworker placed in the Jewish community center, a full-time group worker placed in a home for the aged, and so forth. This seems so elementary a step toward needed collaboration and specialization and yet the evidence suggests that this kind of collaboration occurs rather infrequently.

The Problem-Focused Model (Inter-Agency Type)

The problem-focused structure calls for two or more agencies to have identified a need wherein the expertise of more than one agency system is required to provide service. An example of this model is the drug response center in Chicago. This is a youth- and young adult-oriented agency with a special interest in meeting the typical and

not so typical developmental life crises of this age group. Problems dealt with are drug abuse, sex, family and peer relationship problems as well as vocational and educational issues. A joint agency was established by bringing together the Jewish community center, the Jewish family service agency, one of the Jewish hospitals, the Jewish vocational service and the Jewish child-care agency. Until very recently, each staff member was supervised by his agency. The Jewish community center administrator served only in an administrative capacity. Recently it has been recognized that the team approach of working together and the specific skills acquired by the Center administrator make it possible for him to function as the professional as well as the administrative supervisor. There are still professional links maintained between the "detached staff worker" and his home agency but these are of a different character from what they had been.

The Age-Group Focused Model (Multi-Service Type)

The age-group focused (multi-service) structure starts out with a particular agency designated to develop a comprehensive service program using the resources of all Jewish communal institutions for a given population. Two case examples would be the Freda Mohr Senior Multi-Service Center in Los Angeles, which is administered by the Jewish Family Service and the Senior Multi-Service Center, administered by the Jewish Y's and Centers of Philadelphia. Here the staff is a team from the very start. Lay governance takes place through a committee composed of representatives of the constituent agencies. Both of these examples are neighborhood based and located in a geographic area which has a very high percentage of poor, elderly Jews.

The Age-Group Focused Model (Comprehensive Service Type)

The age-group focused (comprehensive service) structure moves beyond the type described above in two significant ways. First, it is city-based, not target area-oriented, although it may select a given area or areas for highest priority. Second, the range of services provided is far more complete than the previous model described. Third, this is a newly created agency, not a designated existing agency. Fourth, a new governance structure is utilized rather than an existing agency board or a committee on which various agency representatives sit. The Jewish Association for Service to the Aged in New York and the Council for the Jewish Elderly in Chicago and the College Service Agency of Los Angeles are examples.

The Campus Model

This service structure brings together a number of single agency systems on a common piece of land with a view toward maintaining specialization and separation of clients. Member groups would achieve some economies, achieve Jewish communal visibility and facilitates service to the individual and the family. Examples range from the beautiful Washington, D.C. Jewish Communal Campus (Jewish Community Center, Jewish Family Service Agency, Jewish Home for the Aged) to the Los Angeles Jewish Federation headquarters building which houses a number of direct service agencies as well as offices of various Jewish communal groups.

It seems clear that each of the models described above could blend into the next and that all could exist concurrently in larger communities. Whether by will or by inaction of the central planning body these various forms will occur in different communities in different areas of the same city and among

different agencies working with a common population. The opportunities available in previously unserved areas clearly make for a better climate for innovation and experimentation toward the achievement of new models.

The various models described already presently exist. It would be of enormous help to see what has happened in the way in which service is being provided in these newer agency systems. There are means of measuring the consequences without an historical reconstruction of what happened in the past. Indices could be developed, with today as a baseline, and a plan to study consequences over a three or four year period.

There is an additional model which should be considered and which exists in some limited form at the present time.

The Comprehensive Jewish Services Agency

The comprehensive Jewish services agency, hereafter to be called CJSA, is somewhat similar to the "functional federations" but would be far more developed. The CJSA would be a single corporate entity with a centrally based building but would have outposts in outlying areas to serve total geographic communities as well as having specialized CJSAs for given population groups such as the aged, college youth or high-school youth. A wide range of community facilities including synagogues and temples could be utilized as the locus for such regional CJSAs. This model may be applicable both to small or larger communities with two or three Jewish population centers. It is clearly required in metropolitan communities with "semi-independent" suburban areas. The term semi-independent is used to describe areas which are not overwhelmingly "bedroom communities" or even if

they are, seem so remote from the "city leaders" that they can be construed as self contained communities or perhaps isolated communities. The same would apply if the residents of the community saw the "city leaders" so remote from them that they felt the sense of separateness or possibly isolation from the overall community. The entire concept of decentralization of services will be dealt with below as it applies to Jewish community organizations.

