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In Memoriam

This paper is dedicated to Arnold Gurin who died suddenly on February 15, 1991. Project Renewal and the relationship between the Israeli and American Jewish communities had a special place among Arnie's broad human interests and concerns, and it is noteworthy that these areas were the subject of our paper and his last professional work.

Our collaboration, like all relationships, involved a rich personal and professional engagement—the meshing of our personal views and our respective backgrounds. It was a personal experience whose significance for me far outweighs whatever contribution our joint efforts will make.

I was privileged to know Arnie over the span of many years—as longtime friend, former student, as sometime colleague, and for too brief a period as co-worker and collaborator. I shall long remember and prize our relationships.

This paper was the last in Arnold Gurin's long and productive career as a national social welfare leader and educator, and his last contribution to strengthening the relationship of the Jewish communities of Israel and the Diaspora. It is fitting that this paper be dedicated to his memory.
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Introduction

It is now more than twelve years since Project Renewal was launched as a cooperative program between the Government of Israel and the Jews of the world, and at least ten years since the first funds were raised and the first projects undertaken.

Project Renewal was directed toward the improvement of the physical and social conditions of life in disadvantaged neighborhoods in Israel. In implementing its objectives, Project Renewal generated a number of important innovations. One was the involvement of citizens from the neighborhoods in the decision-making process regarding the programs that would be sponsored in the places where they lived. Another was the creation of "twinning" arrangements between specific disadvantaged neighborhoods in Israel and specific Jewish communities in the Diaspora that assumed responsibility for participation in the planning and financing of agreed-upon projects.

The twinning mechanism became the vehicle for new types of experiences between Israeli citizens and Jewish leaders and contributors in the Diaspora. They met face to face, in personal visits, in homes, in meetings on neighborhood business, in negotiations on the planning and funding of a wide variety of facilities and programs. Twinning provided new opportunities for numbers of Jewish community leaders from the Diaspora to form direct working relationships with the Jewish Agency and Government departments. Prior to Project Renewal, relationships with Agency and Government officials had been confined to a small number of leaders at the national level.

Project Renewal was planned from the outset as a time-limited project. It was to operate within a neighborhood for a period of about five to seven years, providing an injection of special funds, manpower, and other resources in order to build up an infrastructure of facilities and services previously lacking in the neighborhood. While there was no real planning as to what would happen after this initial period, there was a general expectation or hope that the "injection" would be sufficient to stabilize the neighborhood and to provide it with a base for long-term functioning at an improved level of well-being.

Little thought was given at the outset as to how Project Renewal might change Israeli-Diaspora relationships over the long term. The impact on these relationships was not an original objective, but evolved in practice. It turned out that the twinning relationship assumed great importance, not only as an instrument for the support of Project Renewal programs but having value in itself. Questions therefore began to arise as to whether and how the positive experiences of twinning could be carried over into other future Israeli-Diaspora relationships.
This paper, which explores such questions, is part of a series of studies undertaken by several members of the International Committee for the Evaluation of Project Renewal to assess the ongoing effects of Project Renewal some five years after the Committee rendered its last report, in June, 1985. At this point, in the fall of 1990, most of the original commitments undertaken by the Diaspora communities have been fulfilled. Our task was to determine what had been achieved, what elements of the program are still being continued and to what degree, and what patterns of relationship originating in Project Renewal may be carried forward into future programs.

Data for this analysis have been gathered from a variety of sources. We collected general information through records and reports of the Jewish Agency, United Jewish Appeal, and United Israel Appeal, and also interviewed leaders of these national agencies, the Council of Jewish Federations, and several local Jewish federations in the United States. The general information and impressions gathered in this way were then supplemented by a mail questionnaire that we distributed to professional directors of 145 Jewish federations in the United States and Canada. The questionnaire (see Appendix I) asked for factual information as to that federation’s history with Project Renewal as well as for an evaluation of the impact of Project Renewal on the community in the past and its potential impact in the future. The questions were formulated in such a way as to have the federation executive serve as an informant regarding community opinion rather than simply giving his or her own personal views.

Usable replies were received from 74 federations. (See Appendix II.) Although the overall response rate was 51 percent, the rate of response was much higher for the larger cities. Thirty-three out of forty large and large-intermediate cities responded, representing a response rate of 82.5 percent). According to United Israel Appeal records, the United States federations replying to the questionnaire had raised a total (in pledges) of $155.5 million for Project Renewal, which represented more than 80 percent of the total raised nationally by that time (spring of 1990).

It should be clear that this report is limited to the experience of North American communities with Project Renewal, and does not reflect what may well be very different experiences in other Diaspora Jewish communities.

The report that follows is divided into several major sections, as follows:

1) Current Status of Project Renewal

---

1 The response rate for the intermediate and small cities was 41 out of 105, or 39%. The classification of communities by size, as used in this paper, conforms with the categories used by the Council of Jewish Federations in its directory.
We begin with a summary update of Project Renewal—what has been raised, the extent to which commitments have been completed, and what fund-raising efforts are still taking place.

2) Continuity of Involvement with the Neighborhoods

This section focuses on an issue that was discussed greatly during the peak of Project Renewal activity. What would happen to the relationships established between the Diaspora communities and the Israeli neighborhoods after the completion of Project Renewal commitments? Would interest be maintained? In what form?

3) Impact of Project Renewal on Community

From the point of view of the Diaspora communities, was Project Renewal a “success?” In what ways? This section will examine the degree of penetration of Project Renewal in the community, the degree of involvement of leaders and contributors in fund-raising and other activities, and perceptions as to how the Renewal experience affected the federation and its community.

4) The Wider Effects of Project Renewal

This section examines the wider implications of what might be called the Project Renewal “model”. The central question here is whether Project Renewal demonstrated new forms of relationship between Israel and Diaspora communities that might be institutionalized by federations and applied to other programs in the future. Some evidence in that direction is reported.

5) Conclusions

In this section we set forth our conclusions regarding the impact of Project Renewal on the relationship between North American Jewish communities and Israel, the changes in the involvement of these communities in the Jewish Agency, and the direction of future relationships and involvement.
Current Status of Project Renewal

Special campaigns for aid to Israel, over and above the regular annual community campaigns, have been a recurring feature of the Jewish communal scene since the State was established. Emergency campaigns were undertaken during all of Israel’s crises and wars. In addition to special emergency campaigns conducted by federations, as supplements to their regular efforts, there have also been efforts to raise special funds for particular projects, notably through the Israel Education Fund. The use of a “second card” or “second line” to make an additional contribution, as well as the use of designated, earmarked contributions to specific identified projects (usually buildings) were therefore established methods of raising funds long before Project Renewal was launched.

At the beginning, there were many among the officials and leaders of the organizations involved, both in Israel and in the Diaspora, who saw Project Renewal either primarily or entirely as another in this series of special efforts. On the basis of prior experience, it would have been reasonable, according to that view, to expect that Project Renewal would come and go within the few years designated for its existence as community attention moved to other priorities, either at home or abroad. As it turned out, Project Renewal has continued on the community agenda for much longer than any of its antecedents. Indeed, two other emergency campaigns (“Peace in Galilee” in 1982-83 and “Operation Moses” in 1984-85) have come and gone in the period that Project Renewal has been active.

There are many reasons for this longevity, some of which will be explored in this paper. First, however, we shall present a brief overview of the Project Renewal campaign, as it started out, and as it looks today.

The original announcement of Project Renewal called for a total effort of $1.2 billion dollars to be shared equally by the Government of Israel and the Jews of the world, with the Keren Hayesod providing $200 million, and the United States, through the United Jewish Appeal and the United Israel Appeal, responsible for $400 million. These figures represented a broad fund-raising objective rather than an operational goal. Actually there never was a single overall operational goal for Project Renewal because of the distinctive way in which the program developed.

The distinctive mechanism was the twinning process. Earlier studies have described how the twinning concept originated and how it was implemented.2 Although communities may have started with the idea of trying to raise their proportionate share of a $400

---

million objective, that concept was modified as the twinning process developed and as they began to consider the specific projects and programs that they would undertake in the specific neighborhood or neighborhoods for which they were assuming an obligation. In the drive to twin Israeli neighborhoods quickly with Diaspora communities, the focus tended to be more on the projected budget of the neighborhood than on utilizing the full financial potential of the community or on assuring that it would take on its share of the originally announced objective.

