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Introduction

In March 2014, Leading Edge and Bridgespan published the report, *Cultivating the Next Generation of Leaders for Jewish Nonprofits*, attempting to understand why many Jewish organizations are struggling to attract and retain talent. This Bridgespan report found that workplace culture is a critical element for organizations in recruiting, cultivating, and retaining stellar staff to fulfill their missions and assume leadership roles.

In response, Leading Edge launched the Leading Places to Work initiative to support Jewish organizations in creating “great places to work.”

Leading Edge partnered with Korn Ferry Hay Group to pilot a groundbreaking employee engagement survey in February 2016. A total of 3,422 employees across 55 Jewish organizations responded to questions about their workplace culture, the critical factors that drive their levels of engagement at work, and what motivates the likelihood that they will stay in or leave their organizations—and the Jewish nonprofit sector as a whole.

This report summarizes the survey’s findings.
Executive Summary
Within the next five to seven years, 75 to 90% of Jewish nonprofit organizations will be faced with the daunting challenge of replacing their retiring CEOs and executive directors. This may prove difficult as organizations are struggling to attract and retain talent.

It is time, therefore, for the Jewish nonprofit sector to heed the message long understood by the business community: A great organizational culture attracts talented professionals, develops their skills, and enables them to do their best work.

In February 2016, Leading Edge partnered with Korn Ferry Hay Group to pilot a groundbreaking employee engagement survey.

A total of 3,422 employees across 55 Jewish organizations responded to questions about their workplace culture, the critical factors that drive their levels of engagement at work, and what motivates the likelihood that they will stay with or leave their organization.

While it is uncertain that these pilot survey findings perfectly mirror the sector as a whole, they do offer an important baseline reference point for identifying levers that can help Jewish organizations create better workplaces.
Survey Background

The survey is based on Korn Ferry Hay Group's Employee Effectiveness Framework, which includes 12 areas that lead to engaged and enabled employees, ensuring that they feel effective in their work and, in turn, deliver desired organizational results.

**Engagement:** the extent to which employees are committed to their organization

**Enablement:** the extent to which employees feel supported in reaching their full potential

Based on responses, employees were grouped into four profiles:

- **EFFECTIVE:** highly engaged; highly enabled
- **DETACHED:** highly enabled; not fully engaged
- **FRUSTRATED:** highly engaged; not enabled
- **INEFFECTIVE:** unengaged; not enabled

Survey Findings

After comparing survey results from the Leading Edge pilot organizations to the General Industry Benchmark, which includes data collected from 6.4 million employees in 390 companies from around the world and a variety of industries in the private sector, the following high-level findings emerged:

**STRENGTHS**

Leading Edge pilot organizations scored higher than the General Industry Benchmark on the following statements:

- Employees are motivated by the mission of their organization and understand how their specific job contributes to it. († 13%)
- Employees feel they are treated respectfully. († 10%)
- Employees are challenged by their work. († 9%)

**WEAKNESSES**

Leading Edge pilot organizations scored lower than the General Industry Benchmark on the following statements:

- Poorly performing employees are held accountable. (¶ 16%)
- Employees feel they are being compensated well enough. (¶ 6%)
- Employees feel there are enough people to get the work done. (¶ 11%)
- Employees feel they have adequate opportunities to advance their careers. (¶ 9%)
- Employees plan to stay with the organization for at least the next five years. (¶ 20%)
The Korn Ferry Hay Group Employee Effectiveness Matrix for the 55 Leading Edge pilot organizations showed the following:

**Korn Ferry Hay Group Effectiveness Matrix**

![Effectiveness Matrix Diagram](image)

Once organizations have an understanding of where employees fall on the effectiveness matrix, they can develop interventions to lead them into the effective quadrant.

A few examples of areas to focus on in order to shift detached and ineffective employees into feeling more effective include:

- Ensuring employees feel valued, respected, and recognized for their work;
- Emphasizing career development;
- Making training a priority;
- Encouraging give and take in the workplace; and
- Focusing on quality.

**Conclusion**

Following this pilot survey, Leading Edge will continue its work to help Jewish organizations improve their cultures. It will curate resources and best practices, provide trainings, and offer opportunities for organizations to connect with regarding their progress in these areas. It will also repeat and expand the employee engagement survey so that additional organizations have access to this tool.

As organizations focus on addressing barriers such as a shortage of people resources, inadequate performance standards, lack of accountability, and the absence of clarity regarding career paths, the Jewish nonprofit sector will move toward a more effective workplace culture to better attract, retain, and develop talent—our most precious resource.
Many emerging leaders are quite driven and willing to take on challenging roles, but not in organizations with rigid cultures that lack collaboration, innovation, and autonomy.

