

COMMUNAL FUNDING AS A QUALITATIVE EDUCATIONAL TOOL

SUSAN HORN, PH.D.

Short Hills, New Jersey

Training and identifying a community master teacher, or redefining the job to one of a community educational worker, seem to be a feasible way of upgrading the professional career of a successful teacher. If the community would recruit, train and sponsor master community teachers' for every school, perhaps a real educational change could be introduced.

Communal funding identifies with black and white starkness the Jewish community's real priorities. Budgetary allocations may reflect an inheritance of the previous generation's traditions or the degree of progress and change in a planned communal blueprint for growth. Communities throughout America are increasing their spending for the educational component in their budget. Whether this funding will be regressive or creatively spent becomes the issue. Can communal educational funding go beyond the educational *status quo* and have a positive qualitative communal influence? This article will examine some community experiences as represented in selective studies. The focus will be on communities which have used funding as a method to effect qualitative educational change.

Historically, the Jewish community has always been able to maintain a balance between individual responsibility and communal responsibility for education. As early as 64 C.E., the total community assumed the responsibility for providing an elementary education for the children of the poor and the orphaned.¹ The Jewish communities in the Middle Ages

imposed an education tax on meat, wine, weddings, circumcisions, and funerals to help finance elementary education.²

Presently, elementary Jewish education is funded by the parents, the congregation sponsoring schools, and in the case of the day school, the local Jewish community federation.³ To give one a communal perspective, in 1982, 26% of all domestic federations' allocations were channeled into education (up from 16.7% in 1966).⁴ Approximately five hundred million dollars were spent by all sources on education.⁵ While federations increased their educational allocation 47% over the previous few years, it still contributed only 44 million of that 500 million annual total.⁶

2. Alvin Schiff, "Funding Jewish Education—Who's Responsibility?" Address presented at the 75th annual meeting of the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service, Philadelphia, May 29, 1973.

3. Walter Ackerman, "Jewish Education Today," *American Jewish Yearbook*, 80 (1980): pp.130-147. Alvin Schiff has repeatedly suggested a fourth level of fiscal funding be added to the American Jewish agenda. The fourth level would include grants and funding for day schools from the local, state and federal government.

4. Council of Jewish Federations, *Federations Allocations to Jewish Education*. New York: Council of Jewish Federation (1966-1975) and (1979-1982).

5. Sally Wertheim and Barry Shrage, "Jewish Education: The Need to Plan," *Jewish Education*, 53 (Spring, 1985): pp. 5-9.

6. Council of Jewish Federations. *Federation Allocations to Jewish Education*. New York: CJF, (1979-1982).

This article appeared as a chapter in a dissertation prepared in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the author's Ph.D. degree in Hebraic Studies, New York University.

1. *Bava Batra* 21a.

Parents still pay the major part of educational costs.

Day schools and the central agencies of Jewish education represent the major proportion of that educational funding by federations. Day schools have the highest per pupil costs, and have been unable to sustain their programming through tuition alone.⁷ Claiming that the intensity of Judaic programming will contribute to a strengthened Jewish community, the day schools have become the major recipient of federations' increased educational support. The central agencies generally remain the second area of communal fiscal support for Jewish education, with non-ideological and independent communal schools a third educational fiscal recipient. In many communities, congregational schools are requesting federation subsidization.

The funding of schools however is only one of the necessities in developing a program of educational excellence. Some communal funding, it has been suggested, is actually misspent, preventing the closing of unviable schools and often hindering serious internal educational evaluation and reassessment.⁸

Schools have been urged to become self-sufficient and self-supporting. Federations should give schools the necessary guidance to introduce efficient business management techniques and plant operation procedures, since communal deficit financing is the least productive funding strategy in

developing an effective educational institution.⁹

As the sum totals for the communal funding campaigns have been improved, there is a hopeful projection that the Jewish community will ultimately be able to achieve a national one billion dollars annual goal.¹⁰ However, even if that level is achieved, it still would not totally underwrite the present needs of Jewish education, which, at this time, exceed the estimated sum of 500 million dollars spent annually. Of course, international commitments of the American Jewish community and commitments to local needs would have reduced availability of funds to education. A larger expenditure of funds might experiment with a program of Jewish education which could produce a greater educational impact than anyone has forseen to date.

