

The Trump Foundation's Relationship with the Government

Dalit Stauber

Introduction

Soon after beginning its activity, the Trump Foundation brought the decline in the number of high school graduates in advanced mathematics and physics to the public's attention, while creating a connection between these numbers and the future strength and prosperity of the State of Israel. The Foundation did more than just sound the alarm. It decided that its top priority would be strengthening the teaching of physics and mathematics in secondary schools, focusing on teachers and their practice. Soon after, the Foundation developed a portfolio of programs to increase the number of teachers who are trained to teach these subjects at a high level, to empower them to teach clinically and to develop and improve their teaching methods, and to build teacher communities so they could learn from their peers and support one another in their practice.

The Foundation deliberately decided not to act alone; rather, to engage in deep collaboration

with all the relevant stakeholders, including the governing institutions of the education system — the Ministry of Education, its districts, the municipalities, and school networks. These partnerships were created based on an understanding that the provision of education is the responsibility of the government. This notion, which recognizes the inherent limitation of a philanthropic body, was crucial to the Foundation in order to ensure broad implementation and sustainability of its programs that can only be guaranteed by public organizations.

A period of five years may be too short to draw conclusions and to discuss the question of whether the Foundation was right in taking this route, and to determine if it achieved its goals and how it did so. It would be even more presumptuous to try to point to specific elements that were more conducive to the success, whether the clinical teaching programs, the media campaigns, the central government policy, or their mix. However, this period is sufficient in order to reach meaningful intermediate insights, which allow learning "on the go" and mid-course corrections.

From Strategy to Practice

The Role of a Foundation

The Trump Foundation defined a clear strategic approach which guides the way it operates and allocates its resources. The Foundation's papers describe the Foundation as a "persistent engineer," constructing plans and overseeing their proper implementation, while at the same time operating as a "polite pyromaniac," setting fires in different locations and blowing, so they will spread. However, all its work is based on a fundamental assumption that the government is the leader of education and that its responsibility should be empowered and respected. The Foundation sees its place as a mosquito near an elephant, a catalyst for its movement and a buzz in its ear.

This principle of "government responsibility" had a great impact on the pace and scope of the Foundation's activity during its early years of operation, when the Foundation was busy planting seeds. It collected data, conducted an ongoing data-backed dialogue and tried to win over hearts and minds, with the goal of making an impact on policy. The Foundation also tried to reach an understanding with the professional echelon of the Ministry of Education and - as the ministry was willing - to put in place a budgeted policy consistent with the Foundation's goals. These steps formed a concrete basis for understanding the importance of the mission and for creating a practical joint vision, objectives, targets and agreed metrics of success for the activity.

Eli Hurvitz, executive director of the Trump Foundation, explained this in the following manner: *Education belongs to the government and the government must lead. The government's responsibility cannot be delegated to any other party and it is their sole responsibility, from start to finish. Philanthropy has a different role - philanthropy can be*

a supporting catalyst, and its advantages and disadvantages must be predefined. Once the matter of responsibility is clear, it also becomes clear why a philanthropic foundation must have an expiration date, so the government will maintain its long-term commitment. When a shared priority area is jointly chosen, where philanthropy is going to assist, it has to have clear goals and methods of operation for how the philanthropic system will help the government in alignment with the rules of the market that are dictated by the State. The foundation then works like scaffolding of a building, supporting the initial construction processes; and when the foundation exits and the scaffolding is removed, the building will continue to stand.

Strategic Partners

The second assumption of the Foundation's work is the importance of creating comprehensive impact by recruiting as many significant partners as possible and shaping public opinion through opinion leaders in the areas of its activity. The Foundation tried to create a "tail wind," active involvement and support for the process (a collective impact ecosystem). These activities stem from a belief that shaping broad public perceptions that recognize and support the importance of the processes that are taking place will help progress through public awareness, social awareness and public pressure, ensuring continued influence after its activity ceases.

Hurvitz notes that he believes in collective impact:

Throughout the work year we worked with Sheatufim, the Rashi Foundation, Intel, and the Ministry of Education. If I were to define the three components of creating collective impact, they are (in reverse order):

- a) Formulating a policy, vision, goals, and metrics*
- b) Creating extensive cooperation between all of the relevant actors*
- c) Developing capabilities in the field*

Measurement

The Foundation determined that its success would be examined on three dimensions: A. Did it effect change in the excellence metrics and was there an increase in the rate of high school students completing the five-unit matriculation? B. Did the change indeed seep into the education systems, and to what extent? C. Were capabilities and awareness built in a way that will allow them to prevail even after the Foundation stops funding the program?

It is clear that beyond the predefined objectives it is important to listen to the "field" in order to learn lessons "on the go" to help the activity succeed and to establish collaboration with the Ministry of Education. It is also important in order to provide a working model and to leave behind a body of knowledge, which will serve as a tool that will allow the minister, the director general and the decision makers to act properly in future cooperation with philanthropic foundations as well. As such, the Foundation hoped to offer a cure for the "disease" of a lack of information management and thoughtful documentation of methods of activity in the government offices, which keep reinventing the wheel every time a difficult and/or pertinent topic needed to be addressed. Hurvitz argues the following:

We do not receive regular feedback or in-depth reflection from our partners, and it is important for us to understand- especially at this time - what can be done otherwise... It is important to us to document what we are doing with the government, so that when the director general of the Ministry of Education wants to cooperate in the future with philanthropy and wants to do it right, there will be a reference or a set of references. It is amazing when you think about how many previous attempts were conducted and the level of cooperation that took place, and there is no documentation of the knowledge or the creation of recommended working patterns...

It is important for the Foundation to know and understand what government officials think about these questions in order to do better work together, and in order to instill this body of knowledge in future cooperation... It is important to reach a situation whereby when the government wants to tell a story about philanthropy and how to work with philanthropy, we will all know what the government needs in order to be satisfied, and where compromises can and cannot be made.

Objective and Methodology

The objective of the following study was to examine the positions of government officials regarding the Foundation's activity: assumptions, methods, and insights regarding further collaboration. Six in-depth interviews were conducted with senior staff members selected by the Foundation. In addition to the executive director of the Trump Foundation, we also interviewed Mr. Shlomo Dushi, executive director of Sheatufim, Ms. Yulia Eitan, deputy head of the National Economic Council at the Prime Minister's Office, Ms. Michal Cohen, director general of the Ministry of Education, Mr. Zvika Aricha, chief inspector of physics, and Ms. Dasi Be'eri, director of the High School Education Department at the Ministry of Education. All of the interviewees were happy to participate in the study process, put time and thought into it, and answered honestly and with great transparency, out of a sincere desire to contribute to the insights and continue the successful cooperation with the Foundation.

