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Executive Summary

Are Jewish organizations great places to work? Not yet—but we’re striving

This report shares overall findings from the sixth annual Employee Experience Survey conducted by Leading Edge, which gathered responses from more than 12,000 employees of 257 Jewish nonprofit organizations. The survey helps leaders learn about their employees’ experiences at work so they can improve them.

Being a great place to work is a job that’s never done. Like exercise and healthy eating for a person, maintaining a great place to work is something that organizations need to do every day. This report is a snapshot of how that complex, constant, and important work was going in one set of 257 Jewish nonprofits in May 2022.
Top Headlines

People want to stay in this sector
A strong majority of employees surveyed (70%) want to stay in the Jewish nonprofit sector for two years or more.

See more under “Stayers” & “Leavers”

People (still) want well-being, trusted leaders, and inclusion
Like last year, the top drivers of Employee Engagement remain feeling that the organization cares for employees’ well-being, confidence in leadership, feelings of belonging, and feeling that there is open and honest communication in the organization.

See more under Engagement Drivers

Some employees are less likely to feel like they belong
There are pronounced inequities in experience, especially around belonging and other Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging (DEIB) experiences, along lines of identity characteristics including gender and sexual identity, race/ethnicity, and disability. LGBTQ employees and People of Color (particularly Black employees) are markedly less likely to feel like they belong in their organizations.

See more under Demographics: People

Leaders need to communicate better
The most important way for leaders to improve confidence in their leadership is to improve communication with their teams.

See more under Professional Leadership

There’s been a lot of turnover
One-third (33%) of employees surveyed have been with their organizations for less than two years. This substantial share of workers don’t remember the pre-COVID status quo. And the proportion of employees who are in their first year with their organizations (21% in 2022) is almost twice as high as it was among the organizations we surveyed in 2021 (12% in 2021).

See more under Tenure at the Organization

Working with board members is common
Approximately 1 out of every 4 employees surveyed (27%) reports that they work with the board.

See more under The Board

People feel overstretched
Perceptions of being understaffed (common in the nonprofit sector) are prevalent for the smallest and the largest teams—suggesting a need for stronger leadership in focusing and right-sizing targets and workloads.

See more under Employee Enablement

Many employees have been promoted
Among employees who have been with their organizations longer than two years, 42% have been promoted at least once. But those who have moved laterally without a promotion are less likely to report favorable experiences.

See more under Promotions

Most employees don’t work remotely
Three-quarters of employees surveyed (76%) reported that they work outside their homes for at least part of each week.

See more under Workspace Arrangement

People working in person (i.e., not remotely) trust their leaders more if they feel well prepared for physical security threats
For the first time, we asked about preparedness for physical security threats (for employees working outside their homes). Five out of 6 employees surveyed (72%) feel prepared to act in the event of a security threat, but those who don’t feel prepared are markedly less likely to have confidence in their organizational leadership.

See more under Workspace Supplement: Physical Security

Improving employee experience isn’t a straight line
Organizations that have taken the Employee Experience Survey five or six times have seen a lot of improvement. But the journey isn’t always neat or linear.

See more under Impact of the Survey
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Common Strengths

Employees overwhelmingly agree:

- **DIRECT MANAGEMENT**: My manager treats me with respect (90%)
- **ORGANIZATIONAL ALIGNMENT**: I know how my work contributes to my organization’s mission, strategy, and goals (89%)
- **EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT**: I feel proud to work for my organization (87%)
- **ACCOUNTABILITY & FEEDBACK**: We hold ourselves accountable for results (87%)
- **ORGANIZATIONAL ALIGNMENT**: My organization provides high-quality programs and services to our constituents (86%)

Common Struggles

Most employees do not agree:

- **EMPLOYEE ENABLEMENT**: There are enough people to do the work we need to do (38%)
- **SALARY & BENEFITS**: My organization has worked or is actively working on our approach to compensation (38%)
- **SALARY & BENEFITS**: I understand how salaries and raises are determined at my organization (39%)
- **LEARNING & ADVANCEMENT**: I have opportunities for advancement at my organization (41%)
- **SALARY & BENEFITS**: I believe my salary is fair relative to similar roles at my organization (42%)