— Cultivating the Next Generation of Leaders for Jewish Nonprofits, A Report by Leading Edge in Partnership with Bridgespan, 2014
Why Culture Matters

Within the next five to seven years, 75 to 90% of Jewish nonprofit organizations will be faced with the daunting challenge of replacing their retiring CEOs and executive directors. Unfortunately, Leading Edge’s conversations with several hundred professional and lay leaders across the Jewish world have made clear that the pipeline is running dry: Organizations are struggling to attract and retain talent.

According to the report, Cultivating the Next Generation of Leaders for Jewish Nonprofits, many Jewish organizations have rigid, bureaucratic workplace cultures and steep hierarchies; provide little autonomy for junior and mid-level staff to take risks and feel ownership over their work; offer limited career advancement; and struggle to compete on salary. As a result, Jewish organizations hold minimal attraction for the next generation of leaders, especially when compared with more innovative workplaces outside the field.

At a time when the American Jewish community is rapidly changing, it is critical that organizations change the way they operate to adapt to today’s workplace realities.

A great organizational culture attracts talented professionals, develops their skills, and enables them to do their best work. Many organizations understand that the cost of losing effective employees can be substantial, as can hiring the wrong ones. It is critical that the Jewish nonprofit sector considers this as well.

“A great place to work is one in which you trust the people you work for, have pride in what you do, and enjoy the people you work with.”

— Robert Levering
Co-Founder, Great Place to Work®
What is a Leading Place to Work?

What makes a leading place to work? Leading Edge conducted a broad literature review across industries, disciplines, and sectors and identified five core factors of great workplace culture. Most of the research has been conducted in the private sector, where businesses have long understood that talent is their most precious asset. The lessons gleaned from corporate peers are directly applicable to Jewish nonprofit organizations. The items on the survey do not directly correspond with these five factors, but each of these factors is accounted for throughout the survey.

FIVE CORE FACTORS OF A LEADING PLACE TO WORK

TRUSTED LEADERS: Leading places to work start at the top. Trusted leadership requires buy-in, commitment, and focus from top management and senior leadership to create policies, practices, and procedures that empower employees to thrive.

COMMON PURPOSE: Leading places to work have a clear vision and core values that are regularly communicated, both internally to staff and externally to the communities they serve. Leaders inspire their employees by finding ways to reconnect them to the greater purpose of their work and help them understand how what they do is pivotal to the organization’s overall mission.

RESPECTED EMPLOYEES: Leading places to work treat employees with respect so they feel valued and valuable. That respect begins during the hiring process, continues through onboarding and training, and is woven throughout all the interactions that take place between management and staff.

TALENT DEVELOPMENT: Leading places to work recognize that professionals crave opportunities to advance their knowledge, skill sets, and abilities. Employees want to feel that their employer invests in them and cares about their future; that there is a plan for their growth and development; and that their advancement is considered important to the organization.

SALARY AND BENEFITS: Leading places to work understand that salary and benefits are a foundational element of an employee’s experience in the workplace. These organizations have clear compensation philosophies and methodologies undergirding the roles and responsibilities of their teams. Nonprofit organizations often feel constrained in this area due to tight budgets. Leading places to work find ways to equitably, flexibly, and creatively establish and clearly communicate their compensation and benefits packages.
“The best workplaces allow employees to focus on things that matter, make a difference, and develop as people.”

— Mark Royal
Korn Ferry Hay Group
In order to collect baseline data about employee engagement in the Jewish nonprofit sector—engagement being a key driver of a leading place to work—Leading Edge partnered with Korn Ferry Hay Group, a global leader in employee research, to create and administer an employee engagement survey.

Leading Edge invited 55 organizations to participate in the survey pilot, as seen in Figure 1. These groups range in size from a handful of employees to over 300, and represent a diverse cross section of the Jewish nonprofit field in the United States. They include federations, JCCs, foundations, religious movements, educational institutions, social justice groups, and social welfare organizations. Organizations were required to have at least five employees to provide greater assurance of anonymity of responses when the data were shared with organizational leaders.¹

Despite the diversity of this sample, these results cannot be extrapolated easily to the entire Jewish nonprofit community. Leading Edge does not have enough data yet to say with certainty that these survey findings perfectly represent the sector as a whole. However, they offer an important baseline reference point for identifying possible levers that can help Jewish organizations create better workplaces.

¹. See Appendix A for a full list of pilot organizations.
The survey is based on Korn Ferry Hay Group’s Employee Effectiveness Framework, represented in Figure 2. The framework includes 12 areas that lead to engaged and enabled employees, ensuring that they feel effective in their work and, in turn, deliver desired organizational results.
ENGAGEMENT measures the extent to which employees are committed to the organization and willing to apply discretionary effort in their work.