Since there had been only limited advance planning for the twinning of neighborhoods and communities, plus a good deal of local entrepreneurship on both sides in establishing direct relationships, some mismatches were bound to occur. Some small neighborhoods were twinned with large communities with substantial resources; some neighborhoods with large needs were twinned with communities with limited resources. To deal with the latter situation, small and intermediate communities were grouped or clustered, pooling their resources to meet needs beyond their individual capacities. Larger communities with greater fund-raising capacity were asked, after they had begun their first commitment, and later in the Renewal process, to consider undertaking second and third neighborhood twinnings.

The initial “goal” of Project Renewal was therefore a moving target and is not an adequate criterion against which to measure the actual fund-raising achievement. Operationally, the goal can be defined as the commitments which communities undertook, often incrementally, to provide funds for facilities and programs that had been agreed-upon through negotiations with the neighborhoods and the Jewish Agency.

As of September 30, 1990, the United Jewish appeal reported that pledges for Project Renewal had reached a cumulative total of $199.3 million. The Jewish Agency records reflect the payments actually made by communities, but not the full extent of their obligations. As of September 30, 1990, expenditures in all Project Renewal neighborhoods had reached a total of $359.6 million, against which income had been received of $319.5 million; $182.0 came from twinned communities in the United States and $137.5 from Keren Hayesod twinned communities.

What we have termed the “longevity” of Project Renewal is a reflection of the gradual process whereby obligations were undertaken and carried out, so that payments, both on the five year pledges through which funds were raised, and on the obligations incurred by the communities, continued for a longer period than is typical in special campaigns. This does not mean that Project Renewal, as a distinct program and special campaign, has continued in full force. Campaign activity has declined over the years, but more slowly

---

3 Figures were not available for Keren Hayesod communities.
than anticipated originally.

The Jewish Agency Department for Renewal and Development Report of June 1990 gives the year-by-year figures from the fiscal year which ended March 31, 1980 to the end of fiscal year 1989-90, a period of eleven years. Annual cash income from U.S. twinned communities rose within the first few years to a peak of almost $21 million in 1981-82 and remained near that level through 1986-87, declining more rapidly after that. In the last year, 1989-90, income was reported at $14.2 million.4

Questionnaire replies from our sample of federations provide some additional detail as to the current status of Project Renewal efforts. The majority of communities (61 percent) began their campaigns for Project Renewal in 1980 or before. The median year in which communities experienced the peak of their fund-raising effort was 1982. About one-sixth took on a second or third neighborhood.

While most of the federations (76 percent) are not raising funds for Project Renewal at the present time, almost a fourth are still doing so, eleven years after the Project was launched. A majority (57 percent) of the responding federations reported that they had reached 95 percent or more of the goals to which they had committed themselves.5 Of those who have not reached 95 percent of their goals, about 40 percent are continuing to raise funds, but the majority seem to have ended their campaigns. Overall, about one-fourth of all the federations in the sample achieved less than 95 percent of their goals and are no longer raising funds. On the other hand, 10 percent of those who did substantially achieve their goals report that they are still raising funds for Project Renewal, presumably for additional projects. Most of the federations that are continuing to raise funds (23 percent) are doing it through designated gifts from individual donors, but about half are also making allocations from their regular campaigns for Project Renewal commitments.

We conclude from this review that the Project Renewal fund-raising effort undertaken by Jewish federations, at least in the United States, was more complex and longer-lived than previous special campaign efforts, but that it has largely run its course by this time. This in no way either answers or begs the question of what long-term effects Project Renewal has had or may have in the future on the Diaspora communities and on Diaspora relationships with Israel. These will be discussed in later sections of the report.

4The experience of Keren Hayesod twinned communities was different. The rise was more gradual, and the level was retained. Indeed, after reaching a peak of $11.2 million in 1983-84, and a decline in the following year, the Keren Hayesod communities have produced increasing income each year since 1985-86, and reached a peak of $19.1 million in 1989-90.

5It is not clear whether the respondents always interpreted the question in regard to “goal” as a fund-raising target or as actual commitments made to the U.I.A. From comparisons with U.I.A. data, the goals seem to refer, for the most part, to actual commitments.
At this point, we are dealing only with Project Renewal itself as a specific fund-raising effort and commitment.

Within these boundaries it is relevant to ask whether the Project Renewal campaign was a “success.” It has been argued by some that Project Renewal, while possibly very valuable in creating new types of experiences in Diaspora-Israeli involvement, was not truly successful in providing the funds needed to achieve its objectives. Clearly, the campaign did not achieve the original objective of $600 million from the Diaspora, including $400 million from the United States. But even if one were to dismiss that criterion, as we did earlier in this discussion, there is reason to question claims of unmitigated campaign success.

As far back as 1985, Charles Hoffman, summarizing the history of Project Renewal to that time, pointed to a number of “problems with twinning as a fund-raising instrument.”  

One was the mismatch between resources and needs. At that point, there were twelve “undertwinned” neighborhoods, in spite of extensive use of clustering. On the other hand, not all federations whose capacity was under-utilized were willing to take on additional neighborhoods without first completing their initial commitment.

At the time of Hoffman’s report, there were eighty-two neighborhoods in the program, almost all of which were twinned with Diaspora communities. However, there were still forty additional neighborhoods considered to be in need of Project Renewal even after an original list of twice that number had been reexamined and weeded down. Both needs and expectations were high in these neighborhoods. Hoffman reflected the concern of Project Renewal managers that “the reservoir of potential communities to be matched up with Israel neighborhoods has diminished to the point where only a few more twinnings are possible.”

These concerns proved to be justified from the perspective of the additional neighborhoods seeking assistance through a twinning relationship. By 1985, almost every one of the larger and many of the smaller U.S. communities had made commitments and were twinned. While some took a second or third community four or five years later, there were too few of these to absorb all the neighborhoods that had been declared eligible for Project Renewal. By 1985, the Agency had grown concerned over a mounting deficit in its Project Renewal account, caused by its having had to make expenditures in

---

7Ibid., p. 116.
8Almost three-fourths (73%) of the communities were grouped together or “clustered” and twinned with an Israeli Project Renewal neighborhood, in order to maximize community involvement and to decrease the number of untwinned neighborhoods.
some neighborhoods before funds were received from the donor community or, in some instances, even before commitments had been made. The Agency thereupon adopted a policy of requiring that commitments and funding were secure before expenditures were made. Given the paucity of additional twinings, this policy further limited the number of new neighborhoods that could be included.

In addition to pursuing its efforts to add neighborhoods, the Agency projected various plans in the years since 1985 to extend Project Renewal into other areas. These plans became known as Project Renewal Phase II. They called for expanding Renewal activities beyond the confines of individual neighborhoods into regions (e.g., major parts of the Negev and Galilee), for more sharply targeted programs and services geared to particular population groups, and for shifts of emphasis from social, recreational, and cultural services to economic development, employment, education, and training. This expansion was given institutional form through the creation in the Jewish Agency of a Department for Renewal and Development that has responsibility both for continuing Project Renewal programs and for other programs, financed out of general Agency budgets, that lie in the field of urban and regional development, handled hitherto by other departments.

The Agency and the UJA were generally not successful in generating funds for Phase II, although there are a few notable exceptions. Replies to our questionnaire indicated that of twenty communities who received requests for additional commitments, only three responded favorably. In general, after 1985, communities were unwilling to continue with special “second card” or special campaign efforts, beyond fulfilling the obligations they had already incurred.

Although the communities did not fully meet the needs of the original total Project Renewal program, one may still debate whether the level of their performance can be considered a “success.” On one level, it can be argued cogently that the addition of resources of $200 million, earmarked specifically for the improvement of life in disadvantaged neighborhoods, is a very substantial accomplishment, and there is positive evidence of improvement in some areas. Should it however be considered a “successful” effort in relation to the needs of the untwinned neighborhoods and the potential resources of the contributor communities?

There are many criteria and differing perspectives that could be applied to the measurement of Project Renewal campaign success, and there is probably no way in which it can be answered objectively. However, in our study we did attempt to use a few simple measures that would permit comparisons among communities, without claiming that these are adequate measures of success. In order to measure fund-raising achievement, we developed, from the replies to the questionnaires, a ratio for each community that related the size of its cumulative contribution to Project Renewal to its performance in
the regular campaigns of 1988 and 1989. The latter figures were used as a proven measure of fund-raising capacity. The ratios themselves, as numbers, have little meaning, but they made it possible to classify communities on the dimension of whether their performance for Project Renewal was greater or smaller in relation to their proven fund-raising capacity.