They addressed the necessary conditions for success when working with a philanthropic foundation, issues where cooperation with such a foundation is appropriate, the importance of the style of operation of the foundation and its executive director, the

recommended channels of communication and their frequency, the level of satisfaction from the activity and suggestions regarding what can be implemented in order to create a successful model for future cooperation between the government and foundations. The interviews provided insights on matters pertaining to the implementation of the strategy and the theory of change, the impact of the Foundation on the education field, the quality of management of the cooperation with the government and the Ministry of Education, and recommendations on how to effectively utilize social networks and evaluate the concept of excellence that guides the Foundation's activities.

The Research Question

A number of key issues were examined, ranging from questions regarding the basis for the Foundation's objectives, to evaluating the activity that took place and addressing further activity:

"Working within the system" -

The Foundation decided to operate within the system while using the tools at its disposal and not to offer any supplemental extra-curricular activity that is dependent on philanthropic grants. This was done in order to ensure government responsibility. What is the "price" that the Foundation paid for this decision, if any? Retrospectively - was this the correct decision?

The partnerships strategy - The Foundation's strategy of partnership with the public sector in general and the Ministry of Education in particular, involves being a co-investor. As such, the Foundation and the Ministry of Education invest in the project independently and separately, with no direct agreement between them. What were the alternatives to

this kind of partnership? How is this put into practice?

Creating partnerships with stakeholders -

In order to expand the circle of excellence and to build the required networks for this purpose, the Foundation decided to work closely with the larger "eco-system" and initiated cross-sectoral collaboration [the 5X2 initiative], which includes the Ministry of Education as a central player. The goal was to build a coalition between various actors in government, academia, the high-tech industry, the army, local government, etc. Is the Foundation successful in nurturing the required network in order to promote the desired change? What can be improved?

Sustainability - Are the partnerships the Foundation established achieving the ongoing and wide scope of implementation and sustainability that it would like to achieve?

"Looking toward the future" - What are the challenges the Foundation faces in the next five years? What are the future risks entailed in the Foundation's ability to continue its activity? Is it able to cope with them, and how?

Findings
Foundation Leadership

One of the things that came up in the interviews is the centrality of the Foundation's executive director as a leader of the endeavor. The interviewees referred to the centrality of the leading personality of a philanthropic foundation and his personal style, as part of the foundation's positioning and as a decisive factor in the success of the process and strategy implementation. Eli Hurvitz is considered a determined and consistent person, who knows how to express the Foundation's objectives very well,

with a clear perspective regarding the Foundation's role in the process, while at the same time emphasizing the importance of the government as the leader who takes overarching responsibility.

This is how Shlomo Dushi describes him: *Organizations are made up of people, and Eli's role here is very important and complex when it comes to creating connections between people in order to build relationships - relationships that leave space for others-, in a manner that each person's voice holds equal value, with some compromises, even though many concepts are positive and they become part of the consensus when different things are combined.*

Michal Cohen added her own emphasis: *The personal aspect is very important. Everything depends on the relationship between people....the Trump Foundation's strength is in the fact that nobody cares who is leading and there are no ego games. The Foundation practices what it preaches. It doesn't just talk about partnership, it operates as a partnership.*

Zvika Aricha adds: *This is not an organization that talks about "expanding" the Ministry of Education and rebuilding it. Rather, we recognize the system and listen to it, unlike other foundations, which required a veto on what they were trying to achieve while fully ignoring the ministry.*

Dasi Be'eri also thinks that: *The importance of the person who represents the foundation and his personal style is unequivocal. The more a person encourages partnerships and is attentive, the greater the chances of success. I sat down with foundations that were very knowledgeable. And here you have a foundation that is very powerful and at the same time it has an extremely admirable level of humility...*

Yulia Eitan continues to describe the uniqueness of the Foundation: *The Trump Foundation acted the entire time as a partner, instead of as a client; a partner in understanding the problem and in taking action to expand the window through conversation. This is a challenge that should not be taken for granted.*

The Role of Government Vis-à-Vis the Role of Philanthropy

The interviewees, civil servants who represent the establishment through their various positions, are all convinced that the government must not allow anyone else to lead in the core areas. The civil servants are extremely familiar with the government's obligation and its responsibility for education, as well as their personal professional responsibility which stems from this. They bear responsibility due to familiarity and desire. At the same time, as those who follow its procedures, they are well aware of the system's weaknesses and its limitations. As such, they experience severe frustration at times with the fact that their extraordinary efforts do not always bear fruit at the pace and scope that they would like due to organizational, bureaucratic, economic, and sometimes political difficulties, including frequent policy changes owing to the frequent turnover of ministers.

They often become tired of serving as society's "punching bag" for any number of problems and they are often not recognized and appreciated for their efforts and professional investment, which is rarely disclosed to the public. However, the interviewees referred to the advantages of "combining forces" with a philanthropic foundation that knows how to work in real cooperation with respect for government and its responsibility in order to promote topics that are clearly important and central. In these cases, they greatly value the cooperation and are willing to assist

and to be assisted so as to achieve the shared objectives, to meet the targets and to realize professional dreams, which would not have come to fruition without the help of the Foundation.

The Trump Foundation also receives substantial praise for the choice and focus on the important challenge of promoting excellence in science and mathematics. Over the years, the Ministry of Education has made a variety of attempts to increase the number of students in the five-unit matriculation tracks for mathematics and to increase the number of teachers who are trained to teach them, but without any noticeable success. Among all of the ministry's objectives, there was no emphasis placed on this goal in the past in terms of focus and resources to bring about the desired breakthrough: a significant increase in the number of mathematics and physics students in the five-unit track and putting a team of teachers with high capability levels at their disposal, that would enable them to address the demand. Partnering with the Foundation facilitated focus and success for all the ministry partners, as they strive toward a high level of work and motivation for further cooperation in order to achieve the goal and additional goals.

This is how Zvika Aricha describes it: *When we met, Eli asked me: How do you view the system and what is important in your eyes? The conversation was in 2009-2010 and the numbers were revealed two-three years later. The number of students completing four units in mathematics increased among those studying physics. I was the first to feel that something was happening. Although the number of 7500-8000 completing matriculation was maintained, those completing four units of mathematics constantly increased. The result is that the mathematics level of physics majors was lower in the universities as well. Without the top tier, the number of teachers and*

experts consistently decreased. This is what I described to Eli and I asked for his help, and I could not imagine at the time - during the first conversation - how much help would be provided.