-17% from U.S. Benchmark
Biggest Deviations from the U.S. Benchmark

The following are the questions for which the overall favorability scores are most divergent from Culture Amp's U.S. Benchmark.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEARNING &amp; ADVANCEMENT</th>
<th>SALARY &amp; BENEFITS</th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL LEADERSHIP</th>
<th>EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT</th>
<th>COLLABORATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have opportunities for advancement at my organization</td>
<td>I believe my salary is fair relative to similar roles at my organization</td>
<td>I am kept appropriately informed about major decisions and events happening at my organization</td>
<td>I would recommend my organization as a great place to work</td>
<td>There is good collaboration between teams/departments in my organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-26% from U.S. Benchmark</td>
<td>+17% from U.S. Benchmark</td>
<td>+15% from U.S. Benchmark</td>
<td>+14% from U.S. Benchmark</td>
<td>+13% from U.S. Benchmark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top Five Engagement Drivers

These questions are the ones most strongly correlated with Employee Engagement in this year’s survey. Improving these facets of employees’ experience will make the biggest impact on their levels of engagement.

1. My organization demonstrates care and concern for its employees
2. I have confidence in our leaders to lead the organization effectively
3. I believe employee well-being is a priority at my organization
4. At my organization there is open and honest two-way communication
5. I feel like I belong at my organization

¹ Culture Amp's U.S. Benchmark is based on surveys of millions of American employees in all sectors, industries, and job functions.
Introduction

“How are things going at work?”

That’s probably a question you ask and answer fairly often. And no wonder, because work is an enormous part of so many people’s lives. Someone with a full-time job spends the majority of their waking hours at work.

In May 2022, more than 12,000 people working in Jewish nonprofit organizations took a few minutes to reflect on how things were going at work by taking the 2022 Employee Experience Survey from Leading Edge.

Employee experience matters because employees are human beings, with infinite value and human dignity, created (according to Jewish tradition) in the image of God. Employee experience also matters because the work matters. Research has shown that employees’ sense of engagement—and, by extension, their total workplace experience—is enormously important to whether any given organization will succeed in fulfilling its mission. Jewish nonprofits do a vast array of things, from serving the needs of Jewish communities and broader local communities to serving the needs of all people everywhere. If and when these organizations truly and sustainably succeed, it is because their people are thriving.

In a year in which our field and the world face both dynamic growth and persistent problems and inequities, it has never been more important to ask, listen, act, and ask again: “How are things going at work?”

Much rides on the answer.
Empowering Organizations to Improve

To support organizations in creating even better places to work, Leading Edge conducts the Employee Experience Survey, a people analytics tool that gives employees in Jewish nonprofits the opportunity to provide feedback about their experience at work and share those insights with organizational leaders. This information supports leaders in identifying organizational strengths as well as growth areas that can be addressed to improve workplace culture. That’s not easy to do, and Leading Edge encourages organizations to take the survey only if and when they are prepared to take meaningful action to improve things based on their results.

By participating in the Employee Experience Survey, leaders demonstrate their commitment to employees as key stakeholders. Through the process, leaders solicit honest and confidential input and explore with curiosity and intention the changes needed to transform their organizational culture.

Taking the survey is just the first step in an ongoing process of exploration and improvement. Leading Edge presents organizations with their survey results in an in-depth, interactive format. We also engage with organizations one-on-one to help them interpret their results and identify interventions to help improve their employees’ experience at work.
Learning about the Jewish nonprofit sector

While the primary purpose of the Employee Experience Survey is to empower organizations to improve their culture, its secondary purpose is to learn about issues, trends, and insights affecting the Jewish nonprofit sector as a whole. We do this by analyzing the aggregate data from all organizations taking the survey. This report is a distillation of these findings, gleaned from the 2022 survey and six total years of data from the Leading Edge Employee Experience Survey.

History of the Survey

The first Employee Experience Survey was administered in 2016 to 55 pilot organizations. To date, more than 45,000 people working at 396 organizations have received the survey at least once, and 135 organizations have taken the survey at least three times.2

Leading Edge has administered the survey annually, in spring, from 2016 to 2022, with the exception of 2020, when we concluded that the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic made the survey not suitable to the needs and priorities of organizations dealing with the crisis. (To serve organizations during that difficult year, and to create a more frequent and customizable supplement to the Employee Experience Survey, we created Leading Edge Pulse Surveys, which remain available continuously.)

During the first four years of this survey, senior-most organizational leaders (CEOs, Executive Directors, etc.) took the same survey as their employees. Yet the CEO’s work, challenges, and concerns differ significantly from those of other employees. Starting in 2021, we created the CEO Survey, to capture the unique experiences of these top executive leaders in our sector. The Employee Experience Survey and CEO Survey are fielded simultaneously. A separate report, also available in our Resource Library, details overall findings from the 2022 CEO Survey.

