Jumpstart

JUMPSTART

RESEARCH REPORT 2.09

THE 2008 SURVEY OF NEW JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS

by Shawn Landres and Joshua Avedon

natan

THE SAMUEL BRONFMAN FOUNDATION

INITIAL REPORT ON KEY FINDINGS

INTRODUCTION

In Fall 2008, with the reality of the economic recession descending upon the United States, Natan and The Samuel Bronfman Foundation began discussing ways that we could help our nonprofit partners and foundation colleagues to strategize together about the difficult times ahead. We agreed that the unique role we could play was to provide resources tailored to the many smaller, innovative nonprofits that have sprung up in the American Jewish community in recent years, and to the funders who have invested in these organizations.

Natan, which is funded by a group of young philanthropists, has funded over 80 startups and innovative young organizations since 2002, in a variety of program areas. The Samuel Bronfman Foundation and its president, Edgar M. Bronfman, have cultivated young leaders and nurtured organizations committed to inspiring a renaissance of Jewish life for over two decades. Each of our foundations, in its own way, has worked to support and advance this renaissance and the creative leaders who foster it.

As we considered the resources that might be most helpful to nonprofits and foundations, we realized that the time had come to take a step back and to begin to understand the parameters of what we are now calling the Jewish "innovation sector." Before we could begin to determine how to sustain the sector in difficult times, we needed to know more about it.

The 2008 Survey of New Jewish Organizations is the first attempt to understand the contours of the innovation sector by looking at the organizations within it. The survey results are a snapshot of the sector, telling us about the sector's size and reach, and the organizations' funding sources, expenses, structure and governance. Crucially, the survey also gives us a sense for what the sector's leaders believe to be their most pressing needs and challenges in this particular and peculiar historical moment.

The survey results speak for themselves. Over the past 10 years, an organic, grassroots, self-organizing ecosystem of Jewish initiatives has emerged parallel to the existing Jewish communal infrastructure. More than 300 organizations have been founded just in the past 10 years, and donors and members invested over $100 million in them in 2008 alone. These organizations, led by a substantial cadre of professionals and lay leaders, have engaged hundreds of thousands of Jews of all backgrounds, affiliations, and ages. Through their multiple missions and methodologies, they have created a wide variety of access points to Jewish life that emanate from and resonate with multicultural, tech-savvy 21st century America. These findings demonstrate incontrovertibly that it is time for the Jewish community to pay serious attention to the innovation sector.

The current economic crisis, which is likely to be severe, long-lasting, and culturally transformative, will challenge the Jewish community to remake and reorganize itself to meet the demands and opportunities of the 21st century. Support for startups, and a willingness to fund innovative ideas, must be a crucial element in the new Jewish landscape. Our hope is that the data, findings, and implications of The 2008 Survey of New Jewish Organizations will prove to be a critical bellwether in that exciting, albeit very difficult, process.

Importantly, this first iteration of the survey's findings does not include policy recommendations. We are releasing these key findings in the context of a series of consultations that will engage key stakeholders in a communal conversation about the survey's findings and implications. We plan to release more precise recommendations in due course, informed and inspired by our colleagues' wisdom and experience.

We also want to take this opportunity to commend and thank our partners in this project, Shawn Landres and Joshua Avedon of Jumpstart, for their incisive and unflagging work on the survey. Jumpstart and its principals embody the best of the Jewish innovation sector: a passionate commitment to strengthening the Jewish people by supporting sustainable innovation; an open, transparent, and flexible spirit of collaboration and partnership; and a fast-paced work ethic that delivers high-quality, value-added resources and programs for the community. It has been a pleasure to work with them on this, Jumpstart's first Research Report.

Felicia Herman, Executive Director
The Natan Fund

Dana Raucher, Executive Director
The Samuel Bronfman Foundation

February 2009
New York City

ABOUT THE SURVEY

The 2008 Survey of New Jewish Organizations was designed to take a comprehensive snapshot of Jewish startups—defined as U.S.-based nonprofit initiatives founded in 1998 or later with a budget of $2 million or less—so that nonprofit leaders and funders alike might better understand their characteristics, impact, and needs. The survey collected data about their age, location, constituents and participants, structure and governance, income and expenditures, staffing, and volunteer leadership. We also sought information about whether and how these initiatives are reacting to the economic downturn, how they assess their organizational strengths and weaknesses, what kind of capacity-building assistance would have the most impact, how nonprofits might support one another, and what non-financial assistance from funders might be most effective. The deepening of the current economic crisis only magnifies the importance of this data, which we hope will help nonprofit leaders and funders craft responses that can enable innovative Jewish programs to survive the serious challenges ahead.