Yulia Eitan emphasizes the role of government in setting the policy, stating that: *I believe that it is critical to understand the government's need even before building the tools. Eli Hurvitz immediately allowed for a professional conversation from which he took some things and left out others, but there was a dialogue about all of the challenges. From my standpoint, the government does not have to manage foundations or organizations instead of the foundations or organizations managing themselves. The method that the executive director of the Trump Foundation chose is a good way to teach about the process, how to get an organization to run properly, and then we go back, and ask again about the need. There was an attempt here to create a meaningful process and to clearly elucidate the real need.... The government must be responsible for most matters and the foundation must contribute at the margins with a sense of respect for the government's responsibility. The government operates the system, and the foundations assist in the areas determined by the government. The nature of the content will always be determined by government, while the mediator may at times be from the foundation staff. The non-profits have a conceptual advantage, but the material must be presented in a creative manner, in a way that will enrich the government's toolbox. The government must consult with the non-profits, in order to address blind spots. However, the policy is decided by the government.*

Michal Cohen uses the image of an "octopus" to describe the model of working alongside philanthropy: *If the government wants to succeed with the foundations it has to be confident about its added value and its leadership, and that the topic is on its agenda.*

Collaboration with foundations strengthens the government and the public service. There is room for everyone. The definition of tasks must be clear and include clear setting of expectations. Topics on which there should not be cooperation with philanthropy are regulatory matters that require a sovereign authority. But other than that, there is no hindrance to partnering with a civic organization according to the aforementioned rules. The model of a coalition that is formulated behind the ministry with many arms, like an octopus - is a successful model.

Dasi Be'eri emphasizes the importance of the Foundation for the strength of the activity: *The government has many important goals, but it goes back and forth between them and must balance its energy dispersal. The Trump Foundation comes and provides a focus, requiring "high walls" around the topic all the time. As a department director, I learned that when there is a person who keeps pestering you (in the positive sense), he creates a great amount of action.*

Shlomo Dushi refers to the added value of philanthropy: *What is appropriate for cooperation with philanthropy? The most problematic part is the governmental perspective - that someone who brings money is desirable in our parts because it generates extra cash for the senior officials' pet projects. This is the most problematic thing possible. There is a great temptation to work with philanthropy, of all kinds, due to the State's troubles. Philanthropy's place should be in an area where there is value to working in various sectors to address a matter in which government requires extra help in order to create added value, and not just taking available cash."*

The Partnership Model

Throughout the period, from the moment the Foundation was established, there was an ongoing dialogue with the Ministry of Education, ministers, and director generals,

so that the ministry would lead the process and positively view the importance of the objective and fully identify with it and its responsibility to achieve it. The joint focus of all parties on the goal of promoting science and mathematics only came about following significant steps the Foundation took over a few years. These steps included properly understanding the situation, increasing public awareness, recruiting numerous partners from the relevant government ministries, university representatives, non-profits, museums, and significant parties in industry and the private sector. All of the above came together to build a mechanism of dialogue and create a roundtable where 100 organizations and companies that decided to join the cause, would sit and provide a tailwind for the government.

This model of partnership with many parties who joined together for the process was based on an innovative concept, since at this roundtable each one of the parties recognized the government's responsibility and leadership, but also had an equal status in the conversation as a student and teacher, regardless of its size and the importance of its role. This mechanism, which was closely managed with great sensitivity by the Foundation and Sheatufim, is what ultimately neutralized extraneous or hidden interests involved in a process of many organizations. Even if these organizations had a motive of promoting their interests, such as - for example - teaching computer science, or focusing on training engineers, ultimately the proximity to the ministry, the minister, the director general and the professional staff, was considered an immense profit in itself, with a place of honor at an influential table of decision makers.

The great power of the eco-system, where all partners support and understand the work from close-up, and address difficulties

and opportunities while operating as a coalition, is a great asset to the minister of education and the ministry. This strength can also face significant opposition if it is not used wisely. The minister of education at the time, Rabbi Shai Piron, was not on the same page as the Foundation regarding the importance of promoting excellence specifically in mathematics, but the data that was carefully collected by the Foundation presented a situation on the ground that could not be ignored. The process received an extraordinary window of opportunity with the arrival of Minister of Education Naftali Bennett to the Ministry of Education, with his deep understanding gained from his high-tech background and as a former minister of the economy, of the importance of the process and the revolutionary implications for the education system, society in Israel, and for the development of the economy in coming decades.

During his tenure as minister of the economy, Bennett took note of the great deficits and the immense need in the labor market and in the various industries for engineers and graduates with mathematics training. The continued professional training of these graduates, when provided on the right level and adjusted to the market's needs, can address the industries' developing needs and guarantee Israel's economic vitality. The fact that the leading officials in the Ministry of Education at this time are deeply convinced that the process is essential from a professional standpoint, along with the unequivocal statement that the minister received from the National Economic Council that supported the process, provided fertile ground in order to make significant wide-ranging decisions. And indeed, immediately after taking office in the Ministry of Education, Minister Bennett's understandings were translated into the significant strategic target of doubling the number of mathematics students completing five units, and this target was backed up by his decision to

provide a 100 million NIS budget for the process.

Shlomo Dushi referred to the cooperation between the parties and declared: *This kind of work involves crises that occur from time to time, as well as players who are trying have an impact with secondary agendas, such as those from industry or from the civic sector who want to take a slightly larger cut. But if you understand that you are in an eco-system with the potential to be very effective and that there is a need to compromise, not on your activity but in the public domain, then you can create something very significant. Here, the Trump Foundation saw a real concrete value in the collective impact model, instituting a different paradigm or more concentrated work, with no ego, and a joint front dealing with the ministry in order to maintain a routine of constant contact. If you eliminate political aspects, the most important thing is that an amazing system was built based on trust, which proves that with such organizations you can reach more meaningful achievements than what is possible with each organization working on its own.*

Yulia Eitan expounded on this topic: *Any philanthropic entity encounters a reality in which it can be an agent of change, but at times you have to wait for a window of opportunity that will allow for a breakthrough. The topic of five units of mathematics could not be breached during Minister Piron's tenure, since this topic did not interest him. Minister Bennett announced that this was his plan on his first day in office, because as minister of economy he worked on the engineer deficit, where the cause of the deficit in this profession in the labor market is a lack of mathematics knowledge and the small number of five-unit students. He understood that the system is producing graduates who are unable to enter the work force, which created dynamics that made him ready to listen. Bennett himself got on the phone and asked the Council what they think.*

He came prepared and he understood the need. He entered a ministry that understood what is on the table, following the processes that the Trump Foundation already put in place. The fact that the Foundation succeeded in ensuring their place at the table for the first discussion immediately when the minister began his tenure is a double success for the Foundation. Firstly - the fact that the professional ranks did not object. It is easier for a minister if he doesn't have to fight with the professional ranks. At the same, when a serious external party speaks it is worthwhile to listen to them.