ENABLEMENT measures the extent to which employees view their job conditions as supporting them in performing to their full potential.

Based on data collected from questions directly measuring engagement and enablement, employees were then grouped into four profiles reflecting how they felt in their jobs: Effective, Detached, Ineffective, or Frustrated, as shown in Figure 3.

**FIGURE 3**
Korn Ferry Hay Group’s Effectiveness Matrix

- **EFFECTIVE:** describes highly engaged and highly enabled employees. These individuals are motivated and extremely productive.

- **FRUSTRATED:** describes highly engaged employees who are not well enabled. These individuals are not set up for success, are mismatched to the role they have, and struggle with change.

- **DETACHED:** describes highly enabled employees who are not fully engaged. These individuals are engaged with their day-to-day tasks and/or their role at the agency, but not with the agency itself. These employees struggle with change and cannot align with the company direction.

- **INEFFECTIVE:** describes unengaged employees who do not feel well enabled. These individuals find it challenging to be motivated by the organization and are a poor fit for the role.
Results of the Leading Edge pilot group were compared to two external Korn Ferry Hay Group benchmarks:

**Nonprofit and Public Sector Benchmark**—includes data collected from 24,000 employees in seven organizations across the nonprofit and public sectors.

**General Industry Benchmark**—includes data collected from 6.4 million employees in 390 companies from around the world and a variety of industries in the private sector.

Because of the small sample size making up the Nonprofit and Public Sector Benchmark, this report uses the General Industry Benchmark as the comparative norm. When results from the Jewish nonprofit field deviated +/- four points from the General Industry Benchmark, they were considered significant and therefore highlighted as either "Strengths" or "Opportunities for Improvement" in the Results & Analysis section of this report.

### Survey Administration

Leading Edge prepared each organization for the survey release by conducting both conference and individual calls, and provided templates for organizations to communicate with their employees, and ready them for the survey launch. In February 2016, Korn Ferry Hay Group emailed respondents a survey link to an online survey. Data were gathered from each respondent anonymously and aggregated by Korn Ferry Hay Group.

Respondents were asked to rate each question on the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Strongly Agree" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Agree" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Neutral" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Disagree" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Strongly Disagree" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**For the purpose of analysis:**

- Responses of “Strongly Agree” and “Agree” indicate a **favorable** response.
- Responses of “Disagree” and “Strongly Disagree” indicate an **unfavorable** response.

Based on responses, employees were then placed into one of the four effectiveness profiles, as defined in **Figure 3**.
The survey consisted of 55 scored questions and two open response (comment) questions. Each question corresponded to the 12 key areas identified in the Korn Ferry Hay Group Employee Effectiveness Framework, defined in Figure 2. Employees were then placed into one of the four effectiveness profiles defined in Figure 3.

Each organization was given access to an online dashboard where it could analyze its own results, and compare its results with the aggregate results of the other pilot organizations.

Leading Edge offered all pilot organizations individual consultation calls to walk them through their results and their implications. Each organization was encouraged to determine from its own data the one or two actions it could take that would have the most significant impact on its employees' engagement and enablement. Many of the pilot organizations have already embarked upon an ongoing process to address the opportunities that emerged from the survey.

Sample Size

For the pilot survey, Leading Edge sought to gather data from 5% of employees across Jewish organizations in the United States.

There are approximately 9,500 Jewish nonprofits in the United States.² Using the national average of eight employees working per nonprofit, Leading Edge estimates there are approximately 76,000 employees working in Jewish nonprofits in the United States.³

There were 4,740 potential respondents in the pilot group, with nearly 3,500 employees responding to the survey, which is approximately 5% of employees at Jewish nonprofits.

The 55 organizations that participated in the survey were required to have at least five employees to ensure anonymity of results.

---

² Dr. Paul Burstein’s 2009 publication, “Jewish Nonprofit Organizations in the U.S.: A Preliminary Survey,” identified approximately 9,500 Jewish nonprofits in the United States.

³ According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 11.4 million people work in the nonprofit sector and according to the Center for Charitable Statistics, there are 1.5 million nonprofits in the United States, which is an average of eight people per nonprofit. Thus, Leading Edge estimates there are approximately 76,000 employees working in Jewish nonprofits in the United States.
“Great employers must shift the focus from trying to get more out of people, to investing more in them by addressing their four core needs—physical, emotional, mental, and spiritual—so they’re freed, fueled, and inspired to bring the best of themselves to work every day.”

— Tony Schwartz
President and CEO of The Energy Project
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Results & Analysis

Demographics

The 55 organizations surveyed employ 4,740 individuals, of which 3,422 responded to the survey, a 72% response rate.4

Of the respondents, 66% identified as female, 29% identified as male, and 5% answered “other” or “prefer not to answer” (see Figure 4).