More than 400 invitations to complete the survey were emailed in November and December 2008; 290 respondents began the survey. Of those, 230 qualified to be included in the final sample: that is, they were founded in 1998 or later and have annual budgets of $2 million or less. 187 of those 230 respondents completed the entire survey. 67 non-respondents were identified through public records to have been eligible for inclusion in the results, along with another 12 non-respondents whose current operating status is unclear. Subsequent to the survey's conclusion, another five otherwise eligible initiatives were identified. Thus we estimate that there are slightly more than 300 Jewish startup initiatives nationwide. This would indicate an overall survey response rate of about 75%, and a survey completion rate of about 60%. Additional details on the survey methodology are available online at http://jewishjumpstart.org/survey/.

KEY FINDINGS

I. TERRAIN: LANDSCAPE & PEOPLE

Key Finding 1 The size and diversity of the Jewish startup sector indicate that this is not a fringe phenomenon, a novel outreach strategy, or limited to the so-called "next generation."

Key Finding 2 A large number of small, niche-based initiatives has emerged across the country, increasing the number and diversity of customized access points to Jewish life. Few organizations have large numbers of participants and constituents; smaller, more intimate organizations are the norm.

Key Finding 3 The vast majority of new initiatives describe their mission category as religion-related, education, arts/culture/humanities, or civil rights/social action/advocacy. Very few are focused on service provision, such as human services, mental health/crisis intervention, employment, housing/shelter, or health care**.**

Key Finding 4 New initiatives bring together people of different Jewish backgrounds and appeal to people at different places in their Jewish journeys. Serving the highly involved and engaging the less connected are not separate activities.

II. DASHBOARD: ECONOMIC INDICATORS

Key Finding 5 The sector has grown dramatically, but new initiatives may lack the infrastructure to weather the economic downturn.

Key Finding 6 Startups younger than seven years old are especially vulnerable because they do not yet have stable revenue streams.

Key Finding 7 Startup leaders face challenges building sustainable models for governance and financial management.

III. ROADMAP: NAVIGATING THE LEAN YEARS

Key Finding 8 Jewish startups are already feeling the effects of the economic crisis and say they need sector-wide support to survive.

Key Finding 9 Startups seek collaborative approaches to increase the effectiveness of their programming.

Key Finding 10 Startups say they would benefit most from mechanisms that lower administrative and operational costs.

OVERVIEW

American Jewish life has undergone a noticeable transformation in the past decade as the institutions of 20th-century Judaism have grappled with changes in Jewish demography, identity and community. The new environment has created both opportunities and challenges for Jewish organizations and communities. In response to the changing conditions, an entire landscape of new Jewish initiatives has emerged. Originally created as bootstrap efforts to address program and service gaps in existing institutions, they increasingly represent a new communal infrastructure for hundreds of thousands of Jews of all varieties and persuasions.

New technologies, as well as broader social and cultural changes, have empowered individuals and groups to build communities and organizations that speak to their needs and values. These organizations expand opportunities to engage Jewishly beyond those offered by established Jewish organizations. Since the mid-1990s, hundreds of independent Jewish initiatives have been launched, many dedicated to specific niches within the broader architecture of Jewish life. Because these organizations reflect the fluid and porous identities of their constituents, they blend religion, education, culture, and social advocacy. Their programs span every aspect of Jewish life and often combine these missions in unconventional ways that set them apart from relatively mono-focused 20th century Jewish institutions. This blending of mission focuses is yet another example of how the traditional taxonomy of Jewish organizations may no longer be operative. It is difficult to make clear distinctions based on movement affiliation or even to differentiate between local and global initiatives. In short, the old categories frequently don’t apply.

FINDINGS

I. TERRAIN: LANDSCAPE & PEOPLE

Key Finding 1 The size and diversity of the Jewish startup sector indicate that this is not a fringe phenomenon, a novel outreach strategy, or limited to the so-called "next generation."