The Jewish community's federations are looking to the future in their attempt to develop new strategies and to achieve higher goals for communal funding. These strategies relate to allocating special purpose funds not intended for ongoing operating expenses, but intended rather to give federations and their agencies greater financial stability. The concept of endowment is designed to support long term planning and to finance new programs and projects within the Jewish community.¹¹ This long range fiscal plan has positive implications for communal Jewish education in the twenty-first century. Jewish educators need to innovate and experiment, providing new ideas for communal fiscal planners, thus offering a long term plan which could use such funding to maximum effect. Creative financial development needs an equally creative

7. George Pollak, and Gerhard Lang, *Budgeting and Financing in the Jewish Day Schools*. New York: JESNA (1984), pp. 76-77. Today tuition fees meet a higher percentage of costs than previously. It is noted that an experiment is currently being done in Chicago where a policy of tuition fee of 72% of actual costs is instituted as a condition for day schools' eligibility for communal support. Other communal leaders feel that a scholarship policy and reduced rates for siblings are adequate reasons for day schools to have tuitions which do not cover actual costs, and that lower tuitions attract capable students.

8. Sally Wertheim, *op. cit.*, pp 5-9

9. Alvin Schiff, *op. cit.*

10. Phillip Bernstein, *To Dwell in Unity*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, (1983), p. 278.

11. *Ibid.*, p. 291.

response from those involved with Jewish education in each community.¹²

TYPES OF TRADITIONAL COMMUNAL EDUCATIONAL FUNDING

JESNA, formerly the AAJE, has offered Jewish communities advice on communal funding. In their National Policy Statement on Communal Support for Jewish Education, they attempt to channel the communal fiscal allocation for education through the local central agency. However, this advice is not necessarily implemented on the local level. The recommendation of the national agency attempts to philosophically and politically strengthen their constituents, the central agencies, as well as qualitatively use funds to improve communal educational standards.

The Policy Statement urges that direct communal grants to schools should be phased out and that deficit financing be used only for the most intensive type of Jewish day school, or for funding experimental ventures. All communal funding should be to the central agencies, which, in turn, would establish the necessary criteria for grants to schools.¹³ This is a direct attempt to give the central agency a mode of communal sanction and a method of introducing standards. It also is attempting to guide the communities into giving the central agencies the power which accompanies the communal grants.

The Policy Statement defines the criteria for communal grants to schools. The

school must have viability, adequate facilities, responsible sponsorship, a financial need and an open admission policy for enrollment.¹⁴ The schools receiving communal aid need to adhere to the central agency's standards, professional personnel practices, and supervision requirements. The school must consult with the central agency before instituting policy changes, and cooperate in inter-school events, as well as show evidence of communal involvement in their curriculum and the development of *K'lal Yisrael* in the school.¹⁵

The Policy Statement, after defining which schools are eligible for communal assistance, offers advice on formulae for annual grant distribution. The formula chosen should allow for objective distribution, and be applied equally to all schools. Deficit financing is warranted only when the school is experimental, very intensive or conducted by the central agency.¹⁶ A pupil-hour formula is suggested, as well as paying a portion of the tuition fees. The total income formula is similar to deficit financing in that the community pays the difference between the total school income and the total expense. The community may pay the total educational costs, or part of it, e.g. the teacher's salaries, or teacher welfare benefits. Communities may also assume the costs of the student-school transportation.¹⁷

Temporary communal grants would be issued on a non-continuing basis for pilot projects, training of master teachers, library development, communal testing, and the use of creative arts. Tuition scholarships would be available for needy students.

12. *The Endowment Review*, Spring 1985, reports that it is the new annual tradition of the Jewish Community Foundation Board of New Jersey Metro-west for each board member to contribute \$590 annually in order to buy for the community a one million-dollar, thirty-year, zero coupon bond, in an attempt to build this endowment of unrestricted funds.