2 In this figure of 396 organizations, one of these units represents 200+ professionally staffed Hillel campuses across the globe, which are treated as one unit for survey administration purposes; if each of these were counted individually, the figure for all years combined would be around 600.
By the Numbers

Over 6 years, more than 45,000 people have received the survey

See more under Appendix A: Survey Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>What</th>
<th>How</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>257 organizations took the survey</td>
<td>103 questions: 64 scored, 9 multiple choice, 3 open-ended, 27 demographic</td>
<td>Online administration via Culture Amp</td>
<td>May 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20,223 employees were eligible
12,387 employees responded
61% response rate

Limitations

The purpose of the Employee Experience Survey is to help each participating organization improve its team’s experiences—**not to conduct a census of the sector**. Since the people and organizations that took the survey (and the people within each organization who chose to respond) were not randomly selected, and since the group of organizations taking the survey has grown and changed each year, it is worth emphasizing that we cannot know to what degree this sample may or may not be representative of the field as a whole—whether regarding demographics, employee experience, what drives engagement and retention, or anything else. The findings in this report apply to the people and organizations that responded to the survey. Regarding the Jewish nonprofit sector more broadly, they provide **general indications, not definitive or precise conclusions**.
Buzzwords

We aim for self-explanatory language, but just in case it is useful, here are the main terms of art we use in this report:

“Favorability Score”
Most questions in the survey present a statement to the respondent and ask them to respond on a “Likert scale” (Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree). A “favorability score” for a question is the percentage of people responding who chose “Agree” or “Strongly Agree.”

“Employee Engagement”
Employee Engagement is a factor. (In fact, it’s the most important of all the factors, for reasons we’ll explain under Employee Engagement.) It means feeling proud to work at the organization, wanting to stay, being likely to recommend it to others as a great place to work, and feeling motivated to do one’s best work.

“Factors”
“Factors” in this survey are groups of survey questions that are about the same topic. Looking at responses to these questions together, and/or the average favorability score for all questions in each factor, can be helpful in analyzing survey results.

“Engagement Drivers”
Since Employee Engagement is so important, we want to explore what other kinds of experience cause employees to feel more engaged. So for all questions in the survey that are in factors other than Employee Engagement, we calculate their level of correlation to the Employee Engagement questions. We call questions “Engagement Drivers” when they have the strongest correlations to Employee Engagement out of all the questions in the survey. This means that someone who responds favorably to these questions is more likely to respond favorably to the Employee Engagement questions. We emphasize the importance of the top five Engagement Drivers.

“Retention Drivers”
In our analysis of who wants to stay at or leave their organization, we analyze which questions have the largest gap in favorability score between “stayers” (those who want to remain at their organization for five years or more) and “leavers” (those who want to leave their organization within a year). The questions with the largest gaps between stayers and leavers are “Retention Drivers”—parts of the employee experience that appear particularly important to people’s desire to stay.

“Factors”
Employee Engagement
Accountability & Feedback
Collaboration
Direct Management
Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, & Belonging
Employee Enablement
Learning & Advancement
Organizational Alignment
Professional Leadership
Psychological Safety
Salary & Benefits
The Board
Well-Being

Job Level terms:
An “Individual Contributor” is an employee who doesn’t directly manage any other employees. A “Manager,” in this survey, is an employee who does manage one or more employees but is not part of the executive team. The “Executive Team” is the subset of employees reporting directly to the CEO, Executive Director, or equivalent.

See more under “Stayers” and “Leavers”

See more under Engagement Drivers

See more under Results by Factor
Impact of the Survey

Leading Edge now has data from six years of Employee Experience Surveys, and 135 organizations have taken the survey three times or more. When we look at results from organizations that have taken the survey different numbers of times, we can see that the survey makes a clear and positive impact.

A POSITIVE—BUT NOT LINEAR—JOURNEY

Organizations taking the Employee Experience Survey repeatedly tend to take a particular journey. This journey is not universal; each participating organization has its own unique story and trajectory. But looking in the aggregate across many employees at many organizations, one common overall pattern is clear:

The rise: From year 1 to year 2, favorability scores rise.

The dip: From year 2 to year 3, and persisting through year 4, favorability scores dip back down again.