The major difference among communities on this measure is related to size of community. As the following table shows, the level of effort, comparatively, varied inversely with the size of city. On the whole, the larger cities tended to raise less for Project Renewal in relation to what they raised in general campaigns than did the smaller cities (see Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Federations (n=68)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small and Intermediate Cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large and Large-intermediate Cities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As subsequent sections of this paper will indicate, the larger cities differ from the smaller ones on many other dimensions of Project Renewal. They took a greater role in planning, participated more intensely in decision making, and are in the forefront of considering applications of Project Renewal to future programs. It is clear that they played a leadership role in Project Renewal across the board. All of this was not reflected, however, in the relative size of the financial burden that they assumed.

Part of the reason for this anomaly, as it applies to fund-raising, may be the process of twinning already described. For a number of the larger cities, the original twinning resulted in under-utilization of their capacity. While some correction was attempted by soliciting their support for a second or third neighborhood, many communities found it difficult to make that change in mid-stream. Beyond that, it is possible that larger cities are less flexible than the smaller ones in giving continuing, overriding priority to a single

---

9 The communities are classified by size — small, intermediate, large-intermediate, and large — according to a formula used by the Council of Jewish Federations combining size of Jewish population and the amount raised in the community’s annual campaign.
special campaign. Typically, they have a wider range of commitments, both domestic and international, that constrain the scope of any single effort.

Continuity of Involvement with the Neighborhoods

Because of the special characteristics of Project Renewal, issues arose that did not exist in other special campaigns. Project Renewal created new experiences and methods of work that were considered valuable. Concern arose that these values be preserved after the completion of the campaigns, both for the benefits that they could bring to the communities, and for the protection and enhancement of the gains made in the neighborhoods.

There are two general forms of continuing involvement—visiting (person-to-person contact) and financial participation. After the first few years of Project Renewal, as the process of “phasing-out” came under consideration, proposals were made to continue both forms of participation.

The major instrument for visiting has been the missions to Israel that are a long-standing feature of federation fund-raising activity. As Project Renewal evolved, missions that had formerly been focused on meetings with national bodies and leaders were expanded to visits to the local twinned neighborhoods. The major proposed instrument for financial continuity was a reserve or endowment fund to provide some special program resources and ongoing maintenance support for the physical facilities created in the neighborhoods through Project Renewal contributions.

Forty percent of our respondents reported that their federations have made commitments for some form of continuing financial support to their twinned neighborhoods (twenty-five percent through reserve or endowment funds). Even among those communities who have virtually reached their goals and are no longer raising funds for Project Renewal, about one-third have undertaken continuing financial obligations of some kind toward specific projects.

There was considerably more continuity among larger cities than smaller ones. Only 18 percent of the small and intermediate city federations had made financial commitments that extend beyond the phase-out of the work with their neighborhoods, as against 67 percent of the large-intermediate and large cities. Forty-two percent of the larger federations had established a reserve fund, compared with 10 per cent of the smaller ones. For most of the smaller communities, the financial experience was thus similar to other
special campaigns, in that commitments did not carry over beyond the specific special effort.

There was more continuity in all communities, however, in regard to the non-financial aspects of Project Renewal. Two-thirds of the smaller federations reported that they planned to maintain personal contacts, at least through visits, with their Project Renewal neighborhoods beyond the completion of the agreed-upon programs. All of the larger cities were planning to maintain such contacts. As an actual measure of such continuity, we compared the numbers of people visiting the neighborhoods today with those who had visited during the peak year of fund-raising. Only 45 of our 74 respondents had the information to reply to this question. Among those who did, 52 percent of the larger cities reported that as many or more community members were visiting the neighborhoods in 1989 as at the peak of the campaign. The comparable percentage for the smaller cities was 41 percent.

These findings should be treated with caution, in view of the bias that is undoubtedly present in the low response rate. Those small cities who could supply information are probably better organized and therefore more likely to be able to sustain ongoing activity of the type involved in Project Renewal. That the larger cities, with their larger lay and professional resources, are doing more than the smaller cities in the way of sustained activity is not surprising. That smaller cities are able to maintain continuity with Israeli neighborhoods to the extent that they are is striking, and reflects the special character of the Project Renewal experience for many of the communities.

Impact of Project Renewal on Community

We turn now to a closer analysis of the ways in which Project Renewal affected the federations and communities that participated in it. That there was an impact—and a positive one—is a very widespread perception among federation leaders. We shall first examine some quantitative measures of impact and then discuss subjective evaluations of impact as reported in replies to our survey.

One measure of impact is the penetration of Project Renewal into the community. How many people did it involve, as contributors, and as participants, in various aspects of the program? Writing in 1985, when Project Renewal had been under way for about five years and was still a prominent aspect of community activity, King et. al. estimated that about 5,000 diaspora Jewish contributors were visiting Project Renewal neighborhoods
each year and that a total of “at least” 20,000 members of Diaspora Jewish communities had made a visit to a neighborhood at some time.\textsuperscript{10} The basis for these estimates is not given, but they are not unreasonable in view of the great emphasis placed by the fund-raising agencies on missions to Israel as a major fund-raising instrument. Project Renewal gave a new and exciting dimension to missions by bringing contributors into direct contact with the projects for which their funds were being spent and with the people on whose behalf the funds were being raised. King quotes a Jewish Agency official as estimating that 75 percent of the funds raised for Project Renewal were raised on missions.\textsuperscript{11}

There is no overall estimate as to the numbers of contributors to Project Renewal. Some sense of the magnitude of the effort is suggested by our questionnaire replies. For the federations responding to the questionnaire, the median total number of contributors to Project Renewal (over the whole period of the Project) was about 400.\textsuperscript{12} This compares with a median of about 4000 gifts to the 1989 regular campaigns, or a ratio of about 10 percent.

There were substantial differences among communities in the degree to which Project Renewal reached the contributing public. Using the ratio of Project Renewal contributors to total gifts to the regular 1989 campaign, we were able to divide the respondents into three roughly equal groups, representing low (under 7 percent), medium (7 to 17 percent) and high (17 percent or more). As Table 2 indicates, the smaller cities reached a substantially larger proportion of their contributors for Project Renewal than did the larger cities. This is consistent with the earlier finding that the smaller cities made a proportionately greater fund-raising effort than the larger ones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Ratio of Project Renewal total contributors to total number of 1989 campaign gifts (Percentage of cities-N=53)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small and intermediate cities</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large and large-intermediate</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contributing and visiting were by far the most widespread forms of participation in Project Renewal. But a major innovation of Project Renewal was the creation of opportunities for the federations to participate as partners with the municipalities and

\textsuperscript{10} King et. al., op. cit. pp. 129 and 135.
\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., p. 135.
\textsuperscript{12} Twenty-five percent of the respondents were unable to supply this information.
neighborhoods in the planning and budgeting process. After a few years, a structure evolved whereby representatives of the communities met at least annually with neighborhood officials and residents as well as with Jewish Agency officials to agree upon plans, budgets, and expenditures.

By its nature, this type of activity involves far fewer numbers than are involved as contributors or even visitors. King et. al. noted that very few people in each community—sometimes only one or two—became really knowledgeable about the programs that they were supporting; but that, across two hundred communities or more, this meant that at least several hundred people became more knowledgeable about programs funded by their communities. Questionnaire replies on this point were fragmentary. About half of the respondents reported on numbers participating in budget consultations. As expected, the numbers were small—five or fewer in most cases—but eight federations reported that ten to twenty of their people had participated in these consultations during the peak period, and in the largest city as many as fifty were involved.

Because of the special nature of this planning relationship, many communities found it desirable to engage a person to serve as their liaison with the neighborhood with which they were twinned—to provide information back and forth, and to negotiate on issues requiring decisions. King et. al. found that about 50 percent of the Diaspora communities had such representatives. A similar figure (56 percent) was found in our questionnaire replies from North American federations. These were almost all part-time employees (generally, a local Israeli), but three of the responding federations had had full-time representatives.

Project Renewal stressed the desirability of person-to-person contacts and involvement and this is widely considered to have been one of its greatest values. In addition to what has been discussed thus far, there are two other forms of such contact that merit a brief comment, although little systematic information is available: personal visiting with residents and volunteer service.