13. American Association for Jewish Education, *National Policy Statement on Communal Support for Jewish Education*. New York: AAJE, (June 1968 and 1971).

14. *Ibid.*

15. *Ibid.*

16. *Ibid.* It is easy to see the inherent contradiction in this policy demanding "objective grant distribution," and simultaneously, allowing deficit financing in agency-run schools.

17. *Ibid.*

A day school Policy Statement similarly attempts to force the day school into cooperating with the central agency as a requirement for communal fund allocations, and requires the school to show that it fulfills a demonstrated community need.¹⁸ Some recent success has been achieved in granting the central agency this fiscal fiduciary status. Other communities, however, have bypassed the central agency, and provided communal assistance directly to schools.

In actuality, the criteria for subsidy is most generally not based on its educational effectiveness. The most popular method of day school funding still is the lump sum school grant, the per pupil grant, and deficit financing.¹⁹ The teacher subsidy or percentage of the budget is probably the operative method least employed.²⁰

Surprisingly, the independent supplementary elementary schools operated on a communal basis have the highest costs of any type of supplementary school, despite the rationale for cost saving through school consolidation.²¹ But this may be the result of the higher costs incurred with an attempt at a more qualitative program, longer school year, or more teaching hours by licensed teachers and a full time principal.²² The communal supplementary school and the day school both have the

highest costs, and both are the recipients of communal funding. Currently, there is an incipient trend for congregational schools to apply for communal funding and while it is not yet a communal educational practice, it is an issue that is being discussed more and more often in the Jewish community.²³ In the initial stages, the congregational schools seeking aid have been asked to open their enrollment to the children of non-members even if at a higher tuition cost than their members are requested to pay. There is some evidence of a growing interest in some type of communal-congregational educational partnership.

Generally, communal funding represents a lump sum grant and does not usually reflect a serious communal intent to improve education qualitatively, or to insist upon strict standards of educational or fiscal responsibility. It is the most popular method of communal support and abandons the community's role in determining educational quality.²⁴ The "percentage of the total budget" type of communal support also has little educational impact. The per-pupil grant method allows schools to receive a communal subsidy with no differentiation between affluent students and those in need. Deficit financing is used by 25% of the schools, and is probably the most fiscally irresponsible method. It may make savings unnecessary, and rewards poor management.²⁵ Rather than serving as a factor for qualitative improvement, this funding formula, while often the simplest, is still the least effective mode of communal support.

Other methods of communal funding have had a favorable qualitative impact.

18. AAJE. *op. cit.*

19. G. Pollack, and G. Lang, *Budgeting and Financing in Jewish Day Schools*. New York: JESNA (1984), p. 66.

20. AAJE *op. cit.*

21. G. Pollack, and G. Lang, *Budgeting and Financing in the Jewish Supplementary School*. New York: JESNA (1983), p. 54. The high support of communal schooling is evidenced over the past 20 years, when these schools had received almost 55% of the combined school allotments and their grants were four times larger than grants to day schools. See *Community Grants to Local Jewish Schools*. New York: AAJE, (1970), p. 70.

22. There is an excellent detailed analysis of comparable costs and tuitions in communal schools in L. Spotts, *A Study of Jewish Education in Minneapolis*. New York: AAJE (1974-75), Appendix VIII pp. 13, 14.

23. *Suggested Guidelines on Communal Support for Congregational Schools*. New York: JESNA, 1983). This statement replicates the previously discussed guidelines for communal aid, but modifies the traditional open enrollment policy requirement for communal subsidy.

24. *Trends Newsletter*, New York: JESNA, (Spring 1982), p. 3.

25. *Ibid.*

The incentive grants, teacher subsidies and enrichment programs have shown evidence of creative communal responsibility. These are areas where greater concentration of effort is needed in the future.

METHODS OF COMMUNAL FUNDING

Self-Sufficient Central Agencies

Federations have shown their eagerness and receptivity to adopting creative funding methods for educational purposes. The central agencies are capable of providing guidance in this area to federations. Central agencies need to play a major role in educational funding, since when less community dollars are raised, the Jewish central education agency's budget is cut first. However, before offering funding advice to the lay communal leadership, the professional agency leadership must shape its own agency into a model of educational and fiscal accountability. The agency must show how it can creatively deal with a reduced budgetary allocation. Some bureaus have begun to develop income producing programs.