At the time of the survey, 54% of potential respondents were between the ages of 20 and 39 (see Figure 5). It is estimated that the Leading Edge pilot group skews younger than the estimated average age across the Jewish nonprofit sector because of the inclusion of organizations like BBYO and Hillel, which tend to employ younger professionals. The professional levels of respondents were categorized based on supervisory responsibilities, as seen in Figure 6, with management and leadership making up 42% of respondents in the pilot group.5

4. For more demographic data, see Appendix B.

5. Data on pages 12 and 13 is based on respondents’ self-reported information. Some respondents chose not to answer all questions, which explains instances where the numbers do not entirely align with total number of survey respondents.
At the time of the survey, 54% of potential respondents were between the ages of 20 and 39. It is estimated that the Leading Edge pilot group skews younger than the estimated average age across the Jewish nonprofit sector because of organizations like BBYO and Hillel, which tend to employ younger professionals. Note: 169 respondents did not answer this question.

Of the respondents, 66% identified as female, 29% identified as male, and 5% answered “other” or “prefer not to answer.”

Of the 55 organizations, approximately 70% (40) are led by male CEOs, and approximately 30% (15) are led by female CEOs.

The professional levels of respondents were categorized based on supervisory responsibility. Those with management and leadership responsibilities comprised a total of 42% of respondents in the pilot group.
Leading Edge also collected basic salary information from respondents (see Figure 7), with the largest salary group being the $40,000 to $49,999 range.

**Figure 7**

Salary Ranges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$350k+</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$300k – $349,999</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250k – $299,999</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200k – $249,999</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150k – $199,999</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$125k – $149,999</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100k – $124,999</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90k – $99,999</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80k – $89,999</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70k – $79,999</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60k – $69,999</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50k – $59,999</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40k – $49,999</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30k – $39,999</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$29,999</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Themes

Based on survey results, here’s how Leading Edge pilot organizations compare to the General Industry Benchmark:

STRENGTHS

Leading Edge pilot organizations scored higher than the General Industry Benchmark on the following statements:

- Employees are motivated by the mission of their organization and understand how their specific job contributes to it. (13%)
- Employees feel they are treated respectfully. (10%)
- Employees are challenged by their work. (9%)

WEAKNESSES

Leading Edge pilot organizations scored lower than the General Industry Benchmark on the following statements:

- Poorly performing employees are held accountable. (16%)
- Employees feel they are being compensated well enough. (6%)
- Employees feel there are enough people to get the work done. (11%)
- Employees feel they have adequate opportunities to advance their careers. (9%)
- Employees plan to stay with the organization for at least the next five years. (20%)

“I was motivated to join my organization because of my passion for our mission, the outstanding work we do, the opportunity to work with great colleagues, and the role we play in the Jewish community.”

—Survey Respondent
FIGURE 8:
Leading Edge Pilot Group Effectiveness Matrix

The complete Employee Effectiveness Matrix among the 55 Leading Edge pilot organizations is:

DETACHED: 12% feel detached. (same as the General Industry Benchmark)

EFFECTIVE: 52% feel effective. (4% higher than the General Industry Benchmark)

INEFFECTIVE: 22% feel ineffective. (5% lower than the General Industry Benchmark)

FRUSTRATED: 14% feel frustrated. (1% higher than the General Industry Benchmark)

Strengths Identified in the Survey

In aggregate, the 55 organizations making up the pilot group exhibited strengths in four primary areas:

1. Connection to mission and strategy
2. Feelings of respect and recognition
3. Authority and empowerment
4. Overall engagement

Statistically, all four of these areas rated significantly higher than the General Industry Benchmark.
Employees have a good understanding of their organization’s mission, strategy, and goals, and believe they are making a difference through their work. They understand how their jobs relate to the mission and how they fit into the bigger picture of the organization. This is the area where pilot organizations rated the strongest.

94% of respondents had a favorable response to the statement, “I have a good understanding of my organization’s mission, strategy, and goals.” (16% higher than the General Industry Benchmark)

94% of respondents had a favorable response to the statement, “I understand the relationship between my position and my organization’s mission, strategy, and goals.” (13%)

86% of respondents had a favorable response to the statement, “The mission of my organization makes me feel like I am making a difference through my work.” (There is no General Industry Benchmark for this question.)

Employees feel that they are respected as individuals and receive positive recognition for a job well done.

88% of respondents had a favorable response to the statement, “I am treated with respect as an individual.” (10%)

78% of respondents had a favorable response to the statement, “I receive recognition when I do a good job.” (16%)

75% of respondents had a favorable response to the statement, “My organization demonstrates care and concern for its employees.” (13%)
Employees feel that their input is heard and taken into consideration. They also feel they possess the authority to effectively do their jobs.