As of January 2009, we estimate that there are slightly more than 300 Jewish startups currently in operation. About 80% are independent entities and 20% are autonomous subsidiary projects of larger organizations; overall, religious groups (just under three quarters of which are lay-led independent minyanim) make up one fifth of the total. 56% of Jewish startups—like 44% of American Jews—are found in New York and California; the rest are in at least 22 other states, including many not normally associated with large Jewish communities. They are in contact with around 360,000-400,000 people, of whom around 125,000-150,000 are regular participants and core members. They claim an average of nearly 7,000 website visitors per month (though half receive 500 or fewer) and about 3,200 people per mailing list (half have 1,200 or fewer). Although a little more than two-thirds of the population engaged by Jewish startups are under 45, nearly a third are Baby Boomers and older. Outside high Jewish population states like New York and California, the new initiatives engage an even higher percentage of Baby Boomers as members and participants.

Key Finding 2 A large number of small, niche-based initiatives has emerged across the country, increasing the number and diversity of customized access points to Jewish life. Few organizations have large numbers of participants and constituents; smaller, more intimate organizations are the norm.

There are a small number of initiatives with very high attendance and participation levels and a much larger number of groups with lower levels. Although regular participants generally make up about a third of the total annual attendee population, the proportion is higher in smaller initiatives—as is the proportion of people who are highly involved in the Jewish community. Larger initiatives have a higher proportion of episodic attendees and a somewhat higher proportion of participants with no other connections to the organized Jewish community.

As a number of respondents stressed, attendance numbers aren't everything. Where established Jewish institutions tend to use numerical metrics, especially event head counts, to measure their impact and success, many newer initiatives prefer to focus on the depth of their impact, not just the breadth of their reach, and not simply because they tend to be smaller. The quality of engagement is equally as important as the quantity of individuals engaged.

Key Finding 3 The vast majority of new initiatives describe their mission category as religion-related, education, arts/culture/humanities, or civil rights/social action/advocacy. Very few are focused on service provision, such as human services, mental health/crisis intervention, employment, housing/shelter, or health care.

Asked to categorize their initiatives according to one of the umbrella categories in the standard National Taxonomy of Exempt Initiatives (NTEE), 39% of respondents chose "religion-related," more than twice as many as any other category; almost an equal number (38%) selected from among education (17%), arts/culture/humanities (10%), civil rights/social action/advocacy (6%), and youth development (5%). The rest selected a range of nonprofit mission categories, including community improvement/capacity building, and philanthropy/voluntarism/grantmaking. Environment and food/agriculture/nutrition account for fewer than 3% of initiatives. Very few opted for the official nonprofit classifications used by most Jewish community support agencies, such as Jewish Family Services, Jewish Vocational Services, housing-related services, and aging-related services: only 2.9% of Jewish startup initiatives self-identified primarily as human service organizations, another 0.5% each as health care and mental health/crisis intervention groups, and none as employment or housing/shelter initiatives.

The Jewish innovation sector has a strong focus on religion, education, culture, social advocacy, youth work, and creative combinations of these; indeed, given the opportunity to choose more than one mission category, many respondents might have chosen two or more of these key areas. The very small proportion of initiatives focused on human services and related missions invites further analysis. On the one hand, broad-scale social work may not lend itself to low-budget startup structures; alternatively, groups with other primary missions (religion, education, etc.) may pursue human services programming as secondary or tertiary activities (the same potentially is true of environmental priorities). In addition, contemporary Jews—even those with strong Jewish backgrounds and commitments—may be far more likely to engage in human and social services volunteer work through non-Jewish organizations. Nonetheless, during the lean years of the economic downturn, as the demand for critical human and social services swells, and as green initiatives take root across the country, it is possible that innovators may increasingly be motivated to bring their entrepreneurial spirit to initiatives focused on those priorities.

Key Finding 4 New initiatives bring together people of different Jewish backgrounds and appeal to people at different places in their Jewish journeys. Serving the highly involved and engaging the less connected are not separate activities.