The Des Moines bureau sponsored an art show, and Atlanta (1978) offered an adult study tour open to the entire community.²⁶ Indianapolis and Atlanta both charge fees for the use of their film library.²⁷ The New York Bureau sells educational materials and gift items by mail order. This researcher suggests that the central agencies become more self-supporting by selling Jewish educational software, i.e., film cassettes of Jewish content, or specific program materials in which the Jewish public would find interest. It is an area that is still unexplored and underused. When communal funding is reduced, it behooves the edu-

cator to be concerned with the problem of fiscal self-sufficiency.

Governmental grants are another area which the small and medium size bureaus have ignored. Staff limitation is usually the cause for this omission. Agency cooperation was used by the Milwaukee central bureau and the Jewish Vocational service to secure a work study grant for teenagers.²⁸ It has also been suggested that local, state and federal government grants can be used to "aid the pupils in parochial schools and not be construed as aid to the schools themselves."²⁹ Some bureaus have been very active in developing the resource funding from the United States government for day-school students. These government services for day-school students include school breakfast, lunch and milk programs, as well as government subsidies for kitchen equipment, commodities and free and reduced bus tickets.³⁰ The area of "grantmanship" is a valid source of resource development for Jewish education that has only recently been explored. It is an area where the local agency can give the schools, and the community specific guidance and direction.

Some agencies attempt to increase their income through membership contributions. Some attempt to develop independent endowment funds. However, the quest for specialized endowment funds runs counter to federations' general expectations of developing their own unrestricted endowment reserve and, generally, has met with much opposition and little success. In addition, educators in central agencies are generally interested in education and disdainful of the fund-raising process. Nevertheless, if the community's fiscal educational role is to increase, educators must be involved in the fund-raising planning, while proving that they can be fis-

26. L. Spotts, "Funding Relationships Between Bureaus and Federation," *Jewish Education*, 47 (Spring 1979): pp. 14-22.

27. *Ibid.*

28. *Ibid.*, p. 20.

29. Alvin Schiff, *op. cit.*

30. *Board of Jewish Education of Greater New York Annual Report*. New York: BJE (1975-1976), pp. 14-15.

cally responsible. Perhaps Jewish educators will earn the community's respect if central agencies become part of the "fund-raising team," as they begin to strive toward financial self-sufficiency.³¹

Central Agencies Functioning as Foundations

It has been suggested by JESNA that the central agency be the community's educational funding vehicle, and that schools not receive communal funding directly from federation, independent of the central agency mechanism.³² The traditional funding formulae have had little qualitative impact and have institutionalized educational waste by bolstering a weak or mismanaged school. Communal funding can interfere with the "educational free market," and have a negative impact. The community needs to define the priorities of its communal educational responsibilities. It can then focus on a specific area for qualitative control and educational improvement. For example, Oakland, California limited its fiscal resources in this way by subsidizing only those programs which enhance teacher competence.³³

Other central agencies have experimented with allocating a portion of their communal fiscal resources through an incentive grant program, in order to gain a specific educational purpose with their funding. Incentive grants have been given when schools have shown that they have introduced either a central agency curriculum, or an ideological group curriculum. Grants have been given when schools have achieved an adequate level of competence to meet the agency's accreditation program. Incentive grants have also been used to enforce the personnel code of practice for teachers.

Would it not be feasible to experiment by observing a three year moratorium on

continuous annual support for schools and then use the same amount of communal funding, but awarded only through incentive grants? Could this radical change in the traditional pattern of allocation of communal funds actually be a more effective way of increasing communal educational creative productivity?

The 1973 Institute for Jewish Life (IJL) tried to do this on a national level.³⁴ However, the sponsorship and development of the IJL circumvented the established leadership of Jewish education, and significantly compromised the role of the AAJE.³⁵ Due to resultant political pressures, the project was discontinued. But the central agencies themselves, the present local educational establishments, could become the focal point for such a program of educational qualitative experimentation if they lobbied to change their status to that of a foundation-like communal instrument.