85% of respondents had a favorable response to the statement, “I have opportunities to have my ideas adopted and put into use.” (18%)

82% of respondents had a favorable response to the statement, “I have enough authority to carry out my position effectively.” (11%)

Engagement is concerned with how committed employees are to their work and how willing they are to go above and beyond (exert discretionary effort) in advancing the mission of the organization.

87% of respondents had a favorable response to the statement, “I feel proud to work for my organization.” (9%)

82% of respondents had a favorable response to the statement, “I feel motivated to go beyond my formal job responsibilities.” (12%)

“I truly believe in the mission of my organization and know that what I do makes a difference.”

—Survey Respondent
Opportunities for Improvement Identified in the Survey

The survey results revealed four areas where major improvements are possible:

1. Managing performance
2. Having adequate people resources
3. Providing opportunities for career advancement
4. Retaining employees

Statistically, all four areas were significantly lower than the General Industry Benchmark.

MANAGING PERFORMANCE

1. **Managing performance**
   - The survey revealed that, on average, the 55 participating organizations fell short in addressing poor performance.
   - **41%** of respondents had a favorable response to the statement, “Poor performance is generally addressed effectively in my organization.” (16% lower than the General Industry Benchmark)

2. **Employees are held accountable for results**
   - **64%** of respondents had a favorable response to the statement, “Employees are held accountable for results (e.g., meeting their commitments, producing high-quality work, meeting deadlines).” (10%)
At the same time, 64% of respondents agreed with the statement, “I receive clear and regular feedback on how well I do my work.” (4%) This point offers an interesting contrast to the 36% of respondents who did not feel employees are held accountable for results. While organizations excel at providing positive feedback, they struggle to provide the balanced feedback needed to help employees learn, grow, and improve.

47% of respondents said they had a meaningful performance review in the past year (see Figure 9); 29% said they did not have a performance review; 21% had a performance review but it was perfunctory; and 3% did not remember. Some respondents may have been in their organizations for less than a year and therefore may have missed the performance review cycle. There is no General Industry Benchmark for this question.

FIGURE 9:
Performance Review

Among the 4,740 possible respondents of the survey, there were nearly 2,100 unique job titles. Such fragmentation makes it difficult to navigate career opportunities throughout the Jewish nonprofit sector.
Only 38% of respondents believed “there are enough people to do the work we need to do.” (11%) This was one of the lowest rated items on the survey and was significantly lower than the question about fair compensation. Notably, 53% of employees responded favorably to the question, “I believe I am compensated fairly for the work I do.” (6%) Comparing the two responses leads to the conclusion that people are more likely to consider leaving their jobs because they feel overworked and stretched thin rather than because they have an issue with their compensation.

A deficiency in people resources may impact more than just the work that needs to be accomplished—it may also hinder effective training of new employees. In response to the statement, “New employees receive the training they need to do their jobs well,” 49% of employees responded favorably. (11%) If employees are spread thin, they might not have adequate time to focus on training new employees.

Few professionals within the survey saw opportunities to advance their career within their current organization or within the Jewish nonprofit sector.

37% of respondents agreed with the statement, “I have opportunities for advancement within my organization” (9%), while 72% of respondents agreed with the statement, “I have opportunities for learning and development at my organization.”

When asked to select the top three reasons respondents might consider leaving their organization, “more opportunities for career development” was close behind “better financial opportunities or benefits elsewhere,” as seen in Figure 10.
Respondents who indicated an intent to remain with their current organization for less than two years were asked to select the top three reasons they might consider leaving. They were able to select up to three responses, but did not always do so, so the numbers do not add to 100%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Leaving</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better financial opportunities/benefits</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More opportunities for career development</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better work/life balance</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to leave industry (e.g., Jewish nonprofit)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More interesting work</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfaction with senior leadership</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfaction with immediate supervisor</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of resources and support to get job done</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to relocate</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfaction with type of work</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of role model, mentoring, or coaching</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient recognition</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute time is too long</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of fit with co-workers</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater job security</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two of the primary reasons all organizations should care about employee engagement are 1) engaged employees perform better in their jobs and 2) engaged employees are less likely to leave their organization.

40% of survey respondents expected to stay with their ORGANIZATION for “5 or more years or until retirement.” (20%) People in more senior-level roles and people who had been with their organization for longer intended to stay longer.

52% of respondents expected to stay within the SECTOR for “5 or more years or until retirement.” There is no General Industry Benchmark for this question.