The re-rise: In year 5 and beyond, favorability scores rise again to new heights.

Depending on the question and the factor, this pattern is sometimes weak and sometimes strong, but it is almost always there.

We interpret this pattern as a picture of the difficulty and nonlinear nature of changing organizational cultures. After seeing the year 1 results, the organization’s leadership has lots of new information and input they probably didn’t have before. They then quickly make changes to “pick the low-hanging fruit”—addressing those of their team’s concerns that are the easiest and fastest to fix. The rise in year 2 reflects the fact that employees have seen their leadership listen to their concerns and make changes. Their hopes—and expectations—are high in a way they have never been before. But for the organizational leadership, most of the low-hanging fruit was probably already picked last year. The issues that remain can and should be addressed, but more difficult concerns take more time and complexity to address. This kind of culture work may also involve asking employees to leave their comfort zones and old habits in certain ways. With expectations high, progress less instant, and some of the work actually increasing the difficulties, employee experience dips during years 3 and 4. Yet on the other side of that trough, progress returns; the work bears fruit, and in years 5 and 6, favorability scores break out of their dip and reach new highs. (In analyzing this trend, we assume that employee expectation levels are a part of organizational culture that match the same journey described here, even as different individual employees come and go over time.)
BIGGEST AREAS OF SURVEY IMPACT

Here are the areas in which we see the biggest aggregate advantages in favorability scores for organizations that have taken the survey six times, compared with organizations taking it for the first time.

Factor averages (top three):

| +15% | Salary & Benefits |
| +10% | The Board |
| +9%  | Professional Leadership |

Individual Questions (top 10):

| +21% | My organization has worked or is actively working on our approach to compensation—e.g., creating salary bands, communicating an approach to compensation, defining how raises happen, etc |
| +19% | My employee benefits generally meet my needs |
| +15% | I believe employee well-being is a priority at my organization |
|      | See more under "Engagement Drivers" and "Retention Drivers" |
| +14% | My organization demonstrates care and concern for its employees |
| +13% | At my organization board members and professional leaders work together effectively |
| +13% | At my organization board members and professional leaders work together effectively |
| +13% | I am kept appropriately informed about major decisions and events happening at my organization |
| +13% | My organization provides me with sufficient opportunities for professional development—e.g., training, conferences, community of practice, etc |
| +12% | Our systems and processes generally support us in getting our work done effectively |
| +12% | My organization is generally successful in the pursuit of its mission |
| +12% | The leadership team's actions are consistent with my organization's values |
| +11% | My team receives high-quality support from other parts of the organization |
IMPACTS ON THE CEO EXPERIENCE

For most of the organizations that took this survey, their leaders also took the 2022 CEO Survey. Data in the CEO Survey suggests that an organization participating in the Employee Experience Survey (EES) leads to better experiences for the CEO as well:

- Leaders of organizations that have participated in the EES in the past are more likely to report favorable experiences with their board partnerships.
- CEOs from returning EES organizations are more likely to feel favorable about their organizations’ long-term fundraising prospects.
- CEOs from returning EES organizations are more likely to feel that their work is interesting and challenging.
- A larger proportion of CEOs who have previously taken the EES experience effective working relationships with their senior teams.

Since participation in these surveys is opt-in, this doesn’t necessarily prove that Employee Experience Survey participation enhances the leadership experience; it could be, at least to some degree, that the leaders who choose to invest time and effort in learning about their employees’ experience are also leaders who invest more time and effort in improving their own leadership experience. Still, the correlation is positive.

The bottom line: The survey helps organizations improve their employees’ experience. That’s why each year, a strong majority of organizations that take the survey return to take it again. (This year, 69% of organizations that took the survey in 2021 took it again in 2022.)

“The results of the survey have been transformative to our organization.”

CEO of a participating organization (2021)
Leading Places to Work

Since our founding in 2014, Leading Edge has developed and continually refined a working definition of the core elements that make an organization a “Leading Place to Work.” This definition comes from extensive engagement with the latest academic and professional research, our partnership with Culture Amp (we use their platform to conduct this survey, and they have millions of data points from across many industries), aggregate data from six years of the Employee Experience Survey, and annual consultations with organizations striving to improve their workplace culture.

There are other elements that impact workplace culture and employee experience. However, these are the highest-leverage areas on which the Employee Experience Survey focuses.