The CJSA would provide all services, including those described as therapeutic, as life sustaining, as educational, cultural and recreational. The CJSA would also be a fund-raising and social planning agency related to the Jewish Federation in one of several different ways. For purposes of analysis we will look at a few ways in which the CJSA would render service. We need the overall view of providing services in a comprehensive manner for a given locality, in a manner that maximizes local community governance and where the definition of needs and accountability remain concentrated at the local level.

The following are some of the possible merits of this service system.

1. The presence of a single Jewish services agency with branches in special areas for special populations would say to all Jews; "we care for you and we recognize your needs. We have provided both for your individual social needs and your needs as a family. We recognize that you may have family problems, illnesses, and employment problems. We see that you are a part of the Jewish community and you should not be shunted aside to some quiet place where you are treated as only a person with a problem. The needs you have are legitimate."

2. The newcomer to the community, and there are many, would not need to search out services. We would not need a complex information and referral sys-

tem. Everything would be out in front. In addition, new persons coming to the community would have a sense of knowing that the Jewish community exists and that it welcomes new arrivals.

3. Total family service would be a reality, not an administrative and financial tool as the present Jewish community center family membership feel. The individual, the family and the Jewish life cycle could be integrated, beginning with birth through death.

4. Members of the Jewish community would see this agency as serving them and they in turn might see their responsibility for its support in a different way from how they now see support of local agencies, or for that matter Israel and other overseas needs. It might even be possible to see the concept of a Jewish communal tax (Jewish Federation contribution) that would entitle one to the total service resources of the agency. If there is evidence that people, who are involved and understand what is being done and what needs to be done, feel more sense of responsibility and consequently give more, then we cannot doubt the wisdom of such an approach. We are painfully aware of the mass of suburban Jews who are not involved and whose giving level is dimly poor. It would be initially expensive fundraising but it could be excellent local Jewish community organization and would show the bond of relationship between cities and suburbs. In a long-term view the money would come in as well.

A few illustrations of how such an agency might function would be helpful. Let us start from both ends of the age continuum. The family with pre-school children has a number of concerns among which are: help in child rearing, general and Jewish education, socialization, early detection of physical and emotional problems, vacations for the parents, daycare for working parents, meeting with the death of a

grandparent, the problems of relocation to new communities, and so on. With family access to the help it needs at the point at which it is required, with a staff that knows the total family constellation and that has a longitudinal relationship with the family, not merely a crisis relationship or a child-care relationship, and one would have a vastly different kind of interaction between the Jewish communal institution and members of the Jewish community.

For senior adults this longitudinal relationship is even more critical. Most persons sixty-five to seventy are in reasonably good health, have friends and live not too differently from how they did at ages fifty-five or sixty, except for the matter of employment. The Jewish services agency would be able to identify all the Jewish elderly of the community. It would be able to maintain contact with them as the years changed their needs. Consider that the staff would know not only the elderly person but also his children. It would know the children in a far different way from how the Jewish Home or the Jewish family agency knows the children, as they seek to place their parent. The family would be known to many of the agency staff and they could be seen as a total family unit.

Other populations would benefit from such an approach. At the moment the very needy families, who are the annual applicants for nursery school, day camp, and resident camp scholarships, are very often the difficult cases with which the family service agency works. Service to this total family from a variety of approaches and to individual members of the family group, may be able to locate family strengths and see the interplay of component parts of the family unit in a more inter-related way.

The chronically un- or under-employed head-of-household, whether man or woman, has tended to be on the

case list of the Jewish family service agency and the Jewish vocational service. Here again a total view of the family and relationships with various family members might be able to identify strengths and enhance family independence. The need for social relationships on the part of this group is significant and might be met by a multi-service approach.

Services to adolescents might benefit substantially from such an institutional arrangement. The issues of membership and ideology would be resolved by a total Jewish communal acceptance of all youth groups and all youth as part of the Jewish community with a right to call on the resources of the community. The individual team now served by the Jewish school or the Jewish community center or the family service agency would be served as a member of the Jewish community team. An example of how such a Jewish services agency would operate in a decentralized way is work with college youth. The "hard to reach population" requires out-reach decentralization and certainly requires methodologies of various professional disciplines. The few innovative programs that have been established to serve college youth attest to the need for a variety of skills to meet the needs of this population. An example of the Jewish services agency on the campus might be a Hillel Foundation of a totally different kind. The Hillel Foundation might be the administering agency and on its staff would be a Jewish educator, a social group worker, a social caseworker, a vocational counselor, a community relations worker, and one or more arts educators to serve the Jewish campus community. Such a service agency would be available to individual students as well as to Jewish groups on campus and could serve to develop a sense of Jewish community through the development of a Jewish community

organization on campus. Such a campus organization might have full responsibility not only for the provision of services but for the development of fundraising, planning and evaluation of services.