While most of the visiting to neighborhoods was done through missions and took the form of formal meetings with residents, there were also many occasions for visiting with people in their own homes. Respondents indicated that significant numbers of their leaders participated in such activities—fewer than in missions but more than in the budgetary and planning work. A surprising number of cities (almost 80 percent) also reported that there had been visits to their communities from residents of their twinned Israeli neighborhoods. But we cannot be sure how the question was interpreted and whether the reply actually referred to neighborhood residents or to local Israeli officials. Some of

---

13King et. al., op. cit., p. 129.
the respondents did specify that these exchanges included visits by professionals working in the neighborhoods, young people coming for a camp experience, and cultural groups, such as dance troupes and orchestras.

Our questionnaire replies indicated that the amount of volunteer service rendered by these federations to their twinned neighborhoods was negligible. There was undoubtedly more of this type of activity than is reflected in our study. Some of it may have been outside the orbit of the federations. It is known, for example, that both the Jewish Community Centers Association of North America and the Jewish Education Service of North America assigned staff to develop the involvement of, respectively, community centers and religious schools in Project Renewal activities. At the local level, some of the ongoing activity of Zionist organizations in recruiting youth for study and work experiences in Israel was related to Project Renewal programs. Although the data are not adequate to reach a conclusion, this seems to be an area that held more promise and perhaps more potential than was actually achieved.

Evaluations of Project Renewal Experience

There are many indications that Project Renewal is widely perceived by those who participated in it to have been a positive experience for Diaspora Jews. Public discussions, interviews with leaders, and similar informal contacts confirm that general view. It is also confirmed by at least one earlier study which sampled opinions from leaders in thirteen Diaspora communities or community clusters.\footnote{Avi Gottlieb and Sheldon M. Schreter. \textit{Israel-Diaspora Relations: The Context of Project Renewal.} Tel Aviv University, Undated (xeroxed).} That study found an overwhelming consensus (88 percent) among its respondents replying that the Project Renewal experience was “definitely” or “probably” a positive experience for them personally. Although the respondents were for the most part already active leaders and strongly identified Jews, they reported that their own Jewish commitments had been strengthened in various ways, that they were doing more than they had before Project Renewal, and they expressed the belief that community involvement with Israel had also been strengthened.

The same positive note was reflected in the replies which we obtained in our survey of federation executives. It should be noted again that these are individual evaluations by the executives of the situation in their communities, in contrast with the Gottlieb-Schreter study that asked individual lay people and professionals to give their appraisal of their own experiences. Although the executives are generally the most knowledgeable single
source of information in the community, the possibilities of bias are obviously present.

We were concerned in this inquiry to tap not only "global" assessments of the Project Renewal experience, but also more detailed evaluations of different areas in which the experience might have had an impact, either positive or negative. As it turned out, there were indeed differences in regard to different dimensions of impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on:</th>
<th>Percent of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community overall</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General campaign</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of new contributors</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of new leadership</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater leadership involvement with Israel</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More knowledge of and interest in Jewish Agency</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More interest in participating in decision-making in Israel</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most positive responses were obtained in regard to the most general question. As shown in Table 3, two-thirds of the respondents replied that the overall impact of Project Renewal on the community had been "positive," as against 30 percent who said it was "neutral" and only four percent who found it "negative." None of the specific questions received such a one-sidedly positive response.

In striking contrast to the perception of an overall positive effect on the community was the perception that Project Renewal had not had a similar effect on the general campaign. Only 36 percent of respondents perceived such an effect, whereas over 60 percent considered the effect "neutral." In regard to the other items specified in the questionnaire, a majority of the respondents expressed the opinion that there were positive effects, although most of them saw these as "modest" rather than "significant." The replies were particularly positive in regard to the influence of Project Renewal in making for greater involvement of federation leadership with Israel, and making for more knowledge of and interest in the Jewish Agency. A majority were also of the opinion that Project Renewal
had made at least a modest contribution to the development of new contributors and new community leadership.¹⁵

Respondents from the larger cities were much more positive in their estimates of the impact of Project Renewal than were those from the smaller communities. The data in Table 4 illustrates these differences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on:</th>
<th>Percent perceiving positive impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small and intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community overall*</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General campaign*</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of new contributors**</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of new leadership**</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater leadership involvement w/Israel**</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More knowledge &amp; interest in J.A.**</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More interest in participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel decision making**</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹⁵These findings are consistent with the earlier report of Gottlieb and Schreter, who asked their respondents a series of questions on the perceived effects of Project Renewal on their communities. The following percentages of respondents replied that Project Renewal had affected the community to a large or moderate extent on the following dimensions: strengthened the community's fund-raising capacity (50 percent); helped educate the community about Israel, its people and their problems (57 percent); increased the community's overall sense of involvement with Israel (53 percent); helped to reinforce the community's internal cohesion (19 percent).
These replies, taken together, point to a very strong impact of the Project Renewal experience on the leadership of the larger cities, at least as perceived by the federation executives. Although a majority in the larger cities thought that the effects were positive for the general campaign, the conviction was much stronger in regard to non-fund-raising aspects—i.e. the involvement of leadership with Israel, knowledge of the operations of the Jewish Agency, and participation in decision-making in Israel as well as a strong perception that there was, somehow, an overall positive impact on the community.

It is interesting to compare these responses with the earlier observations on how the cities of different size fared in regard to fund-raising. It will be recalled that the larger cities, as a group, raised less for Project Renewal than the smaller ones, proportionately, in relation to their regular fund-raising performance; also that they reached a smaller proportion of their contributors for the Project Renewal campaign. The larger cities, with their larger professional staffs and larger numbers of leaders and contributors, had the resources to take advantage of the greater opportunities for participation provided by Project Renewal and were able to give leadership to its decision-making processes.

The various items, discussed above, on which respondents evaluated the impact of Project Renewal on the community and Federation, were combined into an index\(^16\) that was then used in order to compare responses on the impact questions with other areas examined through the questionnaire. First, we examined whether there was any relationship between the perception of impact and the continuity of Project Renewal discussed in the previous section of this report. The only clear finding was that federations which had a higher evaluation of the positive impact of Project Renewal in their communities were more likely to have committed themselves to continuing financial participation in the twinned neighborhood(s) than those who did not. Of those communities that were “low” on the impact index, only four percent had made commitments for continuing financial support to the twinned neighborhoods, as against 72 percent of those who were high on that index. No relationship was found in regard to other measures of continuity, such as the number of people continuing to visit the neighborhoods. Similarly, there was no consistency in the relationship between these judgments of impact and the level of fund-raising effort or numbers of contributors reached.

\(^{16}\)Two indices were created during the data analysis to summarize the responses to several items referring to the same concept. The first index measures the assessment of the impact of Project Renewal on the community. It was created by adding responses to questions 16 through 22 (see Appendix I). The second index measures the degree of institutionalization or incorporation of elements of Project Renewal model in new and future projects. In both cases, response values going in different directions were recoded to make the indices’ scores meaningful. Reliability tests were computed to assess the internal consistency of the items. The standardized Chronbach’s Alpha coefficients (a common measure of the reliability of the indices) are 0.895 for the community impact index, and 0.733 for the institutionalization index, which indicate a high degree of internal consistency among the items of each index.
Although the focus in this study was on the impact which Project Renewal made on the federations and their communities, we also asked respondents for their opinions regarding the impact the work of their federations had had in Israel. The replies were very positive, as the following table indicates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on:</th>
<th>Percent of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of life in neighborhood</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation of residents in</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decision making</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of partnership</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Diaspora</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved physical facilities</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved performance of J.A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood programs &amp; services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As might be expected, Project Renewal was perceived as having been particularly effective in regard to the achievement of its direct, explicit goals in the neighborhoods, such as the creation of service programs and the improvement of facilities. There was less conviction about more indirect effects, such as improvement in the functioning of the Jewish Agency, or in creating greater understanding on the part of Israelis of an Israeli-Diaspora partnership. Gottlieb and Schreter reported similar findings. Whereas over 60 percent of their respondents believed that the goals of improving neighborhood conditions and facilities and providing enrichment and rehabilitation to neighborhood residents had been achieved, at least to some extent, only one-eighth felt that way about Project Renewal’s influence in strengthening the bond between Israel and the Diaspora.17

17The comparisons that have been made in this discussion between our survey and the earlier Gottlieb-Schreter study can be considered only generally suggestive rather than precise, because of differences in the questions asked as well as in the respondents. Generally, our respondents tended to be more positive than those in the earlier study, although the general direction of the responses was similar.
The Wider Effects of Project Renewal: Institutionalization of the Model

Because of the scale of its operations as well as the innovations that it introduced into the pattern of philanthropic support for Israel, Project Renewal has been perceived from its early stages as an important dynamic element in the relationships between Israel and Diaspora Jews. Many claims for the success of Project Renewal have been based on the impression that it made a significant contribution toward strengthening the Israel-Diaspora relationship in fundamental ways, beyond the specifics of the Project itself. We shall attempt in this section to examine the wider or "spillover" effects Project Renewal has had on Israeli-Diaspora relationships, and what continuing influences we might expect to see.