Michal Cohen explains that: *I understood that if the ministry fails to embrace this program, it won't happen. Shai Piron began with the "Mathematics First" program and then Naftali Bennett put 100 million NIS into it - much more than what was required for the original plan. He provided resources and made it a priority, and this direction will achieve the targets that were set. Naftali deserves credit as the minister who included the topic in his strategic plan, and also provided a significant budget of 100 million NIS, and he also speaks with people in high-tech, in industry, and with the school principals, and he verifies everything. There are status briefings, and there are incentives and rewards. At the end of the day the ministry built the plan, but the Foundation initiated it.*

A change cannot be created on the national level without the government and without an authentic and potent partnership along with it. The new innovative organizing structure, which led to the partnership strategy, provided significant added value, which created extremely precise answers to needs born out of a sense of urgency and intensity. There had been plans before, and officials and entities took action. Evaluation plans were conducted, and the number of five-unit mathematics students still continued to drop. Once the new concept was put in place, suggesting that if the ministry makes this

matter a priority and appoints one party as an integrated address for all execution, backed by an extensive support network with additional flexible resources at measurable rates, the breakthrough would occur. This is the reality that we face now. After consistent focused work for a few years, the Foundation's vision was embraced, during Minister Bennett's tenure as mentioned, and a generous budget was allocated.

With recognition of the government's responsibility, with an understanding of the importance and urgency of the goal, and with a view of the window of opportunity provided by the joint venture and leveraging public awareness through the many partners that came to the collective impact table, the process reached an unprecedented scope. This scope accelerated the process of meeting goals even before reaching the agreed deadline for achieving them. We can certainly conclude that the ministry considers the advancement of excellence in mathematics as its responsibility. The minister and the director general are leading the way, regularly monitoring compliance with the goals; a joint steering committee accompanies the process and advises, the work plan is detailed down to the class and teacher level.

The work plan includes the assignment of tasks among the partners and close monitoring down to the level of a weekly status report. There is a large array of incentives, there are public relations and media activity to provide leverage, and there is noticeable mobilization of all partners in accordance with the needs on the ground. There is consensus among the government personnel and the Ministry of Education personnel that the Foundation's decision to operate from within the system was a correct decision, and after the "birth pangs" stage the strategy is proving itself as the only way to work harmoniously with the ministry.

Michal Cohen continues to talk about the joint work, explaining that: *As far as working within the system is concerned, the Trump Foundation is currently working very well with the Ministry of Education. The policy is determined by the ministry and the Foundation serves as a multiplier that leverages the ministry's ability to achieve goals. In the beginning it was not like this. They came in with their decision to promote science teachers and they were asked why specifically science? At first they declared what they want to advance, without asking if this is what the ministry wants, just assuming that the ministry will say "yes." Today they are on the correct path. Now there is joint work, with the formulation of strategy, metrics, and methodology, and they are involved in accompanying the integration process. A Foundation that wants to push an agenda and have an impact on the national level must connect to the professional level at the ministry that will lead the process.*

Regarding the question of working "within the system or outside it," Dasi Be'eri replies: *I don't know what is correct from a research standpoint, but from my experience the Trump Foundation is an excellent role model when it comes to focusing on the target - science and mathematics. The Foundation doesn't deal with mediocrity or a lack of clarity and focus. They are more precise than the ministry... Therefore, the discussions with the Trump Foundation are very clear-cut and this is very challenging for the ministry, which is not always so "clear-cut"... Excellence - this was always the ministry's focus.*

Zvika Aricha sees the process as one that can be learned from: *Trump's work from within the system, including its support of development and governmental entities, contributed greatly to the success. This investment is an investment over many years, because it included all of the required elements: research, fieldwork, conditions for success, and adaptation.*

The "Co-investor" Strategy

Notwithstanding the above, government officials had an ambivalent approach to the co-investor partnership strategy. On the one hand, they are aware of the difficulties, the bureaucratic foot-dragging and the time that is wasted during each process of tendering a contract with the ministry. Everyone has criticized the way the tender processes drag on, their complexity and the fact that they sometimes pose an obstacle. On the other hand, some people see the tender contract as a guarantee of stability and continuity throughout the years of the contract, as it serves as an "internal barrier" against the risk of policy changes, due to frequent changes in personnel, which are a result of ministers being replaced and the governing crisis in the State of Israel.

The fact that the Trump Foundation can execute joint decisions and its own decisions so quickly was not seen as lacking disadvantages. Some of the ministry personnel consider the relationship with the Center for Educational Technology (CET), a grantee of the Foundation, a contractual process like any other that suffers from all of the problems and defects of the ministry's tender process. Some of them also criticize the exclusivity of CET, which is undoubtedly seen as a provider of a quality product but is considered expensive. With a lack of competition, it hinders opportunities to utilize the potential for contracting with parties that would have allowed for cutting down on expenses and an intelligent use of resources over time. At the same time, the ministry's personnel did not offer an alternate solution that would address the weaknesses of each one of the sides of the coin.

Regarding the partnership strategy, Michal Cohen notes that: *The Foundation decides where it invests. On paper we do not have a relationship with them, rather with CET, so in any case there is a tender process.*

The Foundation does not want to get stuck dealing with government bureaucracy. Over time I think it would be a good idea to consider institutional cooperation processes. Since the cooperation is a result of the relationship with Eli, what exists today may not be possible tomorrow. The fact that there is no legal relationship also does not bind the ministry over time, for example if the minister were replaced. When there is a legal contract, the government is bound by it. As such, the method that they chose has some disadvantages, but there are advantages as well.

Dasi Be'eri is also ambivalent about the fact that the Trump Foundation avoids contracts and legal relationships with the ministry and argues: *Conceptually, they are right. Practically, today the ministry funds the Virtual High School program that is becoming too expensive for the ministry. I ask myself how did this happen? Budgetary methods are not my expertise. From a rational standpoint I understand that the Trump Foundation is right. CET's energies are directed at providing services for the issues where Trump is involved, while at the same time they are very expensive in other areas, and as a result it is very difficult for the ministry to move to the next step. CET is the most appropriate entity from a professional standpoint, but from a cost standpoint working with them is becoming impossible. I had experience with another foundation where the contractual difficulties doomed the plan. At the same time, the presence of this important foundation, the Trump Foundation, should serve as a red light, that a monopoly should not be created, which would increase the prices of the parties that provide services to it and to the ministry, which would negatively impact the rest of the process.*

Creating an Eco-system

The Trump Foundation's strategy for creating an eco-system has been met with a mixed

reaction. It is supported unreservedly by Sheatufim, which views the recruitment of such a large group of organizations with various interests and their transformation into an orchestra that plays in harmony, as an immense achievement of great value toward creating sympathetic public opinion. Sheatufim also recognizes the possibility of opposition being created if there weren't such a large circle of partners. Such voices could have undermined the ministry's work. The fundamental, extensive, and ongoing process, which such a large coalition produced, is an extremely valuable asset for any minister or director general, and they can use them to achieve a decisive impact and make meaningful changes on the ground.