The Core Elements Are:

- **Common Purpose**
  Leading places to work have clear missions, visions, and values. They regularly communicate them, both internally and to the communities they serve. Leaders inspire their employees by keeping them connected to the greater purpose and impact of their work.

- **Trusted Leaders**
  Leading places to work have executive leaders who prioritize organizational culture. They model behaviors and create policies and practices that allow all employees, regardless of identity or position, to thrive.

- **Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, & Belonging (DEIB)**
  Leading places to work fully integrate principles of diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging (DEIB) into how they do their work. They understand the potential for organizations to perpetuate systems and behaviors that reinforce injustice, and they devote time, effort, and resources to prevent and mitigate these harms. They develop teams that reflect the communities they serve and strive to be culturally responsive and deeply understanding of their employees and constituencies.

- **Respected Employees**
  Leading places to work ensure that all employees feel valued, valuable, and empowered to participate fully. Employees trust that they won’t be punished or criticized for making a mistake or speaking their minds. This dynamic of respect, trust, and psychological safety begins during the hiring process, continues through onboarding and training, and is woven throughout daily interactions between management and staff.

- **Talent Development**
  Leading places to work recognize that employees value opportunities to advance their knowledge, skills, and abilities. Employees at these organizations know and feel that their employer invests in them and cares about their future, there is a plan for their growth and development, and their advancement is important to the organization.

- **Clear Salary & Benefits**
  Leading places to work understand that salary and benefits are foundational elements of an employee’s experience at work. They have, communicate, clear compensation philosophies and strategies that are applied fairly throughout the organization. While nonprofit organizations often feel constrained in this area due to tight budgets, leading places to work find ways to equitably, flexibly, and creatively compensate their employees.
We asked respondents how long they wanted to continue working for their current organizations. Almost two-thirds of employees surveyed (64%) want to stay in their organizations at least two years.

In each year’s Employee Experience Survey analysis, Leading Edge identifies differences in responses between those who report that they want to leave their organization within the year (“Leavers”) and those who see themselves staying at least five years in the future (“Stayers”).

Analyzing the differences between how leavers and stayers respond to the survey reveals which elements of organizational culture are most critical for retention, as well as which employees are most at risk of turnover.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, as of January 2020, the median amount of time that both wage and salary workers stay at their jobs is 4.1 years.
Retention Drivers

The following “Retention Drivers” are the survey questions for which there are the largest gaps in favorability score between stayers and leavers. These questions are important metrics for how much turnover risk any given organization or subgroup presents, and important indicators of what leaders and managers should work to improve if they want to improve retention at their organizations. While this table shows the top 10 Retention Drivers, throughout the report we draw special attention to questions that are in the top five Retention Drivers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOP-5 RETENTION DRIVERS</th>
<th>STAYERS</th>
<th>LEAVERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT</strong> I would recommend my organization as a great place to work</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT</strong> My organization helps me stay motivated to do my best work</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIVERSITY, EQUITY, INCLUSION &amp; BELONGING</strong> I feel like I belong at my organization</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WELL-BEING</strong> I believe employee well-being is a priority at my organization</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROFESSIONAL LEADERSHIP</strong> I have confidence in our leaders to lead the organization effectively</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
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<td>78%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIVERSITY, EQUITY, INCLUSION &amp; BELONGING</strong> I feel like I belong at my organization</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WELL-BEING</strong> I believe employee well-being is a priority at my organization</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROFESSIONAL LEADERSHIP</strong> I have confidence in our leaders to lead the organization effectively</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These top predictors of staying and leaving are the same set of questions that they were in 2021. Engagement, belonging, well-being, and confidence in leadership are still paramount elements of the workplace experience for retaining people. Below, under Results by Factor, we will include some actions organizations can take to improve these and other parts of employees’ experience at work.