The Cleveland community instituted a self-study in 1976 which developed a communal funding project similar to the IJL and its "Venture in Creativity." As a result of a communal think-tank, creative educational ideas were to be funded for three years, if they were replicable. All community elements were involved, as the community began to think of ways qualitatively to improve the community's Jewish educational process.³⁶

As a result of this program, incentive grants were awarded for an adolescent student family education program, camp weekend programs, a year-long program for families of primary grade children and educational enrichment programs of the congregational schools' own design.³⁷

31. Alvin Schiff, *op. cit.*

32. AAJE, *op. cit.*

33. *Trends Newsletter*. New York: JESNA, (Spring 1983).

34. The Institute for Jewish Life tried to fund innovative educational programs and met with modest initial success.

35. Alvin Schiff, *op. cit.*

36. *Cleveland Self Study*. Cleveland: Jewish Federation, (1976), p. 27.

37. *Trends Newsletter*. New York: JESNA, (Fall 1982), p. 5.

Limiting allocations to a specific time frame, proved that the successful programs did continue after the trial funding, while other less successful educational experiments were not renewed automatically at the community's expense. In Cleveland, the federation provided the initiative for enhancement of the community's schools and upgraded qualitatively the communal educational expression.

Other bureaus have similarly financed pilot programs through the incentive grants method.³⁸ Some bureaus offer incentive grants for school consolidation and intensive classwork as a method of qualitatively upgrading the system through communal funding.³⁹

Per Pupil Grants With Educational Accountability

Portland, Oregon has experimented with educational vouchers as a means of qualitatively influencing the impact of communal funding. Students each receive a voucher worth a specific amount of communal money to attend the school of their choice.⁴⁰ This funding theory relies on the consumer concept, forcing the schools to produce a quality educational program, in order to attract students. This type of communal subsidy does not differentiate between a needy and wealthy family. It has been criticized as being philosophically regressive, as it acts as a "flat tax."⁴¹ The qualitative impact on a community's educational system, moreover, has not been

evaluated. The concept of education as a consumer service is not commonly accepted in Jewish education.

Contact Hours with a Built-in Educational Accountability

Omaha, Nebraska, has experimented with a contact-hour formula form of communal subvention. All schools calculate the hours per session and the class sessions per year. This total figure becomes the total contact-hours, and then the central agency pays a communal rate per contact hour.⁴² This formula has the advantage of allowing flexibility in school funding allocations. It encourages savings and is fair to recipients. Need is not a factor in this communal subsidization program. The primary focus is an attempt to discourage ideological rivalries and hostilities in the community. The bureau director sees evidence of this accomplishment as communal educational cooperation has increased. He stated, "Communal pedagogic programs which were previously considered out of the question are growing each year and saving additional dollars, while increasing the quality of Jewish education."⁴³

The most interesting qualitative educational factor built into this communal formula is that each subvented school must have annual evaluative testing (according to their ideological movement's requirements) which is subsequently reviewed by the central agency. Each school must have mandatory in-house training programs. The bureau awards the remainder of communal funding in special grants that require validation in order to prove their communal educational value.

Flint, Michigan has instituted a similarly successful subvention policy, with educational accountability to the central agency as a mandatory factor.⁴⁴ Here too,

38. Cincinnati and Baltimore are two of several such central agencies which have special educational program funding available through federation grants, which are not part of the regular bureau budget. No bureau presently functions totally on a foundation basis however.

39. L. Ruffman, *Study of Jewish Education in the San Francisco Area*. New York: AAJE, (1967-), p. 37.

40. *Community Planning Group—Task Force Reports on the Transmission of Jewish Heritage. Portland, Oregon: Jewish Federation of Portland, (May, 1977)*, p. 3.

41. *Trends Newsletter*. New York: JESNA, (Fall 1982), p. 1.

42. Jonathan Rosenbaum, "Allocation Formulae: A New Solution," *Jewish Education*, 52 (Spring 1984): pp. 16-18.

43. *Ibid.*, p. 18.