In its own way, this coalition helped introduce new role models into the system: successful engineers and high-tech professionals. They visited schools to raise awareness of the importance of and motivation for studying mathematics at a five-unit level, and to assist in changing the branding of five-unit mathematics from elitism that is appropriate only for the few to a subject that is appropriate for the masses from all sectors, communities and sexes, and that everyone can succeed.

I should note that it appears that government officials are aware of the leverage that can be provided by the numerous partners to the process, especially key figures who are public opinion leaders. The Ministry of Education officials certainly benefit from the dialogue as well, which uncovered the various organizational cultures, challenging the ministry and allowing it to "sharpen its tools" and improve work methods. Furthermore, there is satisfaction with the extensive public consensus that was created and with its results, as well as the recognition that the Ministry of Education is receiving from partners from other sectors due to the exposure to the ministry's work.

These partners, who were at times the most critical of the ministry, learned to appreciate its work from up close, to understand the difficulties and complexities, to value the quality of the human capital found in the professional teams, the activities performed and their scope.

These numerous entities and their leaders serve, as of today, as goodwill ambassadors for the Ministry of Education in Israeli society and they are spokespeople for its work and achievements. At the same time, the ministry is clearly very sensitive to its status and importance as the program leader. The ministry would like to receive appropriate credit for its part, as they see it, via publicity in the media targeting the public, and at events where the partners are present. Some do not feel like this credit is given appropriately, consistently, and accurately. Some ministry officials are critical of the limited financial contribution of some of the partners and the way they are satisfied with an advisory role. These officials expect the participants, who joined the ministry and the Foundation in this program, to open their wallets. Some ministry officials would like to see the partners take responsibility for leading overlapping topics, which are not the core of the ministry's work, such as documentation and research. These are areas where the flexibility of these organizations can be leveraged in order to empower a systemic learning process that can be derived from them.

The method, which gives each organization - big or small - an equal voice around the table regardless of their objective contribution, is not to the satisfaction of all ministry officials. On the other hand, no other proposal was raised to provide representation based on relative weight or another structure. Sheatufim sees the Trump Foundation's decision to provide an equal voice to any organization regardless of its size, and its ability to reach agreements about an

equal process, as an immense virtuosic achievement, and Eli Hurvitz is given the credit for his negotiation abilities.

Shlomo Dushi says: *In this case a situation was created in which it has a great impact. It starts with the Trump Foundation's understanding that there is no organization, even a large organization that operates in an arena involving a complex issue that can independently create a decisive impact. And if they do have such an impact they will face criticism from the government. The Foundation was willing to act in a dual manner. They would promote their agenda in their own way, while at the same time putting aside their ego in order to create a wide-ranging coalition of partners that generally suits the strategy. One of the things we learned is that as long as the issue is authentic and there is a sense of urgency and many organizations want to work together, each organization still works on its own and employs its own manipulations, but they are willing to huddle under one flag with the same measurements and criteria in order to impact the government. If Eli and I sit with the government in a closed meeting and explain the problem, and also show them 60 organizations that got together to work as a coalition, the system can also hear alternatives from the opposition. And why should the government create an opposition? So, in a case of many groups who came together to support a central data-backed issue, no minister in his right mind wouldn't embrace the opportunity in one way or another... Such an organization has the kind of unbelievable momentum that carries all the forces forward on behalf of a shared objective, after they've made sure that the senior ministry officials share the same goal... Once a minister comes in and raises the flag to the top of the pole and allocates resources, the system still has a weak point, such as how to create motivation for students to sign up for the track, which requires a great amount of effort.*

This is difficult for the system, and the external force does the work. Thirty-seven commercial companies that send senior engineers to conversations with students, 407 schools that visit high-tech companies and learn about their systems, and then these become the current role models for the youth to identify with... There is something very unique here, very effective, even more than what we could have anticipated. The minister of education and the director general beside him, are very seriously pushing the issue and it is at the top of the agenda. This is an issue that could have been an elitist issue, and instead it removed obstacles that was in place for sectors of the population that did not have access - ultra-Orthodox women, children at youth villages, peripheral towns, regions that did not have an option to complete five units. You are bringing a package with a real value that is also easy to digest from a social standpoint.

Zvika Aricha claims that the eco-system generated a "buzz" in the system, a feeling sensed by the public, by partnering with the high-tech field and bringing them down to earth: *It even created humility among the engineers, who went into the classrooms and learned from the teachers' work. They learned to appreciate them and understand that they have what to learn.*

At the same time, Aricha was disappointed that, *These partners all come in for one part - an engineer who comes to one lesson and gets the students excited cannot be compared to what a teacher does over time. I won't agree to projects of expert engineers. I want teachers who will be with the students over time. Long-term teaching provides deep insights that cannot be received through "glimpses." I don't need and I don't want anyone to come to us as "saviors" or advisors. On the other hand, if they open their wallets and contribute to the system so it can do more, that would be appreciated... The Trump Foundation, unlike*

the various advisors, allows for a dream to be fulfilled with real ongoing assistance.... A partnership was created in which the system was harnessed to the project just as much as the external partner. I must note that one of the things that really bothers me in the publications about the leading teachers in the academic field, is who takes credit from among the academics, the government, and the people on the ground. Instead of publicizing "come see a jewel of a process with long-term partnership thinking, that connects interests, and come join us because we will do something that you can learn from," the Weizmann Institute published it as the Weizmann Institute's teachers' communities. The Ministry of Education fully funds all of the communities at the moment. The Foundation left after three years. There is continuity and they are copying the methods that were learned. Today there are 600 teachers in 200 communities.

Dasi Be'eri sees the eco-system that the Trump Foundation worked so hard on, as a correct concept from the standpoint of partnering and recruiting public partners in a way that empowers the ministry: *At first there was contempt from the private organizations towards the ministry, but as we moved forward it turned out that the ministry was much better than what was perceived. On the other hand, the organizations challenged the ministry and forced it to improve. There is great value in partnership because it creates deep recognition and mutual appreciation. At the collective impact roundtable some of the partners learned to see more things in the ministry's work. But Dasi adds that: At the table something public is missing. In the partnership circles everyone is equal, there is something related to personality or character; you may be a manager in a low-level organization and you become a partner who is listened to, even though your contribution as an organization is unproven. And a person like Eli, whose personality is quiet, may be*

heard less. Something in this model may require examination, regarding the relative strength of the partners, which may get lost in all of this, because each organization has one voice. I don't know whether it is bad or good, but there isn't always consistency between the amount of work and the amount of involvement in the discussion. It is worth thinking about this.