Many Jewish startups attract those who are deeply involved as well as those who are moderately involved and the otherwise unaffiliated. Startup leaders estimate that 45% of their constituents and participants already are deeply involved in the Jewish community; 29% are moderately involved; and just over 26% have no other meaningful connection with the organized Jewish community (irrespective of their Jewish background, which the survey did not address). Individual Jewish startups generally are integrated not only by level of organized Jewish involvement but also by age. To be sure, about one in five reported having only deeply and moderately involved constituents, and 18% said all of them were under 45. However, most initiatives are a mix: half have at least 15% each of deeply involved, moderately involved, and otherwise unaffiliated participants, and slightly more than half reported that people over 45 years old make up at least 25% of their constituents and participants. What they are not is outreach-focused organizations: only 3% report a population that is 90% or more otherwise unaffiliated.

Many startups seem uniquely able to find ways for a wide range of people, Jews and non-Jews alike, to access Jewish life and civilization in a way that works for them. While the vast majority of respondents and their key constituencies see their organizations as clearly motivated by and committed to Judaism, Jewish life, and Jewish values, nonetheless about 15% said they find it more accurate to describe themselves as inspired or informed by them, but not explicitly "Jewish" organizations. One respondent noted, "We work on issues that affect the Jewish community but our work is not exclusively Jewish." Another observed that the organization had changed over time: "We started as a synagogue event, but now are multi-denominational and multicultural. Those involved represent all faiths and beliefs. …The organization, and some of its participants, remain[s] informed by Judaism." A third respondent commented on the tension involved in seeking change within the Jewish community. "We're often seen first as an LGBTQ enterprise, and second as a Jewish enterprise," this respondent wrote, "because a number of our contributors are LGBTQ." These comments speak to the relative fluidity of the new environment, and to the malleability of the Jewish identities evidenced by its denizens. Engaging Jewishly is no longer an activity always pursued in dedicated Jewish contexts or exclusively with other Jews. Jewish organizations today operate in a permeable and multi-cultural space and connect with their constituents using the full range of cultural lures available to society at large.

II. DASHBOARD: ECONOMIC INDICATORS

Key Finding 5 The sector has grown dramatically, but new initiatives may lack the infrastructure to weather the economic downturn.

Data from the survey suggests that since the mid-1990s, nearly $500 million has been invested in or earned by new Jewish startups. In 2008 alone, the Jewish startup sector represented a $102-$106 million economy, supported through nearly 100,000 individual charitable donations in addition to program service fees, foundation support, and other revenue. With respect to paid staff, the sector currently employs about 1,000 people nationwide, as well as around 675 program-related independent contractors. One fifth of Jewish startups is entirely volunteer-run and another fifth is dependent upon volunteer labor for half or more of all programmatic work.

Overall, volunteers do less than a quarter of all administrative work, and half of all respondents say they do not use volunteers for administrative work at all.

Among initiatives with independent budgets (not all have them), the average budget is $342,540, and half have annual budgets of $150,000 or less. (Among initiatives with paid staff, the average reported budget is $517,504, and half have annual budgets of $371,853 or less.) There are a small number of large organizations (10% have budgets exceeding $1 million) and a large number of small ones (37% have a budget of $50,000 or less). In comparison with their nonprofit peers nationwide, of all ages—as surveyed in 2008 by Blackbaud and Guidestar—Jewish startups have disproportionately smaller budgets. 89% reported fewer than 400 donors, and half had 100 or fewer donors. As with the distribution of attendees and regular participants described above, while a small number of organizations have a very large number of individual donors, most organizations have relatively few.

Although this study identified a number of non-financial ways for both organizations and funders to strengthen the innovation sector, survey respondents stressed that there is no substitute for increased financial investment in startups, especially through multi-year grantmaking and more unrestricted grants for general operating support. As one wrote, "small groups often don't have infrastructure to even attempt to weather these conditions." Indeed, in a self-assessment of organizational capacity, respondents rated themselves weakest in fund development/fundraising and in board recruitment/development, the two areas most critical to financial sustainability. Ultimately, as one respondent noted, "without general operating support, all these are moot niceties. We are already creative and thrifty out of necessity when it comes to resources, but *ein [Torah] bli [kemach]* ('there is no Torah without bread'). Being able to pay people a living wage and cover basic expenses is very difficult already. Without that, we risk losing the people whose vision and leadership realize our work, and without them cannot continue."

Key Finding 6 Startups younger than seven years old are especially vulnerable because they do not yet have stable revenue streams.