---

5 Not to be confused with Engagement Drivers.
Who Wants to Stay and Leave?

This year, for the first time, we are presenting a few key insights into the demographics of stayers and leavers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leavers are disproportionately lower-ranked</th>
<th>Leavers are disproportionately younger</th>
<th>Leavers are disproportionately lower-paid</th>
<th>There are differences by gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual contributors are more likely to want to leave. Managers and executive team members are more likely to want to stay.</td>
<td>Those who want to leave their organizations are much more likely to be younger than those who want to stay at their organization.</td>
<td>Those whose salaries are below $79,000 are more likely to want to leave; those whose salaries are above that range are more likely to stay.</td>
<td>Nonbinary employees are disproportionately represented among leavers. Women are slightly disproportionately represented among stayers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are differences by disability</td>
<td>There are differences by race/ethnicity</td>
<td>Leavers often work at home</td>
<td>Jewish and non-Jewish employees want to leave/stay at the same rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees who indicate that they have diagnosed disabilities that affect their work are disproportionately likely to want to leave their organizations.</td>
<td>Middle Eastern/North African employees are slightly more likely than employees in other racial/ethnic groups to want to leave their organizations.</td>
<td>Stayers are more likely to work outside of their homes; leavers are more likely to work from home every day.</td>
<td>Jewish and non-Jewish employees are no more or less likely to be stayers or leavers than one another, in this set of Jewish nonprofit organizations surveyed. (54% of respondents identified as Jewish; 39% identified as not Jewish; 7% did not specify.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of these data points suggest identity-based inequities in employee experience within our sector.
Stayers and Leavers for the Sector

We asked respondents not only if they want to stay at or leave their organizations, but also whether or not they want to stay in or leave the Jewish nonprofit sector altogether.

A strong majority of employees (70%) want to stay in the Jewish nonprofit sector at least two years.

We have asked this question every year since 2016, and while the number of organizations taking the survey has grown and changed, making year-to-year comparisons difficult to interpret, it is noteworthy that the proportion of employees who want to stay in the sector for two years or more is much larger post-COVID than it was before COVID.
Results by Factor

We group survey questions into 13 factors of employee experience:

22 Employee Engagement (Key Factor)
25 Accountability & Feedback
27 Collaboration
30 Direct Management
32 Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, & Belonging (DEIB)
35 Employee Enablement
38 Learning & Advancement
42 Organizational Alignment
44 Professional Leadership
47 Psychological Safety
49 Salary & Benefits
51 The Board
53 Well-Being
Overall Favorability by Factor

Here are the factors with their aggregate favorability scores for all employees, in descending order of favorability: 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Favorability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATIONAL ALIGNMENT</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRECT MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE BOARD</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVERSITY, EQUITY, &amp; INCLUSION, &amp; BELONGING (DEIB)</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELL-BEING</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYCHOLOGICAL SAFETY</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT (KEY FACTOR)</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL LEADERSHIP</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNTABILITY &amp; FEEDBACK</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYEE ENABLEMENT</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLABORATION</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEARNING &amp; ADVANCEMENT</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALARY &amp; BENEFITS</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 The favorability score for a whole factor is the average of all the favorability scores for the questions within that factor.

NOTE
In the following sections, most favorability scores (percent of respondents who “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” with a statement) will be color-coded as follows:

- **75-100%**: SOMETHING TO CELEBRATE
- **65-74%**: SOMETHING TO PAY ATTENTION TO
- **0-64%**: SOMETHING TO WORK ON
The factors following Employee Engagement are in alphabetical order, but we present Employee Engagement first because it is the most important of these factors driving organizational success. Copious research supports this conclusion, including this meta-analysis of studies covering 2.7 million employees in which Gallup found that Employee Engagement is significantly correlated with the following metrics (among others): productivity, profitability, employee turnover, safety incidents (accidents), absenteeism, and product quality.

**NOTE**
Comparisons to 2021 and the U.S. Benchmark

Just over half of the questions in the Employee Experience Survey (56% of the questions) are widely used in many organizations’ surveys. Favorability scores from these questions can be compared to Culture Amp’s U.S. Benchmark, which represents people who work in the United States and covers all industries and functions. The remaining Employee Experience Survey questions (44% of the questions) were designed specifically for this survey. When survey questions repeat from year to year, we note pronounced changes relative to last year’s survey results. In general, for comparisons to both last year’s Employee Experience Survey and Culture Amp’s U.S. Benchmark, we note the comparison only when those differences are five percentage points or more in either direction.

**I feel proud to work for my organization**
87%

**I would recommend my organization as a great place to work**
69%

**My organization helps me stay motivated to do my best work**
62%

**I see myself still working at my organization in two years**
62%

**Strong Point**
A strong majority of employees are proud to work for their organizations.

**Growth Area**
“I would recommend my organization as a great place to work.” This is the classic Net Promoter Score question, widely used in every industry to measure customer experience (in the case of this survey, the “customer” is the employee). Favorability for this question has gone down from 2021 to 2022, and remains significantly behind Culture Amp’s U.S. Benchmark.
Key Insight

Support employees through the “engagement crater”

Charting Employee Engagement across tenure, we see a striking pattern. At each end of the tenure line, brand new employees (under one year of tenure) and employees who have been at the organization more than 10 years are both more highly engaged compared with employees with between one and 10 years of tenure, who are significantly less engaged.