Michal Cohen says that: *As far as the eco-system is concerned, I don't know whether the Trump Foundation brought all of the partners. Sheatufim, the Trump Foundation, and the ministry all joined together, and everyone brought partners. The Foundation knows how to work with partners. It doesn't fight for its place and it looks for ways to increase our combined strength and to leverage it, and it backs up the ministry well. The ministry feels like there is public resonance at times. But it is important to emphasize that when I come to an event with partners, for example, the event that took place at the Sheatufim conference, I am not sure what the purpose of the event was. Is the purpose to connect all of them, to promote the partnership, to create public noise about the plans? Many times I felt that when Minister Bennett came and put an emphasis on mathematics, the issue was in any case pushed forward with the ministry leading. Sheatufim's event with the minister was an enormous, bombastic, grandiose event that was covered by the media, and I didn't understand its precise purpose. If as a Foundation you don't want to take ownership of an issue, and you really want to be behind the scenes, even an event like this sends a message. When the minister and the director general come to such an event, it raises a question for me. Because the event put them in a place that was unclear to me, and I am not sure what the value of this event was in promoting the cause. It was weird for me and I did not feel like the ministry was at the center of attention, rather it was public relations that in my view is not so essential.*

The CEO of Intel and Eli Hurvitz talked about the great success and I explicitly told them "don't get confused." It was the ministry that determined the policy and invested one hundred million shekels. And contrary to the atmosphere of partnership in which we usually work together, there we got the sense that the ministry was just a sidekick. Nevertheless, among all the partners there is a great atmosphere and good work. Every plan they fund is in partnership with the ministry. Their added value is in the fact that they initiate, stimulate, and create public resonance.

A very important and challenging point in each extensive partnership organization process is finding the precise focal point, an area on which all of the efforts must be concentrated. The choice of mathematics appears, at this stage, to be a correct consensual choice, because it is fundamental. Beyond the goal of creating technological scientific excellence at the high school level among about twenty percent of the students, it allows for the high school graduates to choose from a wide variety of subjects and professions in higher education and in the work force.

Sustainability

The question of the sustainability of the Foundation's activity and creating an infrastructure that will ensure further activity for many years is of concern to all of the interviewees. All those asked recognize that without a clear policy from the minister and without appropriate funding there will be no continuity for the work that is taking place. It appears that there are two sides to the success coin. On the one hand, the government and the Foundation recognize the importance of the ministry's leadership and funding as part of its overarching responsibility. On the other hand, the ministry recognizes the importance of the Foundation acting as an engine, an accelerator, a gatekeeper, an integrator,

as one that provides leverage and momentum, with a flexible ability to act quickly without obstacles and as such, it can assist at many junctures and in many different ways to help the process succeed and to meet the goals.

I should note that at this stage none of the interviewees felt that the infrastructure that was put in place guarantees sustainability. Many of the activities produced noticeable results on the ground. An increase in the number of students, more teachers, more quality clinical teaching experience, more forums for colleagues to learn from each other, more committed staff members, more public awareness. At the same time, after years of painful experience nobody feels confident enough to guarantee, or even to believe, that it can be assumed that the present infrastructure will carry the program into the future on its own.

A specific reference to the infrastructural gaps was expressed in the context of the importance of creating a mechanism based on precise data, which will allow for an understanding of the performance and needs of the teachers in the different stages of their professional development. A system that will allow a comprehensive view of the potential target audiences for teaching mathematics and sciences, where they will come from, what is required in the training and development process, and how many teachers will be required each year in order to meet the growing demand, the regular maintenance and the quality assurance.

This raises the question of which mechanism will most effectively allow for a precise collection of data from the field for the purpose of monitoring, remuneration, planning, and decision-making. Concern was expressed regarding the quality of the ministry's data, which is collected from the field through the school principals who are very busy and do not consider sending data to the ministry a priority of their job. In fact, it is a task that many complain about.

Dilemmas also arose regarding the proper basic tools needed to maintain public awareness over time and the importance of expanding the efforts to specific segments of the population, and whether creating an annual progress report on this topic and publishing it would help create appropriate public noise. The importance of establishing management, financial and organizational infrastructure to support the endeavor was emphasized, as this would ensure that the focus on intensive work is maintained. Emphasis was placed on the fact that the supplemental budget must be anchored as a basic element of the overall regular budget. This anchor will establish the long-term continuity and will reduce the concern regarding across-the-board cuts and sharp policy changes, or deficits in periods of political instability.

I would like to emphasize that all those interviewed feel like there is much work to be done. On the one hand, it is necessary to expand and deepen the program. At the same time there is a need for continued attention to the implementation of monitoring and oversight, of incentives and remuneration, and most importantly the continuity of a funded strategy of promoting and positioning a goal of developing excellence in science and mathematics, as an overarching goal in the coming years for the Ministry of Education. Michal Cohen notes that: *Looking towards the future, as long as the ministry continues to lead the program and to invest resources - there will be sustainability.*

Yulia Eitan says that: *On the sustainability level - there is no existence without the Ministry of Education. Sustainability will always depend on who the minister and the director general are. Despite everything that was done it is not possible to guarantee sustainability. Of course, we are building stable foundations, but the challenge is to anchor the activity with tools that are less reversible, to make the plans a fundamental part of the budget and part of the routine work of the ministries.*

Dasi Be'eri addresses the sustainability issue as follows: *Some of these activities are sustainable. The Virtual High School program, for example, cannot go backwards, but additional hours depend on the minister's policy. The mechanisms that were created are partially a fact on the ground. The question of sustainability is also related to the question of awareness. If there is no supportive public awareness, there is less confidence in continuity, because agendas change as the ministers and governments are replaced. I believe that leading teachers will become the norm. There is a deeply-ingrained tendency to avoid mathematics and science, and this perception will not disappear quickly. We are only halfway there. Over the last two years there has been a great increase in the number of students, but this does not guarantee that it will always be this way. Looking towards the future it is important to continue creating a public consensus, not only in the professional circles and within the ministry, but out in the public sphere. Within the next five years the government will be replaced and it is therefore important to establish guarantees and anchors so that the culture and routines will continue. The Foundation does not have to create this, but it certainly must push it forward and promote it in order to establish it.*

Zvika Aricha notes: *I am unsettled regarding sustainability. The problem is the ministry, which does not ensure sustainability. The government is always making cuts... It is still not clear whether the government will continue the process. Continuity requires government policy and budget... But I do not want the process not to continue and not be completed in another five years. The Ministry is not able to fill Eli's shoes and those of the Foundation and to continue to sustain the models. Eli and the Foundation have great respect for the system and they work with humility. They are like a small mosquito facing a large elephant. This is also true in terms of resources. Yet even a small steering wheel changes the direction of the boat. The change*

that we are starting to see now will only fully come to fruition in another three years. Now things are moving along well, but if it is halted it will take time for anyone to restart it."