Project Renewal developed during a decade in which there was considerable ferment and change within the Jewish Agency generally. It is beyond the scope of this paper to review that history. Briefly, it should be noted that the Agency, which had been reconstituted in 1970 as an equal partnership between the World Zionist Organization and Diaspora communities, began a process of self-study in 1980 to grapple with the full implications of that reconstitution. What became known as the "Caesarea process" identified a number of basic problems in the governance and management of the Agency on which important differences were identified and discussed. In that process, leaders from the Diaspora, and particularly from the United States, pushed for reforms in the Jewish Agency that would reduce its political aspects and bring it closer to the model of a philanthropic organization with which they were familiar. The Jewish Agency has continued to change in subsequent years, in professional leadership, policies, and structure, with growing influence and participation of Diaspora leaders.

The Project Renewal experience played an important though indirect role in this process of change. It provided a significant number of leaders with an important experience in sharing decision-making responsibility for work in Israel and helped to encourage them to become vocal advocates for change in other areas beyond the Renewal program itself. One of the respondents to our inquiry described Project Renewal as having "let the genie out of the bottle" in the sense that the leaders of the contributor organizations would no longer be willing to delegate all responsibility for Agency policy-making to Israeli leaders and officials.

In tracing the wider effects of Project Renewal, and the efforts that have been made to institutionalize some of its innovative features, we can begin with the evolution of Project

---

18A useful account has been rendered by Zelig Chinitz in A Common Agenda: The Reconstitution of the Jewish Agency for Israel, Jerusalem: Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs. 1985.
Renewal itself. After the first phase, involving the twinning of about eighty neighborhoods, had been completed (about 1983), the Agency tried first to include additional neighborhoods with limited success. This was followed by proposals for a series of new projects that were not limited to specific neighborhoods. Some aimed to develop comprehensive plans for whole towns and cities. Others called for specific programs or services in particular areas. Not many additional commitments were made in the Phase II program, but several of the largest cities, such as New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, San Francisco, among others, did participate.

The concept of developing specific projects that would lend themselves to some kind of twinning—or perhaps simply having federations earmark funds for specific purposes—has become an integral part of planning within the Jewish Agency. As stated earlier, it was given institutional form in 1988, when Project Renewal was absorbed into a larger department called Renewal and Development. This symbolized the intention of using the Project Renewal model, or elements of it, in a broader range of activities than the original neighborhood program. Some of the earlier planning in that direction has been superseded by the overwhelming priority being given at this time to the absorption of Russian immigrants. Within the framework of special campaigns, “Passage to Freedom” in 1989 and “Operation Exodus” beginning in 1990, opportunities are being found for the designation and earmarking of portions of the amounts raised to be used for specific projects involving direct cooperation between Diaspora communities and communities, regions, or enterprises in Israel.

At the time of our questionnaire, in the spring and summer of 1990, we sought information from federation executives as to the thinking in their communities about the use of the Project Renewal “model”, or elements of it, in their future fund-raising programs. They were asked whether any such plans were under discussion, or had actually been adopted, and how much support there seemed to be for the continuation of such Project Renewal innovations as person-to-person contacts, designated giving, and participation in the planning and budgeting of federation-funded programs.

Half of the respondents replied that there had in fact been discussion in their communities of the potential use of the Project Renewal “model” in future fund-raising activities for Israel: and of those who answered that there had not been such discussion, almost half anticipated that this issue would receive consideration in the future. In other words, over 70 percent of the federation executives expected that the Project Renewal experience would at least play a role in future planning of fund-raising and assistance for Israel. Only 11 percent of the respondents reported that their communities had actually adopted

---

policies or projects incorporating elements derived from Project Renewal. On the basis of partial information obtained from other sources,\textsuperscript{20} it seems likely that additional communities are becoming involved in special Renewal-model projects at this time, especially through the Operation Exodus campaign.

Respondents were also asked to give their judgment as to which of the different elements that went into Project Renewal had relatively greater or lesser support among their leadership, as models that might be followed in the future. The results are shown in Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of model</th>
<th>No support</th>
<th>Some support</th>
<th>Strong support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person-to-person contacts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in planning and budgeting</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated gifts</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate card campaign</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earmarking campaign funds for special projects</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These replies demonstrate the central role that person-to-person contacts played in the Project Renewal experience and in the image that Project Renewal created in peoples' minds. With little dissent, our respondents indicated that a continuation of such contacts would have very substantial support in their communities. There was less unanimity about other items of the "model." Somewhat to our surprise, in view of the relatively small numbers who had participated, two-thirds of the respondents thought there would be at least some support for community participation in planning and budgeting. If this is indeed an accurate reflection of community opinion, it suggests that the concept of a partnership between Diaspora contributors and Israelis in decision-making around specific programs has a continuing hold on the thinking of federation leaders.

There was more ambivalence regarding the methods of raising funds for special projects in the future. There was least support for continuation of the second card or separate campaign with which Project Renewal had been launched. As we noted earlier in discussing the current status of the campaign, the separate fund-raising for Project Renewal

\textsuperscript{20} United Jewish Appeal, United Israel Appeal, Council of Jewish Federations, and discussions with large city federation executives.
has been phased down substantially. Communities that still have commitments for which additional funds need to be provided are tending to integrate them into their regular campaigns rather than continuing a separate solicitation. That method is reported to have more support, as Table 6 shows. However, there was “some” or “strong” support from 78 percent of all communities for designated gifts, and 64 percent indicated support for earmarking campaign funds for special projects.

Responses differed by size of city in a manner consistent with findings reported earlier in regard to perceptions of the impact of Project Renewal. Sixty-five percent of respondents from the larger cities reported that there had been discussion in their communities of the possible use of Project Renewal methods in future programs, and another 28 percent expressed the opinion that this possibility would be considered in the future. In the smaller cities the comparable responses were 38 percent and 14 percent.

Responses to the questions that probed how much community support there might be for specific elements of the Project Renewal model followed the pattern described above, with both larger and smaller cities reporting most support for person-to-person contacts and least for separate card campaigns. In all of the specifics, the smaller cities were less supportive than the larger ones, as shown in Table 6a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of Model</th>
<th>Small &amp; Interm.</th>
<th>Large Intermed. &amp; Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person-to-person contacts</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in planning &amp; budgeting</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated gifts</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate card campaign</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earmarking campaign funds for special projects</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to summarize these various responses, an index\textsuperscript{21} was created. combining all of the questions related to the issue of institutionalization of the Project Renewal. Table 7 shows the substantial differences by size of community:

\textsuperscript{21}See Appendix III for explanation of index.
Table 8
Institutionalization of Project Renewal by size of city

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutionalization Index</th>
<th>Percent of cities (N=74)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small &amp; Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The index on institutionalization of the Project Renewal model was compared with a similar index compiled from replies to all of the questions asking for evaluation of Renewal on various aspects of the federation and community. Not surprisingly, the replies were consistent. Sixty-five percent of those who rated impact as low also reported that there was little likelihood of long-term effects in the use of the Renewal model. At the other extreme, 96 percent of those reporting a high impact from Project Renewal were either moderate or high on the institutionalization index. The larger cities were higher on both measures. However there were exceptions in both categories—large cities in which Project Renewal never took hold, and small cities where the impact was very powerful. One small city executive stated, “Our involvement with the Israeli neighborhood starting in 1981 has enriched and transformed our community in a multitude of ways.”