When asked to “select the top three reasons you might consider leaving your organization,” the results showed compensation, career development, and work/life balance as the top reasons for leaving, as seen in Figure 10. When asked directly about reasons for leaving, respondents selected compensation and better financial opportunities, but when asked indirectly throughout the survey, this was not the biggest gap area. Compensation generally surfaces as one of the top responses when a direct question about why someone would leave is asked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clear &amp; Promising Direction</th>
<th>Stayers</th>
<th>Leavers</th>
<th>Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My organization is able to retain high-quality employees</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in Leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have trust and confidence in my organization's local senior leadership team</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear &amp; Promising Direction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior leaders' actions and behaviors are consistent with my organization's values</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect &amp; Recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization demonstrates care and concern for its employees</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in Leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization is open and honest in communications to employees</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I receive clear and regular feedback on how well I do my work</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in Leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have trust and confidence in my immediate manager</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leavers: planned to leave their organizations in the next year (N = 343)
Stayers: intended to remain for 5 or more years (N = 1,314)
In addition to asking why respondents might choose to leave their organizations, an analysis was run that looked at which survey items most differentiated those who intended to stay with their organization five or more years and those who planned to leave in the next year. As seen in Figure 11, the biggest gaps between those who planned to leave and those who planned to stay are related to organizational leadership, demonstrating care and concern for employees, having open and honest communication, and receiving clear and regular feedback on performance.

Of the seven items that show the largest gaps between those who reported wanting to leave (Leavers) and those who wanted to stay (Stayers), three deal with “Confidence in Leaders.” It seems that effective leaders can motivate employees to stay, even when other factors (cited in Figure 10) are not being met.

### Effectiveness Profile Trends

As shown in Appendix C, cutting the data by tenure, department, seniority, age, and salary level shows a few noteworthy trends:

**Marketing and Communications staff are least engaged and enabled, while Information Technology systems staff are most engaged and enabled.** Other than these two staff categories, most other groups are fairly representative of the aggregate across all the organizations.

The largest segment of respondents, **individual contributors** (i.e., all non-management personnel), **felt least engaged and effective.**

The **two largest age categories**, ages 20 to 39, **felt least engaged and effective.**

**FIGURE 12:**

The Engagement Dip

![Graph showing engagement dip after 1 year](image)

Engagement dipped after **ONLY 1 YEAR**

After one year into a new employee’s tenure, his/her engagement level dipped precipitously, as seen in Figure 12. This sophomore slump, which impacts an employee’s willingness to stay at an organization, may be a product of inadequate management practices and systems. This dip in engagement happened sooner (<1 year) and was deeper in the pilot group than the General Industry Benchmark.
Employees earning between $40,000 and $69,999, felt least engaged and effective.

The largest segments of staff surveyed were those in entry-level to mid-level positions, the same group of respondents who felt least engaged and least effective. Organizations continue to lose professionals from this category, meaning they are repeatedly spending money to hire new staff. As a result, they are failing to build a leadership pipeline with the kind of staff teams that provide muscle and continuity to achieve organizational goals.

Employees are hungry to develop their skills and connect with mentors who will help guide them through a meaningful career in the sector. Respondents were asked to choose their top three options under the question, “What kind of learning and development opportunities would you like?” The top three development opportunities were:

1) Improve my skills within my current role (45%)
2) Receive mentoring/coaching (41%)
3) Develop my leadership skills (38%)

Other Demographic Differences in Employee Effectiveness

As shown in Appendix C, based on the survey, executives were the most engaged and enabled compared to the other job levels/titles. Conversely, individual contributors were the least.

Employee effectiveness was higher for managers with three or more direct reports, while it was lower for those with zero to two direct reports.

Breakdown by gender showed higher levels of engagement and enablement for males compared to females.

Compared to other age groups, those who were age 50 and older had the highest levels of engagement. Those ages 20 to 29 had the lowest levels.

Employees at the high school/GED education level rated highest for engagement, followed by employees with rabbinic/cantorial ordination. Employees with bachelor’s degrees had the lowest levels of engagement.
Next Steps

“You are not expected to complete the task, but neither are you free to avoid it.”

— Ethics of the Fathers 2:21

Proposed Interventions

The following next steps are adapted from Korn Ferry Hay Group’s interventions developed for each type of employee from the effectiveness profile. Regardless of whether or not your organization participated in this pilot survey, there are ways to identify employees in each quadrant of the effectiveness profile and move them from where they are into the effective quadrant.

FRUSTRATED EMPLOYEES

_Frustrated_ employees are engaged and passionate about their work and the organizational mission, but feel constrained by the structure and systems in place that inhibit them from doing their job well. If they are provided the appropriate support, _Frustrated_ employees are the easiest to move into the _Effective_ category.