For initiatives less than three years old, individual donations (not including bequests), foundation program grants, and foundation general operations grants are the most important sources of revenue. Initiatives founded more recently also are more likely to look to earned revenue (such as retail sales or website advertising) as one of their top four most important income sources. Among older organizations, fees for program services (such as tuition or other activity fees) are more important: as an organization gains legitimacy, people begin to pay for the products and wisdom it is producing.

For the purposes of this study we invited survey responses from organizations founded in 1998 or later with budgets of $2 million or less. Within that population, the data suggest that organizations less than seven years old typically have smaller budgets and income streams that vary widely from year to year. For instance, while foundation grants overall are an important source of revenue, three year-old and six to seven year-old initiatives reported sharply lower dependence on general operating grant income than initiatives just one year older or newer. The newer the groups are, the more likely they are to consider unpaid labor (volunteer labor, in-kind contributions, and pro bono professional services) as one of their top four sources of income. An important rebalancing of income sources toward cash-based revenue typically appears to take place in the sixth or seventh year of an initiative's life, a shift which may mark the end of the startup phase.

Key Finding 7 Startup leaders face challenges building sustainable models for governance and financial management.

Most startup initiatives are independent legal entities that function within the U.S. tax-exempt community, but only about half are required to submit tax returns and other documents available for independent review through sites like Guidstar.org. About 20% of startups are religious groups exempt from filing requirements, and 10% of them operate without any corporate structure, tax-exempt status, or fiscal agent. The remaining initiatives are subsidiaries; their activities are reported by their sponsoring organizations.

Although corporate transparency and responsibility is front and center in the public consciousness, many survey respondents acknowledged that they might not have the structures in place needed to achieve sustainability in governance and finance. About one in six respondents do not have ready access to current, detailed information about their organization's budget and finances: this rises to around a third among those initiatives which are managed projects or subsidiaries. Despite new IRS revisions to the Form 990 tax return designed to emphasize governance and accountability practices, fewer than half of respondents required annually to submit the 990 form report having the key policies in place necessary to address the new requirements in the revised form. Only around one in five respondents reported already having an audit committee in place, an executive compensation committee, whistleblower procedures, or document retention/destruction procedures.[1]

Many respondents requested that funders supply or provide access to capacity-building services and technical assistance. They may be unaware of the wide range of free and accessible support that exists in the non-sectarian nonprofit world. Only 10-15% of them are affiliated with their local nonprofit support centers and state/regional associations of nonprofits.

[1] By comparison, 67% of respondents to Blackbaud's *2008 State of the Nonprofit Industry Survey: North American Survey Results* have formed an audit committee and 46% have established whistleblower procedures. Respondents to the Grant Thornton 2008 *National Board Governance Survey for Not-for-Profit Organizations* also have implemented these governance policies with far greater frequency than 990-obligated Jewish startups. For a selection of sample policies and model board resolutions, please see the Jumpstart website at http://www.jewishjumpstart.org.

III. ROADMAP: NAVIGATING THE LEAN YEARS

Key Finding 8 Jewish startups are already feeling the effects of the economic crisis and say they need sector-wide support to survive.

As of December 2008, 59% of responding initiatives reported already having taken action in response to the economy. While only 29% of all-volunteer initiatives reported already having taken action, more than two thirds of those with paid staff have done so. Overall, the most common steps included delaying planned new initiatives (41% of those taking action), reducing the scope of programs or services (32%), reducing marketing budgets (24%), freezing salaries (19%), freezing new hires (17%), and reducing staff hours (14%). Consistent with their self-assessed weaknesses (see Key Findings #6 and #7, above), by far their top priority for external assistance is access to pro bono or discounted professional services (accounting, legal, fundraising consulting, etc.).

Already buffeted by external influences in good times, startup initiatives are at particular risk in the current environment. Many do not have the financial wherewithal or expertise that may be needed to weather the storm. Some question what cutbacks even are viable without irreparably damaging their ability to achieve their missions. Many also say they struggle in the absence of sector-wide structures and philanthropic incentives that reward collaboration and sharing resources. Even with the likely net decrease in available funds, providing long-term funding commitments and helping organizations to increase the number of donors to their organizations (through introductions and referrals) could help mitigate the instability of the startup years and speed the maturation and capacity-building of innovative new initiatives.