In reply to several open-ended questions, a number of respondents provided information on the discussions, plans, or actual actions taking place in their communities around the future use of the Project Renewal model. As indicated earlier, very few had as yet made firm decisions, but there were several large cities that were actually engaged in some new activities that were explicitly designed to use the Project Renewal approaches in a new context. For example, the Federation of MetroWest New Jersey, before the current emergency Operation Exodus campaign, began to participate in an immigrant absorption program with its two Project Renewal neighborhoods. Atlanta reported that it was funding several economic development projects in cooperation with universities in Georgia. The New York UJA-Federation decided to allocate a portion of its endowment fund income for special projects in Israel. Los Angeles took on a Project Renewal neighborhood as late as 1987 (this was its third) and was more active than most cities in continuing to raise funds for Renewal, but also undertook several special projects, outside the Agency Renewal network. San Francisco had already gone further in that direction by joining together with Israelis to establish a joint committee in Israel to review and recommend special projects in areas like religious pluralism, Israeli-Diaspora relations, Arab-Israeli relations—thus operating directly in Israel rather than through the Jewish Agency.
There is no indication of any general tendency on the part of federations to circumvent the Jewish Agency in their support of Israel. On the contrary, almost all of the respondents who reported about discussions taking place in their communities indicated that attention was being focused on Operation Exodus and how the Project Renewal model might be used effectively in the absorption of Russian immigrants. The most concrete proposals reported to us came from the Boston and Baltimore federations. Each of which had, in the spring of 1990, adopted policies calling for earmarking a portion of Operation Exodus funds to be used for economic and job development and training projects in designated municipalities in Israel, incorporating Project Renewal features such as local steering committees, and joint planning and budgeting. Other federations reported that serious consideration was being given to earmarking a portion of the Exodus funds for the absorption of Russian immigrants in the same neighborhoods with which they had been twinned in earlier Project Renewal programs.

It is clear that Operation Exodus will be the arena for the next stage of development in the relationships among the federations, United Jewish Appeal, United Israel Appeal, and the Jewish Agency. Some preparatory steps have already taken place. As reported earlier in this paper, the Jewish Agency has gradually expanded the scope of Project Renewal through its new Department of Renewal and Development. In July, 1987, anticipating the influx of Soviet Jews, the Agency Assembly adopted a resolution for Project Klita (Local Authorities Absorption Project) to utilize principles “pioneered by Project Renewal.” In this program the Agency provides coordinators to assist local steering committees in developing programs of housing, employment, and social integration. By October 1990, the Jewish Agency Renewal and Development Department reported that funds had been allocated to 46 Israeli localities for linkage or “twinning with an Israeli community, participation in the local steering committee and to undertake special projects subject to Agency approval. They will receive reports on absorption activities and through community programs develop relationships with olim and the Israeli community. As of December 1990, fifteen communities have requested participation in Project Klita and linkage with an Israeli community. Funding comes from the general Exodus budget or the Jewish Agency rather than from earmarked campaign funds. Diaspora communities are offered an opportunity for full-time Project Klita coordinators.

There has been a parallel development in fund-raising procedures and policies in the UJA-UFA complex in the United States. In 1989, the UJA developed a set of policies for fund-raising under Phase II of Project Renewal. This provided that the UJA would negotiate with local federations for a guarantee of its “regular” allocation (presumably based on the 1988 figures) and that 50 percent of funds allocated to the UJA above that guarantee could be designated for Project Renewal neighborhoods. This planned earmarking of a portion of funds raised in the regular campaign is an important precedent for the future.
The most recent action (October, 1990) is the decision of the Board of Governors of the Jewish Agency to allocate up to five percent of Operation Exodus campaign funds for special projects in economic development, job training, and job development. The specific projects may be proposed by Diaspora communities as well as Israeli municipalities and are subject to approval by the Jewish Agency, within specific guidelines. The Agency presumably will have an overall picture of the distribution of Russian immigrants in various locations in Israel and the needs in those localities for various types of development projects. The program is to be administered by the Jewish Agency Renewal and Development Department. The ceiling of five percent is lower than what some federations have contemplated. Boston, for example, had proposed 20 percent. The precedent is, nevertheless, significant.

It is also significant that the area for this earmarking is economic and human resources development, as contrasted with the Project Renewal focus on social and educational services. The economic area, which was generally recognized as having been underemphasized in Project Renewal, is central to the absorption problem. Previous efforts to promote economic development in Israel were sponsored by private individuals or groups seeking to encourage investment, but there was very little involvement on the part of federations. Seven federations have set up economic development task forces to function in this area as catalysts, bringing universities, chambers of commerce, and other groups together with Israeli officials and enterprises, in efforts to fund specific economic development projects in twinned Israeli communities. To some extent the Project Renewal experience of direct participation and involvement with Israeli counterparts may have set the stage for this broadening of the sphere of federation help to Israel outside the traditional philanthropic realm.
Conclusions

As we noted at the beginning, the Project Renewal effort in the Diaspora began as a special campaign to obtain the support of Diaspora Jews for a massive effort in Israel to improve the conditions of life in disadvantaged neighborhoods. There had been other special campaigns for Israel, mostly in relation to the crises faced by Israel in its successive wars of survival. Each of those campaigns had lasted for the period of the crisis and then receded. The Project Renewal campaign was viewed initially as another such time-limited effort. It soon became obvious, however, that the Project Renewal effort had certain unprecedented characteristics that would make it different from other special campaigns.

By this point in time, the special campaign aspect of Project Renewal has run its course. Although it was conceived as a five-year program and therefore had a longer time frame than most other campaigns and did indeed continue actively on the community agenda for a longer period than usual, the period of intensive fund-raising was confined in most places to no more than two or three years.

What made Project Renewal different for Diaspora communities is that it was more than a fund-raising campaign. Unlike other emergency efforts that were for general help to the entire country of Israel in times of crisis, Project Renewal consisted of particular and focused efforts for specific populations in specific localities. It provided opportunities for individual federation participation and involvement in ways previously unexplored. These special aspects of Project Renewal have survived the active campaign effort to a significant extent. Beyond that, the Project Renewal experience seems to have a continuing influence on present and future thinking in regard to the ongoing and always changing events in Diaspora Jewry’s efforts on behalf of Israel.

Elaborate claims have been made for the success of Project Renewal and its impact on Israeli-Diaspora relations, some of which may be overly expansive. The Renewal experience was perceived to have had, and did have, a significant impact in creating new ways for Diaspora leadership and for federations to be directly involved in the programs of the Jewish Agency. Clearly, there were also limitations. Not all of the neighborhoods that had been identified as requiring the program were included, and not all of the approved projects within the included neighborhoods were funded. The total raised was significant, but substantially less than had been projected at the beginning, and there is some reason to believe that there was a larger fund-raising potential than was realized.
the larger cities. While the Project Renewal experience involved substantial numbers of people in one way or another, they were a narrow segment of the local community, primarily leaders who were already active and involved. However, it is this leadership group, especially in the larger cities, along with those active nationally, who have the major role in determining community policy. For these decision-makers, Project Renewal was a significant experience with lasting effects.

Project Renewal was part of and interacted with a larger process of change that has been taking place during the last decade in the relationships between the Jewish Agency and its Diaspora supporters. The Agency, as a political and bureaucratic body, has been subject to a variety of pressures generated by the professional and lay leaders of Diaspora communities, seeking to change the Agency in many areas of its operation. These moves had been toward greater depolitization and professionalization, and greater accountability to those providing the funds. Diaspora leaders and Federations had also been seeking greater influence in the Agency’s overall operations and in its decision-making on programs and priorities.

Some of the leaders who were engaged in those efforts had also been active in Project Renewal. For many, Project Renewal provided their first opportunity to participate in a program that was decentralized and that brought them into direct contact with the recipients of funds. They and their federations were able to participate directly in decision-making about policies, programs, and expenditures, and they could demand and receive a kind of accountability that was less easily obtained through the prevailing centralized operations. At times they were even able, in collusion with local recipients, to prevail over central authority within the Jewish Agency and the government.

It was inevitable that the Project Renewal experience would have spillover effects on other aspects of the Jewish Agency program. Phase II of Project Renewal and the creation of the Jewish Agency Department of Renewal and Development were attempts to capture essential features of the Project Renewal “model” and to extend it to other areas, such as economic development and education. The essential elements that many people are seeking to replicate are: defined, specific projects; decentralization; opportunities for designated giving; and Diaspora community participation in program and policy decisions. At this time, the focus is overwhelmingly on the absorption of Russian immigrants, and the Project Renewal “model” is clearly playing a part in current planning to meet that challenge.