This “crater” pattern across tenure appears across multiple factors of employee experience, but is most pronounced for Engagement and Professional Leadership. The phenomenon of a drop-off in engagement after the first year is well known in many industries as a “sophomore slump,” and in 2021, this survey showed that pattern as well. What is striking is that this year the pattern is less a brief dip in the second year and more of a prolonged crater.

Brand new employees are often optimistic and enjoying the novelty of a new workplace. They know all the positive things about the organization that led them to join it, without yet knowing the drawbacks. Engagement drops during the first few years, as the “honeymoon” ends and the employee gets to know the organization’s flaws. At the same time, as new employees are seen less as “exciting new faces” around the organization, managers and colleagues may not give them as much encouragement and validation as they did when they were brand new. Employees may begin to feel taken for granted. As more time goes by, those less engaged are more likely to find opportunities to leave. Those who were more engaged all along are more likely to stay, and may also develop and refine strategies to make the best of the unique quirks and challenges in their organization.

How to address the “engagement crater?”
Support mid-tenure and new employees

Clearly, mid-tenure employees could use more support from their organizations. At the same time, newer employees represent key opportunities to break the “engagement crater” pattern in the next “generation” of employees. The analysis of “Stayers” & “Leavers” indicates that employees with two to five years of tenure at the organization are the tenure group most likely to want to leave. Since we know this pattern in advance, leaders and managers can make a special effort to speak with and listen to new employees before their engagement crater begins, and to proactively and explicitly prepare them to navigate challenges as the “honeymoon” period of their employment wears off. Discussing this pattern openly and setting expectations of honest, respectful communication about addressing challenges might set up both employees and their managers to prevent the engagement crater—or, at least, make it a bit less steep.

Great people and benefits. Challenging culture.

Respondent

---

7 The Employee Engagement being quantified and charted here is the average of employees’ favorability scores for all the survey questions in the Employee Engagement factor.
8 This pattern is not merely caused by age. While there is also an age effect on engagement, with older employees more engaged regardless of tenure, the tenure effect still exists within age groups.
Engagement Drivers

How can organizations improve their Employee Engagement? It helps to understand what other elements of employee experience do most to cause it. Each factor in this report concludes with some actions that organizations can take to improve employees’ experience of that factor. To improve Employee Engagement—the most important factor, but also the most generalized factor—organizations can take action to improve other metrics that drive engagement.

That’s why in each year’s Employee Experience Survey analysis, Leading Edge uses a statistical algorithm within the Culture Amp platform to identify Engagement Drivers, the most important drivers of Employee Engagement. They are “drivers” in the sense that they not only predict Employee Engagement, but also can be the highest-leverage questions to increase engagement. Organizations that see increased favorable experiences regarding these questions will likely see engagement rise as well.

The “Engagement Drivers” in the table to the right are the survey questions most closely correlated with Employee Engagement questions. That is, when employees responded favorably to these questions, they are more likely to have responded favorably to the Employee Engagement questions as well. In this table we present the top 10, but throughout the report we will draw special attention to the top five.

The top five Engagement Drivers for 2022 are exactly the same questions that topped the list in 2021. That lack of movement is noteworthy. The world, the economy, and (vexingly) levels of Employee Engagement are all changing. Gallup reports that employee engagement (across industries) has reversed a previous upward trajectory and begun declining. So it’s worth noting that the parts of workers’ experience that most measurably contribute to their engagement have nonetheless stayed stable. Organizations that demonstrate care and concern for employee well-being, earn employee confidence in leaders, improve communication, and help employees feel they belong will reap benefits in engagement, retention, and, ultimately, effectiveness in achieving their missions.

See the full list under Appendix C: Engagement Drivers (Full List)
Accountability & Feedback

Strong Point

Accountability for results
A strong majority of employees feel their organizations are holding themselves accountable and producing good work, and respondents to this survey report higher overall favorability than Culture Amp’s U.S. Benchmark.