Shlomo Dushi notes on this matter that: *The issue of sustainability reminds me of what the minister of education said in the last meeting, that the system is jumping forward, but it is running on steroids. The truth is that we need to build muscles, since there is no sufficient infrastructure and the challenge over the next two years must be to ask: what is the required infrastructure?*

Intermediate Conclusions

As far as drawing conclusions from the Foundation's modus operandi is concerned, Ministry of Education officials feel that **the dialogue process must be established and improved**. Even if today, after five years of work, there is a sense that the work methods have become an established norm, this was not the case in the beginning and even today "tweaks" are necessary in terms of the quality and frequency of the partnership. Some of the people report that they would like to know about things from the conceptual stage and to participate regularly in meetings that take place from time to time. Even today some of the Ministry of Education staff, who are leading partners in the process, say that they only learn about activities after the fact from people on the ground.

At the top level, the director general emphasizes that as of today the partnership takes place in the correct dosages, efficiently and with a good atmosphere, but this was not the case in the beginning.

At the same time, it is clear that if there is a point that spans all lines and is shared by all of the government staff, it is the desire to be partners in a regular dialogue, which will provide them with a current status report throughout all stages, from the planning stage up to assessment of execution. The proper dosage must be consistent with the degree of involvement. The aspiration to establish a regular process and improve it indicates a desire to provide impactful feedback, as well as a desire and sincere willingness and professional need of the ministry staff to be leaders and true partners in the processes that are taking place.

Michal Cohen goes into further detail: *Already when I was deputy director general, I held a "crisis" meeting with them, because there was a sense that that they are talking about what is important to them, and even though they did have influence within the ministry, the ministry itself was not leading and it certainly was not leading from top to bottom. In this meeting I tried to set limits and get on the same page. Since then, we launched 5X2, and Sheatufim was very helpful with this connection. At least in the beginning it was hard for me to understand and to identify a driving force, so we defined the limits, the policy, and the leader. When Minister Bennett came and decided to put mathematics at center stage, we were able to immediately launch 5X2.*

Zvika Aricha clarifies what requires improvement: *The Foundation's management method doesn't always include everyone in the process in real time, from the dream stage... A while back I complained to Eli and Tammy that they do a lot of things related to physics that I only find out about indirectly. And if the Foundation conducts an activity at the Kibbutzim College that I am not a part of - how will there be sustainability and continuity? This is a point that requires improvement. It is important to conduct status updates that include all of the information. Without my*

cooperation as chief inspector of physics it will be difficult to succeed. I organized the program despite the coincidental manner in which I found out about it - I heard about it from the instructor - out of a sense of responsibility...

Dasi Be'eri also distinguishes between "then" and "now": *Regarding the methods of communication with the ministry staff I observed something very random about the way the Foundation came into the ministry and only got to my department at a later stage, coincidentally. In many stages there was a work interface, but this was not planned and it was not managed, and suddenly we found ourselves partners. Why did we never act in an orderly fashion rather than "on the go"? Something about the entry method was disorganized. At first there was no clear awareness of the nature of their role and their involvement. This only happened as we moved forward. And this must be improved. Today the government is satisfied, and if, as we continue, there is measurable change whose presence is felt, this will cause the government to continue to be satisfied.*

Yulia Eitan focuses on the following: *The executive director of the Trump Foundation made sure to update and to receive updates in a non-intensive matter, but he maintained the partnership at an appropriate dosage. Nevertheless, once a year it would be good to have structured status updates. The process ran forward and entered the track, but it is still important to be there in order to identify what is needed and to maintain the focus.*

Furthermore, looking towards the future but also retrospectively, wishes and desires arise not only to continue the processes, but also to expand and to add to them. The need was identified for an additional circle of partners - that was not part of the current circle - from foundations and funding entities who can bring with them an additional resource of

thinking differently, which has the potential to inspire the process.

The ministry staff would like the Foundation staff to help them fulfill additional professional dreams which, due to the ministry's bureaucracy or the lack of flexibility of immediate liquid resources, makes them difficult to realize. A precise dialogue with them can lead to expansion and to the addition of processes that are consistent with the primary objective. There is an understanding today of the importance of precise and comprehensive documentation of the process, and its absence is unfortunate since much information could have been produced from it going forward. It appears that the ministry staff would like to be assisted by research and development in this area, and by creating conceptual documents and academic research, which would help strengthen the processes, establish, and validate the questions that nag at them, and make tools available to leverage the process in the public sphere.

The nagging conceptual questions include, for example, questions about how to expand such a significant process without losing focus? How to create a practical plan for leading significant programs with such a scope? How to retain the insights along with the practical plan, which the ministry feels like it learned and upgraded, regarding the organizational ability it developed to generate processes of internal systemic progress with synchronization and coordination between officials? The ministry staff, who feel that today they have someone to talk to about these aspirations and they can even be addressed, are concerned about the day after.

Dasi Be'eri emphasizes the importance of the conceptual change: *Regarding the question of what is missing, I would like to put more emphasis on winning over hearts and minds within the system and among the public. I say this despite 5X2 and despite President Peres. Furthermore, we didn't spend enough*

time on in-depth conceptual documents, on making the concept more accessible and on the added value for the public. At the ministry it is very difficult to find time to prepare in-depth conceptual documents and perhaps this is the Foundation's role. Nobody transferred all the activity into a document that is submitted for the public's comment or for there to be an academic discussion, and then cynicism develops about other things. For example, a statement that the Ministry of Education does not care about violence because it is busy with mathematics. In this case there is a circle of partners. I would expect the Foundation to reinforce the partners and help develop a practical plan for raising awareness. Even for the student - the roundtable should explain to him the reasons for studying five units of math, as well as a virtual roundtable that will explain the importance to the entire public: students, parents, and the general public. I am certain that the Foundation has the documents and the documentation, and the ability to move a respectable process forward in a way that it will have an impact on the governmental level and become a national program with clear benefits laid out, in order to extinguish the cynicism with clear research-validated responses.