Key drivers leading to employees feeling _Frustrated_:
- Lack of adequate resources to do their job
- Lack of enough people resource to do the work
- Lack of sufficient information to perform their job well
- Lack of cross-departmental support
- Lack of clear and regular feedback

TIPS TO AID FRUSTRATED EMPLOYEES:

**Provide essential resources:** Ensure employees have the information and resources they need to get their work done well. Listen to their resource requests and do what you can to make sure they have what they need to do their jobs.

**Prioritize training:** Prioritize training so employees realize they are an important investment for the organization. Treat training as a process rather than an event, and carve meaningful space and time out of employees’ daily jobs for it. Ensure that training offerings for both current and new employees are aligned with changing job demands and are responsive to employees’ interests.

**Regularly revisit work processes:** Evaluate processes regularly to ensure that roles and expectations are aligned with present work demands. Solicit employee input regarding how to restructure and reprioritize work.

**Regularly manage performance:** Hold regular conversations with staff about their performance and professional development. Provide clear feedback on performance relative to expectations, offer coaching to staff in their development, discuss barriers to success that may exist in the work environment, and enhance staff understanding of pay and promotion practices to increase their awareness of the connection between contribution and reward.

**Ensure adequate levels of authority:** Reduce bureaucracy whenever possible. Provide the flexibility employees need to carry out their jobs efficiently and in a way that leverages their skills and abilities. Solicit staff input on the way work is structured to optimize both employee and organizational effectiveness.

**Address feelings of being overworked:** When employees feel stretched thin, it is often not just about headcount. Evaluate whether existing staff have the proper training they need to accomplish the tasks at hand, whether absences are appropriately planned and managed, and whether vacant positions are filled as rapidly and effectively as possible.
DETACHED & INEFFECTIVE EMPLOYEES

*Detached* employees are able to get their work done, but are not fully engaged in the organizational mission and do not go above and beyond their stated responsibilities. Compared with *Effective* employees, *Detached* employees have less favorable feelings about talent and leadership.

Key drivers leading to employees feeling *Detached*:
- Lack of organization’s ability to retain high-quality employees
- Lack of open and honest communication between staff and managers
- Lack of cross-departmental support
- Lack of confidence in leadership
- Lack of organizational care and concern for employees
- Lack of organizational action with regard to poor performance

*Ineffective* employees do not feel the organization supports them to do their job and they do not have an emotional connection to the organization. They feel neither engaged nor enabled.

Key drivers leading to employees feeling *Ineffective*:
- Lack of willingness to go above and beyond
- Lack of alignment with the direction of the organization
- Lack of belief that they are able to use their skills and abilities in their job

TIPS TO AID BOTH DETACHED AND INEFFECTIVE EMPLOYEES:

**Emphasize career development:** Make sure employees understand the career paths that are available to them and ways to advance.

**Prioritize training:** Prioritize training so employees realize they are an important investment for the organization. Treat training as a process rather than an event, and carve meaningful space and time out of employees’ daily jobs for it. Ensure that training offerings for both current and new employees are aligned with changing job demands and are responsive to employees’ interests.

**Give and take:** Engagement is a two-way street. Employees are more likely to go above and beyond when they get something in return. Make sure employees feel valued, recognized, and rewarded for their work. Demonstrate care and concern for employees’ well-being.

**Focus on quality:** Ensure employees see a commitment to quality and internal processes. Improving quality of services and internal processes will help people feel more positively about the organization, while also demonstrating that the organization is being well run.

**Regularly revisit work processes:** Evaluate processes regularly to ensure that roles and expectations are aligned with present work demands. Solicit and listen to employee input about ways to restructure and reprioritize work.
Conclusion

This Leading Edge pilot survey included 55 organizations from across the Jewish nonprofit sector in the United States.

Following this pilot survey, Leading Edge will continue its work to help Jewish organizations improve their cultures. Leading Edge will expand and repeat the employee engagement survey. It will curate resources and best practices, provide training, and offer opportunities for organizations to connect with one another regarding these goals.

Overall, there are a lot of strengths to celebrate across the Jewish nonprofit sector. However, there are still barriers to employee effectiveness—meager people resources, lack of accountability, absence of clarity regarding their path for growth—which will likely impact the sector’s ability to retain employees long term.

As organizations focus on addressing these barriers, the Jewish nonprofit sector will move toward a more effective workplace culture to better attract, retain, and develop talent—our most precious resource.

LEARN MORE AT LEADINGEDGE.ORG

“When a person enters into Judgment [in the World to Come], s/he is asked, ’Did you conduct business faithfully?’”