Many Jewish startups have managed to function without sufficient budgets to support a staff, a permanent facility or basic equipment. The startups that operate without substantial hard costs essentially continue to operate in startup mode even as they mature. Ironically, though in good times we might lament their undercapitalization, in lean years it may be an asset. The organizations at the lower end of the budget scale are truly labors of love for their organizers and participants, who make up for their own limited financial resources with gifts of time, passion and creativity.

Key Finding 9 Startups seek collaborative approaches to increase the effectiveness of their programming.

The 2008 Survey asked respondents to name one way Jewish startups could be helpful to one another. In the 89 open-ended responses, references to collaboration, partnerships, and sharing or pooling resources appeared more than 77 times. The priorities, as one respondent wrote, are “creative thinking about joint work (partnerships, mergers), and deep consideration of target audiences and present community needs through broad-based, inter-organizational, inter-generational conversation.” Equally important is avoiding duplicate efforts: “focus upon your mission strengths,” wrote one person, “and reach out where others are stronger.”

Top priorities include developing programs jointly with other organizations (72% said this would have a somewhat or very positive impact on their organization's health), coordinating event/program calendars (59%). Among respondents from initiatives with paid staff, a somewhat lower percentage expressed interest in sharing program staff (38%). Respondents also sought partnerships among funders and nonprofits working together to achieve and amplify targeted outcomes. Survey respondents noted that streamlined application and reporting procedures, and transparent standards for evaluating proposals and assessing success could lower some development and program costs and free up additional funds for program support.

Key Finding 10 Startups say they would benefit most from mechanisms that lower administrative and operational costs.

Although a number of respondents expressed interest in strategic alliances and partnerships to increase capacity, others noted that their missions and visions are unique to their service area. A top priority for discussion and action is collective purchasing of goods and services, from group health insurance and technology infrastructure to printer ink, shipping, and travel. Among those respondents from initiatives with paid staff, there was much clearer support for sharing technology/IT staff (68%) or administrative staff (54%) than for sharing program staff (see Key Finding #9, above). There was broad-based support for other operational synergies that would lower administrative costs without sacrificing mission or program independence, such as joining an employee benefits pool (63%), or sharing office space (44%). Around 8% of respondents commented that they already are sharing staff and office space, coordinating event calendars, and programming jointly with other organizations. The relatively high importance placed on achieving cost-savings in administration and operations reflects not only the high relative cost of administration and human resources (around 40% of expenditures) but also the fact that most organizations cannot or do not use volunteers in these areas (see Key Finding #5, above).

By contrast, respondents are much more wary of actual organizational mergers. 42% of respondents anticipated that a merger could have a somewhat or very negative impact on their organization's health, while 31% anticipated a somewhat or very positive impact. Instead of mergers, operational synergies could catalyze rather than stifle innovation through collaborative relationships on the program side (see Key Finding #8, above), including joint ventures, co-sponsored events and projects that serve the missions of multiple organizations and advance the shared values held by these new innovators.

CONCLUSION

The 2008 Survey of New Jewish Organizations has identified a substantial, growing sector that cannot be pigeonholed as a collection of "next-generation" experiments or outreach efforts. For those accustomed to large-scale umbrella Jewish organizations serving many different constituencies under a single banner, these new initiatives may appear small and fragmented. However they are signs of the times—and they may provide a preview of the distributed nature of the organized Jewish community of the future. This rapidly growing patchwork of innovative initiatives is reaching increasing numbers of people of all ages, backgrounds, and levels of affiliation, representing populations that established institutions have struggled to reach. Though they often focus on religion, education, culture, and social advocacy, they tend to present an integrated offering, stitching together the various threads of Jewish life for their participants. The diverse missions and programs of Jewish startups offer more opportunities, not fewer, and provide for a broader range of Jewish practice. To survive the lean years, Jewish startup leaders are eager to work together with one another to increase their efficiency and impact. Their long-term survival may rest on the sector's ability to meet this challenge.

QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER INQUIRY

We hope these findings and discussion have been useful to you. The overall survey findings are available at http://jewishjumpstart.org/survey/. To be sure, the 2008 Survey did not address a number of important factors related to these new initiatives, especially demographic and Jewish background data related to their founders and key employees, green business practices, and leadership transition issues. In addition, asking some of this survey's questions over time would enhance our understanding of how startup initiatives themselves change as they mature, and which start-ups succeed or fail. Please let us know what questions or further analysis particularly interest you by emailing njosurvey@jewishjumpstart.org or posting a comment at http://jewishjumpstart.org/survey/.

REFERENCES

The 2008 Survey of New Jewish Organizations stands on the shoulders of significant research on contemporary Jewish innovation. See especially Anna Greenberg's surveys for REBOOT, Steven M. Cohen and Ari Y. Kelman's research for the National Foundation for Jewish Culture and for the Andrea & Charles Bronfman Philanthropies, Steven Windmueller's reflections on the "Second American Jewish Revolution," and Steven M. Cohen, Shawn Landres, Elie Kaunfer, and Michelle Shain's emergent spiritual community research for Synagogue 3000 and Mechon Hadar. For a complete reference list, please see http://jewishjumpstart.org/survey/.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Natan Fund, The Samuel Bronfman Foundation, and Jumpstart are grateful to the following organizations for helping us to identify and contact our survey sample: Bikkurim, the Andrea & Charles Bronfman Philanthropies, the Bronfman Youth Fellowships in Israel Alumni Venture Fund, the Center for Leadership Initiatives and ROI 120, the Covenant Foundation, the Foundation for Jewish Culture, the Hadassah Foundation, JESNA, the Jewish Community Foundation of Los Angeles, the Jewish Venture Philanthropy Fund of LA, Mechon Hadar, the Righteous Persons Foundation, the Charles and Lynn Schusterman Family Foundation, Slingshot (21/64), The Steinhardt Foundation for Jewish Life, the UJA Federation-NY Commission on Jewish Identity and Renewal, and UpStart Bay Area. Shifra Bronznick, Steven M. Cohen, Nina Bruder, Sharna Goldseker, Benjamin Greene, Rabbi Yoni Gordis, Rabbi Elie Kaunfer, Nessa Rapoport, Toby Rubin, Rabbi Rachel Nussbaum, Jonathan Sarna, and Nigel Savage offered very helpful comments on earlier versions of this paper. And special thanks are due to our families in New York and Los Angeles who put up with our working late nights and weekends to make this happen. Finally, on behalf of Jumpstart, Joshua Avedon and Shawn Landres would like to express their deep appreciation to Felicia Herman and Ariel Groveman Weiner for the spirit and practice of collaboration that has brought this survey and report to life; thanks to their leadership and commitment, this has been a true partnership of colleagues bringing diverse skills and perspective to achieve a shared goal: to build a vibrant and dynamic Jewish future.

PROJECT COLLABORATORS

The Natan Fund believes strongly in the power of innovative ideas to transform and strengthen the Jewish people. Supported by a growing group of young philanthropists, Natan makes grants to nonprofit organizations with annual operating budgets of $1.5 million or less in a variety of program areas. Natan's members make all of the foundation's funding decisions, and because the Natan board pays the foundation's operating expenses, 100% of all other donations goes directly to the organizations that Natan supports.

The Samuel Bronfman Foundation seeks to inspire a renaissance of Jewish life. Informed by the vision of Edgar M. Bronfman, The Samuel Bronfman Foundation cultivates long-term relationships with organizations that advance their mission with innovation, depth and meaning. They maintain partnerships and support organizations such as the Bronfman Youth Fellowships in Israel, Hillel: The Foundation for Jewish Campus Life, The Curriculum Initiative, Foundation for Jewish Camp, MyJewishLearning.com and the Jewish Outreach Institute among others.

Jumpstart is an incubator, think tank, catalyst, and advocate to build sustainable Jewish initiatives for the future. Founded in 2008 by Shawn Landres and Joshua Avedon, its mission is to develop, strengthen, and learn from emerging nonprofit organizations that build community at the nexus of spirituality, learning, social activism, and culture. Signature initiatives include a fiscal sponsorship platform and J Space, a Jumpstart-catalyzed project to create a multi-tenant nonprofit center for innovative Jewish organizations in Los Angeles.

http://www.jewishjumpstart.org http://www.natan.org http://www.thesbf.org

v 1.1