It is still too early to tell how extensively the Project Renewal “model” will be used in future programs, and in what ways. At this point, there is considerable discussion of how to do this, but the specific applications are still limited and carefully circumscribed. There were unique aspects to Project Renewal that are not necessarily directly applicable
to other programs. Chief among them was the neighborhood approach that grew out of the housing and social service needs of disadvantaged populations and areas, but that is not as suitable to economic development or to a national program of immigrant absorption. Even within the context of Project Renewal there was always concern as to how to reconcile decentralized planning and earmarked giving with an overall rational matching of needs and resources, and it was recognized that some less than optimum allocations of resources did occur. That dilemma will continue to face the planners of future programs. The latest official action of the Jewish Agency permitting the earmarking of five percent of Operation Exodus funds for economic projects, was careful to limit the size of that earmarking and also to assure that the projects would be governed by central Agency guidelines. A further challenge will face the national fund-raising bodies in helping smaller communities to use the Project Renewal model not only for fund-raising, but with appropriate programs and vehicles for ongoing Israeli relationships.

There are nevertheless strong indications that efforts will continue to incorporate the attractive features of the Project Renewal experience into future programs for Israel. Within the Jewish communities, the widespread perception that the experience was positive and beneficial to the community supports such a trend. It is also supported by general developments both within the Jewish community and outside. As the overall relationships between North American Jewry and Israel become more complex, especially in the political sphere, there is a continuing impulse toward finding different ways of contributing toward projects in Israel that are compatible with the preferences and views of different contributors and communities. The experience of the New Israel Fund is a case in point. More generally, in community fund-raising, for example in the United Way, there is a decided trend toward making room for more individualized approaches, such as designated giving.

In the immediate future, the process that has already begun to identify specific projects and opportunities for designations, person-to-person contacts and other features of the Project Renewal “model” within the campaign for absorption of Russian immigrants may be expected to continue. The same expectation holds for subsequent special campaigns for Israel that will undoubtedly follow. What is less clear is whether, and to what extent, the ongoing programs of the Jewish Agency and its beneficiaries in Israel may be modified in a more permanent way in order to incorporate some of these new approaches. The possibilities of such structural changes are already on the agenda of some of the larger cities, and small steps have been taken, such as the earmarking of portions of federation allocations for special projects.

Although no clear pattern has emerged as yet, it seems safe to predict that there will be a period of exploration in which community federations and national agencies and the Jewish Agency in Israel will experiment with a variety of approaches that permit a
greater degree than hitherto of individualization and decentralization within a framework of overall central planning in which Agency and Diaspora leadership and organizations will be involved. In the long run, Project Renewal's major long-range impact on Diaspora-Israel relations may be its contribution to the evolution of a much more pluralistic and broader system of Diaspora community support, participation, and decision-making than had existed in the past.
Appendix I

Sample Design:

The sample was designed using the list of federations affiliated with the Council of Jewish Federations. At the outset of the study, it was decided to exclude from the sample frame those federations categorized as volunteer directed in the CJF directory. The list of federations was checked against the Project Renewal Summary of the United Israel Appeal (Summary Inception to December 31, 1989) to establish the amount committed by each federation. Those federations with total pledges to Project Renewal of $3,000 or less were excluded from the sample. Through the review of the United Israel Appeal records, two organizations not included in the CJF directory were added to the sample in the category of small federations. The final sample included 142 federations with pledges to Project Renewal over $3,000.

Names and Location of Federations Responding to the Survey:

**LARGE SIZE FEDERATIONS:**

- Atlanta Jewish Federation, Inc.
- Associated Jewish Community Federation of Baltimore
- Combined Jewish Philanthropies of Gr. Boston
- Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago
- Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland
- Allied Jewish Federation of Denver
- Jewish Welfare Federation of Detroit
- The United Jewish Federation of MetroWest
- Jewish Federation Council of Greater Los Angeles
- Greater Miami Jewish Federation, Inc.
- Allied Jewish Community Services
- UJA-Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York
- Federation of Jewish Agencies of Gr. Philadelphia
- United Jewish Federation of Greater Pittsburgh
- Jewish Community Federation of San Francisco
- Jewish Federation of St. Louis
- Toronto Jewish Congress

Atlanta, GA
Baltimore, MD
Boston, MA
Chicago, IL
Cleveland, OH
Denver, CO
Detroit, MI
East Orange, NJ
Los Angeles, CA
Miami, FL
Montreal, Quebec
New York, NY
Philadelphia, PA
Pittsburgh, PA
San Francisco, CA
St. Louis, MO
Willowdale, Toronto
LARGE INTERMEDIATE FEDERATIONS:

South Palm Beach County Jewish Federation
Jewish Federation of Cincinnati
Columbus Jewish Federation
Jewish Federation of Greater Dallas
Jewish Federation of Greater Ft. Lauderdale
Jewish Federation of South Broward, Inc
Jewish Federation of Greater Houston
Milwaukee Jewish Federation, Inc
Jewish Federation of Greater East Bay
Jewish Federation of Greater Kansas City
Jewish Federation of Greater Phoenix
Jewish Federation of Rhode Island
United Jewish Federation of San Diego
Jewish Federation of Central New Jersey
Greater Hartford Jewish Federation
Jewish Federation of Palm Beach County
Boca Raton, FL
Cincinnati, OH
Columbus, OH
Dallas, TX
Ft. Lauderdale, FL
Hollywood, CA
Houston, TX
Milwaukee, WI
Oakland, CA
Overland Park, KS
Phoenix, AZ
Providence, RI
San Diego, CA
Union, NJ
West Hartford, CT
West Palm Beach, FL

INTERMEDIATE SIZE FEDERATIONS:

The Birmingham Jewish Federation
Jewish Federation of Greater Bridgeport, Inc.
Jewish Federation of Greater Buffalo, Inc.
Jewish Federation of Southern N.J.
Jewish Federation of Pinellas County, Inc.
Jewish Federation of Greater Clifton-Passaic
United Jewish Community of Harrisburg
Jewish Welfare Federation of Greater Indianapolis, Inc.
Jacksonville Jewish Federation, Inc.
Ocean County Jewish Federation
Jewish Federation of Las Vegas
United Jewish Federation Northeastern NY
Jewish Community Federation of Long Beach
Jewish Community Federation of Louisville, Inc.
Jewish Federation of the North Shore, Inc
Memphis Jewish Federation
New Haven Jewish Federation
Jewish Federation of Greater New Orleans
Jewish Federation of Omaha
Sarasota-Manatee Jewish Federation
Birmingham, AL
Bridgeport, CT
Buffalo, NY
Cherry Hill, NJ
Clearwater, FL
Clifton, NJ
Harrisburg, PA
Indianapolis, IN
Jacksonville, FL
Lakewood, NJ
Las Vegas, NV
Latham, NY
Long Beach, CA
Louisville, KY
Marblehead, MA
Memphis, TN
New Haven, CT
New Orleans, LA
Omaha, NB
Sarasota, FL
Jewish Federation of Greater Springfield  Springfield, MA
United Jewish Fund and Council  St. Paul, MN
Jewish Federation Greater Toledo  Toledo, OH
Jewish Federation of Southern Arizona  Tucson, AZ
Jewish Federation of Delaware, Inc.  Wilmington, DE

SMALL SIZE FEDERATIONS:

Jewish Federation of Austin  Austin, TX
Canton Jewish Community Federation  Canton, OH
Chattanooga Jewish Federation  Chattanooga, TN
Jewish Federation of Edmonton  Edmonton, Alberta
Jewish Federation of El Paso, Inc.  El Paso, TX
Fall River UJA, Inc.  Fall River, MA
Fort Wayne Jewish Federation  Fort Wayne, IN
Knoxville Jewish Federation  Knoxville, TN
Lancaster Jewish Federation  Lancaster, PA
Madison Jewish Community Council, Inc.  Madison, WI
Jewish Federation of Dutchess County  Poughkeepsie, NY
Jewish Federation of Reading, PA, Inc.  Reading, PA
Scranton-Lackawanna Jewish Federation  Scranton, PA
Shreveport Jewish Federation  Shreveport, LA
Jewish Federation of Cumberland County  Vineland, NJ
Jewish Federation of Waterbury, Inc.  Waterbury, CT
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COHEN CENTER FOR MODERN JEWISH STUDIES
BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY

PROJECT RENEWAL FOLLOW-UP STUDY ON ISRAEL-DIASPORA RELATIONS
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FEDERATION EXECUTIVES

Instructions

More than 12 years have passed in the inauguration of Project Renewal. In order to assess the effectiveness of Project Renewal and understand how its achievements might be sustained in the future we have developed this survey to examine the impact of Project Renewal on relationships between North American Jewish communities and Israel.