44. Joseph Cohen, *Survey of Jewish Education in Flint, Michigan*. New York: AAJE, (June 1974), p. 1.

this policy has encouraged more joint communal efforts in sponsoring communal junior and senior high school programs and in sponsoring a communal nursery school.

Teacher Subsidies as a Communal Investment

Communal teacher subsidies have been considered as a variation in the "percentage of the total costs" funding model. It is difficult to allocate funds in this way since one would need to calculate teacher wages individually as they relate to teachers' educational background and experience. Many of the teachers lack professional qualifications, and this formula is generally rejected by most communities. However, it does have a potentiality for changing a community's educational complexion and can be a useful method for prompting higher qualitative standards for newly employed teachers. Miami, Los Angeles and Providence have based their funding system on the qualifications of the teaching staff. Schools receive subsidies depending on the number of teachers who are licensed or working toward a license, with the hope that this requirement for licensing will have a positive qualitative effect.⁴⁵

Jewish day-school teachers generally receive the highest salary of Jewish school teachers because they are employed for the most hours. However, most day schools provide no fringe benefits and still pay significantly less than the public schools. Jewish Education Association of New Jersey Metro West attempted to remedy this by providing communal salary supplements for day-school teachers. The day-school teachers' salaries were to be increased over a three-year period. First, this salary addition would be supplied by an unrestricted communal endowment fund and then, the general campaign funding would continue to provide day-school salary increases

as a means of communal educational improvement.⁴⁶

Milwaukee's Jewish community has developed another interesting method of teacher subsidization. Here, the community does not pay teachers' salaries, but rather allocates more communal funds to schools where the teachers have better professional preparation. The communal subvention is called the Teacher Growth Formula.⁴⁷ Schools receive funding according to a formula based on the number of hours of in-service professional training and growth toward certification status of their staff. The focus of the communal funding is the school teacher, rather than the school, or the student. The community pays for university extension courses, and offers teachers subventions for professional improvement.

Master Teacher Corps

While these funding programs are usually satisfactory, they still have a very limited impact. In most cases, they attempt to move the salary of the Jewish teacher toward parity with that of the public school teacher. Even if parity could successfully be achieved, the Jewish teaching profession would still not be affected significantly. The public school teaching profession, to which it is compared, similarly suffers from low community esteem and relatively low salaries. Training and identifying a community master teacher, or redefining the job to one of a community educational worker, seem to be a feasible way of upgrading the professional career of a successful teacher. If the community would recruit, train and sponsor master community teachers for every school, perhaps a real educational change could be introduced. In that case, community funds would be better spent on the support of outstanding community teachers, who have positive im-

46. Minutes of Meeting, Jewish Federation Metro-West, August 1985.

47. *Trends Newsletter*. New York: JESNA, (Winter 1984), p. 3.

45. *Trends Newsletter*. New York: JESNA (Fall 1982), p. 3.

pact on their colleagues, the regular classroom teachers, on a daily basis in every school. The creation of an elite teacher corps in a community, could perhaps generate enough status and individual self esteem, to attract others to a Jewish teaching career.

St. Louis attempted to use federation's funds to develop a communally sponsored full-time Jewish teacher corps. The central agency was to recruit and to centralize the employment of teachers who would be guaranteed a salary competitive with salaries in general education.⁴⁸ These teachers would also teach "high quality magnet classes in courses made available on a community-wide basis."⁴⁹

Teacher salary subsidization remains a most effective tool of communal investment in order to develop a qualitative educational program. Since the heart of the problem in Jewish education as in all education is the teacher, the Jewish community must devise some way to build the Jewish teaching profession. The Jewish community to date has been unsuccessful in its approach to this problem. Supporting schools may be an urgent matter, but long-term qualitative growth cannot be achieved unless the classroom teacher is of the highest possible quality.

THE JEWISH COMMUNITY'S AFFECTIVE EDUCATIONAL ROLE

Educators have always recognized the interplay between informal and formal educational activities. The Jewish community traditionally has supported the formal or cognitive aspect of Jewish education with communal funding. In recent times, there has developed a communal trend toward underwriting more of the

informal, and affective educational experiences.