The Jewish services agency would function quite differently in the area of community relations. At present, Jewish community relations councils are often theoretically councils and in reality more like clubs of people interested in community relations. There was a time when such individuals were in fact representatives of organizations, but as they acquired competence in the field of community relations they stayed on long after their relationship with their original group had any meaning either for them or for their group. Imagine a Jewish services agency where all or most groups in the Jewish community would meet, where all would feel part of the community's institutions, not "tenants" nor window-dressing for the Jewish community center. Given a desire to move toward a course of action, whether national public affairs or on behalf of Israel, there would be the opportunity for a full process of debate, discussion, dissent and consensus. Such action would then have the support of many people and it would not be as necessary to "pull together a crowd." The crowd would be composed of those members of groups that had gone through this process of education and decision-making and would see action as a logical outgrowth of this process.

Nowhere does the need cry out more for a comprehensive approach than in the case of the introduction of Jewish knowledge and programs as part of the services now provided by the separate agencies. A course for Jewish Center workers, for caseworkers and for early childhood educators may be quite helpful but it does not have the potential for service of a staff member trained in

Jewish studies, serving together with teachers in the nursery school, family counselors, recreation workers and arts educators. Such Jewish educators on the staff of the Jewish services agency would have a real opportunity to make an impact, beginning with nursery school through senior adult services.

Several major questions remain unanswered. Beginning with agency governance, what would be the relationship of the CJSA to the Jewish Federation, both with respect to social planning for local services and in relation to allocations for overseas needs? The matter of lay involvement in governance needs the most serious consideration. We presently have many devoted lay people who have become advocates of an agency or a service and others who have become advocates of the total community. Both are needed, but what would happen within the construct of the CJSA system? One ready answer is the development of area committees or committees which are concerned with services to a given age group. In such a comprehensive service approach, the sense of relationship with an individual agency would seem to be lost. Another trend however that may mitigate this problem is the increasingly dominant role that Jewish Federations play in Jewish community organization, becoming a key point of reference for many lay people. There is a real question as to whether loyalty to the individual agency is as significant today as it was when the independent agencies were established, when they were responsible for their own funding and when social planning was conducted on a laissez-faire basis.

We are aware that the broader the involvement, the better and the more clearly the lay person understands the service of the agency, the more he can be its advocate. It may be that far more people could be involved in the CJSA model which would have regionally de-

centralized units both the regional and problem-oriented committees would more than make up for the numbers of people now involved in agency governance. It is also quite possible that lay people might be able to identify more readily with an overall approach to serving teenagers than they can with viewing the team service from the perspective of an individual agency.

What of the relationship between the CJSA and the Jewish Federation? One clear answer would be to follow the functional federation model and that is that the CJSA and the Jewish Federation would be one and the same. This would place the Federation clearly in the business of providing services which is a direction in which most Federations do not wish to travel. It is quite possible that given a certain Federation philosophy that the system of the Federation being the operating agency of the CJSA is not totally without merit. Given a full commitment to decentralization, the fear of monolithic power could be reduced. Let us imagine a CJSA which would raise its own money, do its own social planning, develop its own services, do its own evaluation of effectiveness and allocate funds as it would see the need. The overall concept would not work if a central group held control of the 60 or 80 percent of the funds raised by the biggest 100 to 500 givers. There would need to be a willingness to divide this portion of the funds by areas. The vitality of local communities could be stimulated and Jewish community organization could develop a sense of oneness now absent. There would be a contest for resources, of course, but not by agencies, rather by communities. Whether Federations run or do not run the CJSA this approach of comprehensive service and decentralized decision-making has enormous potential for community development.

In order to avoid concentration of

power it would probably be best to see the CJSA as a separate corporate entity in the Federation. We would have, therefore, representatives from areas of the city and suburbs, representatives from special interest groups, such as Aged Colleges who would represent the interests of their committees, communities and constituents to the Federation. There would still need to be persons with an overall community view. These would be represented by Federation leadership but again communities would be heard from rather than agencies. It is clear that the above description is most applicable to the metropolitan community with suburban areas.

What of intermediate communities? Is this model workable in that setting? Surely the concept of locating services centrally with a high degree of coordination is possible. Is it desirable? It would seem to this writer that decentralization of Jewish population even in intermediate communities calls for some stimuli or modes for coming together, setting aside economic considerations as to how a community can most effectively utilize its resources and give services.