Regarding the question "what would I nevertheless do differently?" Shlomo Dushi answers: *I would build another circle that we didn't build. There is a circle of companies that coordinates and funds the visits at about 450 schools. One thing I didn't do and I would have done, is create a coalition of foundations and funding entities, since we may be surprised to discover the added value of such a process for the initiative. What was lacking is a new resource, with thought put into it, which is not exactly our role, but we could have contributed to this indirectly. Because we are also lacking the method of work and the players from the philanthropy field. These players could have made a special effort in this direction as well.*

I don't identify anything beyond this. Overall, there is an atmosphere in this arena that is very positive.

I would like to emphasize that all of the interviewees expressed a great amount of confidence that the experience with the Foundation allows a model to be produced that can be learned from in the future and be used to lead partnership processes of great value with wide-ranging consensus. They assert that there are mandatory conditions that were conceptualized for success with a philanthropic foundation, and they are:

1. Choosing an important central topic on the agenda
2. In-depth study of the subject and collecting precise up-to-date information regarding the phenomenon
3. The government must lead while taking overarching responsibility for the process
4. Support from professionals in the ministry for the vitality and importance of the process
5. Precise coordination and consensus regarding the vision, goals, and methods of action
6. Determining an integrating responsible body within the ministry
7. A joint coordinated process from the beginning of the planning stage, while ensuring an ongoing dialogue with update meetings through all the phases of execution
8. Recruiting significant relevant partners to support the process and creating supportive public opinion
9. Winning over hearts and minds; increasing consciousness and public awareness in extensive circles
10. Creating a sense of urgency and maintaining motivation over time
11. Maintaining the proper balance of private resources versus public resources in all stages of the process
12. Maintaining a willingness to listen and empathy along with determination

to promote the processes with all of the partners

13. All of the partners must remain humble and leave leadership to the ministry
14. Committed and determined leadership

The interviewees also referred to **situations which are tempting but must be avoided when working with a philanthropic foundation:**

1. Just because someone brings money to the table, it doesn't mean cooperation with them is desirable or appropriate. Cooperation must be avoided with those who come to address the senior officials' troubles by providing "petty cash."
2. Ensure that the partnership creates an added value for the State.
3. The State does not like to work with foundations that behave in a patronizing manner and gloat about "trapping" the government into a long-term obligation it may not be able to uphold.

Summary and Conclusions

If we examine how government perceives its success and the ability to meet the three objectives determined by the Foundation, already at this stage we can say that the number of mathematics students at the five-unit matriculation level increased to 13,000, well beyond what was determined for this stage of the program. Of course, it must be verified that all of the students take the matriculation tests at this level on their completion of 12th grade, and then it can be assumed that this index will be considered a success. Physics studies are growing in parallel, since in most cases they are the same students who take advanced mathematics.

Regarding the goal for the change to seep into all layers of the education system, it

appears that the change is in process. The media and public campaign to convince parents and students of the importance of studying mathematics at the five-unit level is in full force, and the number of students studying five units is constantly on the rise. The increase in the number of teachers, the improvement in the quality of teachers who were and are being trained to teach these students and those who will follow them, the support frameworks that were developed for them, and the pedagogical practices that were developed by them, are an inseparable part of the success in meeting this objective. There is still a need for additional mathematics and physics teachers, and despite the "bottleneck" it appears that if the demand is tailing supply, then along with the steps that have to be taken, there is also reason for optimism.

The third objective, which deals with the aspiration to create infrastructure for continuity, to guarantee the sustainability of the process over the years even if the Foundation ceases to be involved, still requires "supporting scaffolding" and reinforcement. The Virtual High School exists, the teacher communities are working, and the processes of developing and training teachers are taking place. Furthermore, as public awareness develops and intensifies, the partnerships are expanding and becoming more established. At the same time, not all the partners express confidence in the infrastructural capabilities that were established in order to make this a permanent process for the long-term without the professional, budgetary and moral support network provided by the Foundation. They are concerned about the ministry's ability to maintain the processes without ongoing strategic leadership that is backed by the policy and budget of the current minister.

The answers to the question regarding the Foundation's chosen strategy indicate a very

high level of satisfaction with the character of the head of the organization and his methods of operation. There is a sweeping consensus regarding the Foundation's decision to operate "within the system," to focus on one important and significant core topic, whereas government is entrusted with and exclusively responsible for leading the process. The Foundation serves as a catalyst that allows for and accelerates processes with flexibility and efficiency in order to help the government promote important processes with a consensus.

The decision to operate as an investing partner without a formal contract and without a tender is perceived by the ministry officials as being advantageous in the way it addresses the ministry's bureaucracy, but it has other disadvantages. It causes some of the processes to become more expensive and creates a risk of transience if there are changes in personnel.

Additionally, regarding the ecosystem issue there were critical voices concerning the partners' level of involvement and place. Nevertheless, it is apparent that the ministry officials learned to recognize the many advantages of working in a transparent partnership with this group that serves as a power multiplier, as goodwill ambassadors who generate supportive public opinion for the process, alongside additional advantages of the partnership. A partnership has the tendency to create an atmosphere, an environment and a synergy that inspire additional dreams and aspirations as challenges to be fulfilled, even beyond the shared challenge of creating continuity and sustainability for the process.

As with any intensive, comprehensive project there is room for improvement in certain areas, but all of the partners are convinced that the present partnership is a breakthrough that will lead to significant achievements.

The modus operandi of the Foundation and the strategy that was chosen has proven itself at this stage as being very powerful and effective in promoting the process itself, but also as something that can be learned from on behalf of future programs and on behalf of future partnerships.

This case study can be summarized in the words of Executive Director of Sheatufim, Mr. Shlomo Dushi, which reflect the spirit of all of those interviewed:

I believe the government has good reason to be very satisfied with the partnership model. The minister can take credit for a revolution in the education system. The action we are taking now will have an impact on the next 50 years of the State of Israel. The ministry embraced this as a flagship program and the minister can demonstrate that in three years he achieved a revolution, and then he can certainly be satisfied. There is a new different model here, which you won't find in any government book and is not familiar in the government world, since it comes from other worlds with great complexity and immense focus. The collective impact world instilled concepts that were intended to coexist well with this complex world, to contain the complexity as a present reality, not to be afraid of it, and to utilize it positively. The wisdom in this process is to solve problems while involving all the interested parties, and to build trust - a process that is much more interesting than working alone. The Trump Foundation, by just initiating the process, created a breakthrough and a strategic reality-changing process, and it would not have achieved these results without the process. It therefore deserves a lot of credit, for the process and for the results. This year there will be 13,000 students taking the [five-unit matriculation] tests. We only expected this to happen in another 5 years - and this is thanks to the Foundation's activity. ■