The most common communal undertaking in this area is the subsidization of trips to Israel for teenagers, as part of their educational experience. Some bureaus have instituted a savings program wherein both the secondary school, the student and the federation contribute to a fund so that every enrolled child will have an educationally oriented trip to Israel awaiting him/her at graduation.⁵⁰ In Cleveland, the school and the student each contribute \$150 annually in a savings program, with Federation adding \$40 annually. The trip is awarded after the completion of seven years of schooling. In 1985, one hundred and thirty children participated in the program. Rochester and Chicago have savings plans similar to Cleveland's. MetroWest in New Jersey partially subsidizes summer trips for those students completing three years of high school. Scranton offers high school trips which are subsidized in a way similar to that of the MetroWest.⁵¹

The generous support of YM-YWHA programs in almost every organized Jewish community in the United States reflects a major involvement in informal educational activities. The objective of these activities is to combine a Jewish educational component with social and recreational factors. The bureau should extend its expertise in formal education to enhance the YM-YWHA's educational programming. The bureau could also develop a closer relationship with the numerous camp programs run by the YM-YWHA. Greater cooperation, rather than agency competition, is most desirable as a community goal.

The involvement of the formal Jewish educational establishment with the affective or informal educational program is slowly having an impact within the Jewish community. The early efforts have been

48. *Report of the Jewish Education Study Committee of the Jewish Community Federation of St. Louis*. St. Louis: Jewish Community Federation (February, 1982).

49. *Ibid.*, p. 29.

50. *Trends Newsletter*. New York: JESNA, (Summer 1982).

51. *Ibid.*

very successful, but major communal support has not been as forthcoming as one would have expected. It is an area that needs to be more fully developed, as the maturing Jewish community assesses its differentiated educational needs and marshals its forces to meet those needs.

A RADICAL CONCEPT —
JEWISH
EDUCATIONAL TRUST FUND

Baruch Rand, the former director of the Toledo bureau of education has suggested a novel rationale for Jewish educational support.⁵² He suggested that in view of the large degree of assimilation and intermarriage of the American Jewish community, its future existence is no longer assured, placing its survival in great jeopardy. Without a strong, vibrant successful educational program, the American Jewish community was in danger of cultural and spiritual extinction. He suggested a moratorium on annual aid by local communities to Israel. These funds would then be assigned by each local community to a trust fund for education.

In this trust plan, "a sum equivalent to the annual federation educational allocation would be set aside for a period of ten years."⁵³ Such a trust fund would assure adequate funding for Jewish education in periods of economic stress. Tuition for Jewish schooling could then be abolished.⁵⁴

52. Baruch Rand, *The Challenge and Pitfalls of a Communal Educational System*. Toledo: Board of Jewish Education, (1973), p. 3.

53. *Ibid.*, p. 6.

54. Baruch Rand, "The Challenge of a Communal Educational System in Small and Middle Size Communities," *Jewish Education*,⁴⁷ (Summer 1979): pp. 35-41.

Such a moratorium on aid to Israel has not been considered to date by any community. The concept of endowment building, however, has been defined and actively pursued in the American Jewish community.

IN CONCLUSION

Communal funding of Jewish education has been increasing, as the community recognizes the role of education for Jewish survival. The dollar amount communally expended, while now a quarter of the total domestic allocation, is still only a fraction of the total amount spent by the Jewish community. The communal funds that have been allocated by the federations have often by-passed the central educational agencies, and have been allocated directly to schools. Communal funding maintains the central agencies and partially funds the schools. Most funding is not directed at qualitative educational improvement but rather permits the schools the use of these funds at their discretion, with little or no accountability.

Incentive grants and teacher growth formulae have been used, often successfully, to change the communal educational picture. Communities would do better to focus their financial support on programs aimed toward specific communal educational priorities. Funds could then be more effectively used and with greater educational impact. The central educational agency has the responsibility to define more carefully these communal educational priorities. Rather than to decry the inadequacy of communal support, central agencies must assume a greater responsibility in all aspects of the funding process.