Clearly the relationship between the CJSA and the Federation in small and intermediate communities is a difficult one. The fact that it is difficult should not deter us from pursuing the objective of more effective service delivery and of community building. I suspect that the CJSA would be a creature of the Federation and if not, at the outset would evolve into that form. There is some reason to question the degree to which "autonomous agencies" are not already "creatures of the Federation." It is true that agencies have separate boards, it is also true that these boards have community minded people to a greater degree than they have agency advocates. It is true that agencies by and large determine their own priorities; it is equally true that the budget allocation process is

a strong control on how much innovation takes place. It is true that social planning can be strongly influenced by a given agency. It is equally true that the implications of planning by one agency very much influence other agencies.

There is reason to believe that today's lay leadership is looking for better service delivered more efficiently with a more conscious objective of meeting individual and group needs as well as enhancing Jewish life. It is quite possible that a more total way of looking at service delivery will challenge the thinking of lay people in a way in which the individual agency sometimes does and often does not do.

The questions related to governance and the relationship of CJSA to the Federation are not at all clear and perhaps they can only become clear as a consequence of different experiences. It is quite likely historical realities will very much influence realities. We have attempted to look at various forms of Jewish communal organization as it applies to the Federation agency system. The possible loci for several of these approaches are not limited to the usual Federation system. There are clear possibilities for synagogues to be key bases for regional CJSAs. There is a different role in this approach for national Jewish adult and youth groups as to their rights and their place in the community. The concept of the Federation gift as the Jewish "communal tax" becomes more widely accepted and supported when people who have given their "tax payment" perceive themselves as entitled to the services of the Jewish community and entitled to vote on issues within the Jewish community.

The Jewish community has changed. Individual Jews today are different from what they were like thirty years ago; Jewish institutions have changed probably less than their constituents. Some patterns of service delivery have

evolved more out of the needs of the very service delivery system than out of appraisal of the nature of today's Jewish community and its changing institutional forms.

The sense of community among Jews is strongly felt today more in the fears than in the hopes we hold for each other. A sense of community must be

strengthened: a sense of concern and a sense of cultural achievement, using the term culture in its broadest sense. Some coming together of Jews is a pervasive, contemporary need, whatever institutional forms it may take. It is clear that an acceptance of the objective "creating community" would help to put us on the path toward its achievement.

The Mentally Impaired Aged: Reordering Priorities*

JACQUELINE SINGER EDELSON

Project Co-ordinator, Special Care Training Program, Jewish Home for the Aged, Toronto, Ontario

This article discusses some findings out of two projects in the residential care of confused and forgetful aged persons. The article discusses what was learned about giving care and about staff training needs; the challenges that are presented to the institutional system; and some questions about assessment and diagnosis.

THIS article is based upon two specific projects over the past six years, centered in the Special Care Section of the Jewish Home for the Aged of Toronto, in which care to the grossly mentally impaired residents is concentrated.

These residents are recognizable by all geriatric workers. They are diagnosed as having chronic brain syndrome, with *extremely severe impairment* of cognitive function. Most suffer from accompanying illnesses, and a wider range of physical disabilities. Many are in wheelchairs. Few have a steady gait. Some are practically helpless, unable to feed, dress or toilet themselves. These are the residents, average age of 84.7 years, who cannot by themselves manage their daily living. They cannot find their way to the central dining room downstairs or go back to their own room from any part of the building without getting lost and frightened. Most will not remember if they have had lunch; some have even forgotten their own names. Almost all would be incontinent without nursing routines, and even with the routines, some are incontinent of bowel and bladder. Disoriented, and confused, they are unable physically, socially and emotionally to survive without help, and they require continuous supervision and nursing care around the clock.

Some display extreme agitation and restlessness: one woman paces the corridor back and forth, twenty times to the hour; another pulls the buttons from her sweater, and counts out loud; another repeats automatically in her breathing "oi veh" "oi veh"; and another pounds her fist in anger on the table. A man likes to collect little trinkets, and takes them from other people's drawers into his pockets; another woman sits all day with her head and eyes downcast and refuses to budge, except for meals. Types of behavior all too familiar.

Familiar, too, are the problems in delivering care to these residents for which we sought answers in our Project proposal:

1) The disparate views of nursing staff and group services about a resident's responsiveness sounded as if the activity staff were reporting entirely different residents. Cooperation and involvement in group programs contrasted sharply with the difficult and stubborn behaviour with which nursing aides had to deal in the morning . . . and that frightened and timid old woman with whom the social worker was spending so many hours in reassurance, turned out to be a scratcher and a biter! Physical conditions alone did not satisfactorily explain the unevenness of function in these residents, nor the changeability in their mood and comprehension.

2) There was a conviction that many were indeed still capable of doing so

* Presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service. Grossinger, New York, June 9, 1975.