This questionnaire has been sent out exclusively to Executives of Jewish Federations. Some questions are strictly factual. Please feel free to delegate this part of the questionnaire to anyone in your office who is in a position to supply this information. Other parts of the questionnaire are more subjective and speculative, in these we are asking you, as the person in the best position to make such judgments, to reflect the views of your leadership.

Please return the survey to the Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies at Brandeis University in the enclosed, postage paid envelope by _________.

Thank you for your cooperation.

A. General Information

1. Name of Federation: ________________________________

2. Name of Respondent: ________________________________

3. Position: _________________________________________

4. Size of Jewish Population ___________________________
5. Amounts Raised (in pledges):
   a. Regular campaign  $_____  $_____
   b. Project Renewal campaign  $_____  $_____
   c. Passage to Freedom campaign  $_____
   Other campaigns (specify)
   d. ___________________  $_____  $_____
   e. ___________________  $_____  $_____

6. Total number of gifts to regular campaign in 1989: ___________

B. Project Renewal History

7a. In what year did your community first begin fundraising for Project Renewal? ___________

7b. Was your community part of a cluster of communities twinned with a neighborhood?
   1. Yes ____
   2. No ___

7c. Has your community undertaken a second or third neighborhood?
   1. Yes ____ (go to 7d)
   2. No ____ (go to 8)

7d. If yes, in what year or years? ___________

In answering the following questions, please include both the neighborhood(s) with which your community was twinned originally and any for which you may have assumed responsibility later.

8a. What was (or is) your total fundraising goal for Project Renewal? $__________

8b. Total raised to date (in pledges): $__________

8c. How much has been collected to date: $__________

8d. Is fundraising for Project Renewal continuing at this time?
   1. Yes _____ (go to 8e-8g)
   2. No _____ (skip 8e-8g, go to 9)

8e. Is Project Renewal fundraising continuing through separate designated gifts?
   1. Yes _____
   2. No _____

8f. Is Project Renewal fundraising continuing as part of the regular campaign?
   1. Yes _____
   2. No _____
8g. Is Project Renewal fundraising continuing other than through separate designated gifts or through the regular campaign?
   1. Yes _____ (please explain) ________________
   2. No _____

9a. What is the total number of contributors to Project Renewal since the beginning: __________ contributors

9b. What was the year of maximum Project Renewal fundraising activity in your community?
   19________

9c. In that year how much was raised for Project Renewal? $__________

9d. In that same year how much was raised in the regular campaign? $__________

9e. How much had been raised in the previous year's regular campaign? $__________

10. Please give us your best estimate of the average numbers of people in your community (per year) who participated in the following Project Renewal activities during the most active period, and the average number who participated during 1989:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Average No. People</th>
<th>Average No. People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Missions and other visits to your Project Renewal neighborhood(s) in Israel</td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>5-8, 9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Planning and budgeting consultations in Israel</td>
<td>13-16, 17-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Meetings with officials of government and Jewish Agency</td>
<td>21-24, 25-28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Personal visits with neighborhood residents</td>
<td>29-32, 33-36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Volunteer service in the neighborhood(s)</td>
<td>37-40, 41-44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other (specify)</td>
<td>45-46, 47-50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>51-54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55-58, 57-60, 61-64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11a. Did your community have an employee who served as a Project Renewal communicator in Israel?
   1. Yes _____ (go to 11b)
   2. No _____ (go to 12)

11b. If yes, was the position part-time or full-time?
   1. Part-time _____
   2. Full-time _____

12a. Have there been visits by neighborhood residents to your community?
   1. Yes _____ (go to 12b)
   2. No _____ (go to 13a)

12b. If yes, what was the purpose of such visits?

C. Current Level of Project Renewal Activity

13a. Has your community established a reserve or endowment fund for future support of projects in your neighborhood(s)?
   1. Yes _____
   2. No _____

13b. Has your community made any other commitments to continue financial support to your twinned neighborhood(s) after the completion of agreed-upon projects?
   1. Yes _____ (go to 13c)
   2. No _____ (go to 14a)

13c. If yes, please describe the purpose of the commitment and its amount:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Dollar Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14a. Beyond financial commitments, do you expect that your community will continue contacts with your twinned neighborhood(s)?
   1. Yes _____ (go to 14b)
   2. No _____ (go to 15a)

14b. If yes, in what ways?
15a. Have you received a specific request from UJA for additional commitments to Project Renewal, such as continuing your current project or taking on additional neighborhoods or new projects?
   1. Yes (go to 15b-15d)
   2. No (go to 16)

   If yes, please indicate:

15b. Nature of the project: ____________________________

15c. Amount requested: $ ________________________

15d. Was the request:
   1. Accepted (go to 16)
   2. Pending (go to 16)
   3. Rejected (go to 15e)

15e. If rejected, please indicate your major reason: ____________________________

D. Impact of Project Renewal on Your Community

16. Looking back on the entire history of Project Renewal, would you say that its overall impact on your community has been: (please check one)
   1. Very positive ____
   2. Positive ____
   3. Neutral ____
   4. Negative ____
   5. Very negative ____

17. What has been its effect on the general campaign? (please check one)
   1. Very positive ____
   2. Positive ____
   3. Neutral ____
   4. Negative ____
   5. Very negative ____

18. What effect has Project Renewal had on the development of new contributors? (please check one)
   1. Significant ____
   2. Modest ____
   3. None ____

19. What contribution has Project Renewal made to the development of new leadership? (please check one)
   1. Significant ____
   2. Modest ____
   3. None ____

20. To what extent has the Project Renewal experience contributed to greater involvement of your community leadership with Israel? (please check one)
   1. To a significant extent ____
   2. To a slight extent ____
   3. Not at all ____
21. To what extent has the Project Renewal experience in your community led to greater knowledge of and interest in the operations of the Jewish Agency? (please check one)
   1. To a significant extent ___
   2. To a slight extent ___
   3. Not at all ___

22. To what extent has the Project Renewal experience in your community led to a greater interest in participation in decision-making in Israel? (please check one)
   1. To a significant extent ___
   2. To a slight extent ___
   3. Not at all ___

23. Please describe other ways in which the Project Renewal experience has had an impact in your community:

   ____________________________________________________________

   ____________________________________________________________

E. Perceived Impact of Project Renewal in Israel

24. How would you rate the effectiveness of Project Renewal in each of the following areas:

   Very Effective (1)  Somewhat Effective (2)  Not at All Effective (3)  Don't Know (4)

   a. Improving the quality of life in your twinned neighborhood? ___ ___ ___ ___

   b. Improving the level of participation of local Israeli residents in problem-solving and official decision-making? ___ ___ ___ ___

   c. Improving the degree to which local Israeli residents understand the concept of partnership between Israel and the Diaspora? ___ ___ ___ ___

   d. Improving physical facilities for social, educational, and recreational programs in Israel? ___ ___ ___ ___

   e. Improving the performance of the Jewish Agency? ___ ___ ___ ___

   f. Creating social programs and services provided in neighborhoods? ___ ___ ___ ___
F. Wider Implications of the Project Renewal Experience

Discussion is taking place today on whether the "Project Renewal model" (e.g., earmarking, participation in decision-making, twinning) can and should be used in planning future programs in Israel or elsewhere, including programs for absorption and other services for Soviet Jews.

25a. Has any such discussion taken place in your community?
   1. Yes ____ (go to 25b)
   2. No ____ (skip 25b, go to 25c)

25b. If yes, what is the general tenor of the discussion? (go to 26a)

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

25c. If not, do you anticipate that there will be consideration of using the "Project Renewal model" at some later time?
   1. Yes ____
   2. No ____

   Please Explain: _________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

26a. Has your community actually adopted any policies or undertaken any projects (other than Project Renewal itself) which contain elements of the "Project Renewal model?"
   1. Yes ____ (go to 26b)
   2. No ____ (go to 27)

26b. If yes, please describe:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

MORE ON BACK PAGE
29. How would you estimate the level of support among your leadership for each of the following elements of the "Project Renewal model" in future programs? (Please check one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strong Support (1)</th>
<th>Some Support (2)</th>
<th>No Support (3)</th>
<th>Don't Know (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Person-to-person contacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Participation in planning and budgeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Designated gifts from contributors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Separate card campaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Earmarking of a portion of regular or special campaign allocations for specific projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other (specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Other (specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GENERAL COMMENTS:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Please return the survey to the Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies at Brandeis University in the enclosed, postage paid envelope by ________.