— Babylonian Talmud
Tractate Shabbat, Folio 31a
Appendices
Appendix A: Participating Organizations

AVODAH
BBYO
Bend the Arc
Birthright Israel Foundation
Center for Jewish History
Central Synagogue
Charles and Lynn Schusterman Family Foundation
Congregation Beth Am
Crown Family Philanthropies
David Posnack JCC
Footsteps
Gann Academy
Greater Miami Jewish Federation
Harry & Rose Samson Family JCC
HIAS
Hillel
Israel on Campus Coalition
JCC of Central NJ
Jewish Community Center of Greater Baltimore
Jewish Community Federation of San Francisco
Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Boston
Jewish Family and Children’s Service of Minneapolis
Jewish Family Services of Columbus
Jewish Family Service of San Diego
Jewish Federation of Cincinnati
Jewish Federation of Columbus
Jewish Federation of Greater Dallas
Jewish Federation of Greater Pittsburgh
Jewish Federation of Greater Portland
Jewish Federation of Greater Washington
Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Detroit
Jewish Federation of South Palm Beach County
Jewish Federations of North America
Jewish Funders Network
Jewish Women’s Renaissance Project
Jews United for Justice (JUFJ)
JTS - Davidson School
Kadima: Mental Health Services
Keshet
Mazon
Mechon Hadar
Mishkan Chicago
Moishe House
Orthodox Union
PresenTense
Repair the World
Sefaria
Spertus Institute for Jewish Learning & Leadership
The Harry & Jeanette Weinberg Foundation
The Jewish Education Project
The Wexner Foundation
Union for Reform Judaism
United Synagogue of Conservative Judaism
Upstart
Urban Adamah
Appendix B: More Demographic Data

Religious Affiliation:

- 73% Jewish
- 22% Other
- 5% Prefer not to answer

Previous Jewish Experience:

Respondents were asked to indicate up to three (3) of the following Jewish experiences they had had in the past.

- Other Israel Experience: 53%
- Jewish Congregation or Minyan: 52%
- Jewish Religious School: 52%
- Jewish Summer Camp: 46%
- Jewish Youth Group: 44%
- Hillel: 33%
- Jewish Day School: 22%
- Birthright: 17%
- Jewish Cohort Leadership Experience: 14%
Respondents by Organizational Type:

- Jewish Engagement: 22%
- Religious: 17%
- Federation: 10%
- JCC: 7%
- Social Welfare: 4%
- Educational: 2%
- Social Justice Foundation: 2%
- Israel: 1%
- Other: 1%

Respondents by Organizational Geographic Reach:

- East: 25%
- Midwest: 24%
- West: 18%
- National: 13%
- International: 20%
“Working under strain, beset with worries, enmeshed in anxieties, a person has no mind for ethereal beauty.”

—Abraham Joshua Heschel, *The Sabbath*
Appendix C: Effectiveness Profiles

Effectiveness Profile by Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Frustrated</th>
<th>Detached</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Pilot Organizations</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year to less than 2 years</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years to less than 5 years</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years to less than 10 years</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years or more</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effectiveness Profile by Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Frustrated</th>
<th>Detached</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Pilot Organizations</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance/Operations</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing/Communications</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development/Fundraising</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming/Direct Service Provider</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantmaking</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administration/Support Staff (not department-specific)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Departments</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: Effective, Frustrated, Detached, Ineffective
### Effectiveness Profile by Seniority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Frustrated</th>
<th>Detached</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Pilot Org.</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Con.</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager of Mgrs.</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Effectiveness Profile by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Frustrated</th>
<th>Detached</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Pilot Org.</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 29</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 39</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 49</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 59</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 65</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Effectiveness Profile by Salary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Range</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Frustrated</th>
<th>Detached</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Pilot Organizations</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $19,999</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $29,999</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 to $39,999</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $59,999</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000 to $69,999</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,000 to $79,999</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 to $89,999</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $124,999</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$125,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 or $199,999</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 to $249,999</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250,000 to $299,999</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$300,000 to $349,999</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$350,000 or more</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Effectiveness Profile by Education Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Frustrated</th>
<th>Detached</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Pilot Organizations</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School / GED</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinic/Cantorial Ordination</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ABOUT LEADING EDGE

Founded in 2014, Leading Edge is a donor collaborative of foundations and federations that seeks to influence, inspire, and enable dramatic change in attracting, developing, and retaining top talent so that Jewish organizations may thrive.

www.LeadingEdge.org

ABOUT KORN FERRY HAY GROUP

Korn Ferry Hay Group is the pre-eminent global people and organizational advisory firm. They help leaders, organizations, and societies succeed by releasing the full power and potential of people. Their nearly 7,000 colleagues deliver services through Executive Search, Hay Group, and Futurestep divisions.

www.KornFerry.com/HayGroup