Growth Area

Performance reviews continue to be a pain point for a majority of employees
This finding echoes broader data: Gallup has found that in the broader economy, only 14% of employees strongly agree that the performance reviews they receive inspire them to improve. (In this survey, the 45% favorability score represents 19% “Strongly Agree” and 26% “Agree,” roughly in line with the Gallup figure.)
Managers are least likely to find performance reviews useful

For most questions across the survey, the pattern regarding favorability and job level is that executive team employees report more favorable experiences than average, while both managers and individual contributors report lower-than-average favorability. But “Our performance review process helps me grow and improve” is an exception. For all three job levels, a majority of employees do not agree that their organizations’ performance review processes help them grow and improve, but managers seem to have a uniquely unfavorable perspective on them:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Team Members</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Contributors</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spread</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our performance review process helps me grow and improve

Take Action

Give employees feedback more frequently

Increase the cadence of feedback for employees. One organization has decided to abandon performance ratings. They have created a more frequent and feedback-focused performance management process. Every quarter, each employee sits down with their manager to give and receive feedback and discuss goals from the quarter prior and the upcoming quarter. They can also discuss career pathing.

Ask for employees’ feedback more frequently

Capture employee feedback more efficiently, such as with Pulse Surveys. One organization implemented quarterly surveys. In the first survey they learned that employees desired more flexibility to be able to tend to work/life/family/hobbies, so they implemented a fully flexible work environment policy. Then in follow-up surveys, they were able to determine how people felt about the new policy.

Conduct better one-on-one meetings

Embedding a consistent practice of one-on-one meetings throughout an organization is a key component of performance management. At one organization, managers and individual contributors are trained on how to run effective one-on-one meetings. This organization formed a team to help develop new content to help managers in their one-on-one meetings, including: what makes a great one-on-one meeting, what types of conversations to have, a manager checklist, dos and don’ts, and a bank of questions to use to stimulate the right conversations. Geographically dispersed organizations may want to ensure there are one-on-one meeting champions in each location to assist managers with new training and tools. Executives should also be encouraged to role-model effective one-on-one practices.

Respondent

Our review process is still a complete mystery to me. I don’t understand why the organization, team, and personal goals are entirely unrelated. I also don’t understand how they relate to merit increases. It seems like a process in name only that has little value.”

RESOURCES

“Effective Feedback: Two Models for Managers”
Leading Edge

“Let’s Not Kill Performance Evaluations Yet”
Lori Goler, Janelle Gale, and Adam Grant, HBR
Collaboration

**Strong Point**

Collaboration *within* departments

A strong majority of employees feel there is good collaboration within their department. (Even for this “strong point,” however, there is room for growth; it is below Culture Amp’s U.S. Benchmark.)

**Growth Area**

Collaboration *across* departments

Nearly half of employees respond neutrally or unfavorably to statements about support from, and collaboration with, other departments in their organization. Both questions dropped in favorability score from 2021 to 2022, and favorability for “There is good collaboration between teams/departments in my organization” significantly lags Culture Amp’s U.S. Benchmark. This growth area is most pronounced among organizations with teams larger than 20 employees.

- **There is good collaboration within my team/department**: 82% (-11% from U.S. Benchmark)
- **My team receives high-quality support from other parts of the organization**: 57% (-9% from U.S. Benchmark)
- **There is good collaboration between teams/departments in my organization**: 53% (-6% from 2021, -13% from U.S. Benchmark)
Key Insight

Collaboration across departments is trending downward

Between 2019 and 2022, this question has fallen 12 percentage points:

- There is good cooperation between teams in my organization (question wording in 2019)
- There is good collaboration between teams/departments in my organization (equivalent question wording 2021-22)

The first of these drops is explainable in terms of the initial adjustment to COVID-19 closures; the latter may suggest that many teams are facing new strains two years after the onset of the pandemic in adjusting to new ways of work that often include less face-to-face time than before.

As with all year-over-year comparisons in this survey, it’s important to note that our sample changes each year, has grown each year, and is not random. Still, considering external evidence of growing stress throughout the global workforce, along with this survey’s aggregate downward trend in Employee Engagement even controlling for composition, this trajectory is concerning.

Take Action

Collaborate by example

Leaders are a powerful instrument to facilitate change. Ensure that leaders are demonstrating collaborative behaviors among themselves and encouraging collaboration within the organization. This may look like regular leadership meetings to share updates and explicitly discuss opportunities for greater collaboration across the organization. It might also look like two departments/teams meeting to discuss ways to actively support each other. It could also mean that leaders fill in for each other when one is out to demonstrate that they know about multiple components of the organizations and can step in for each other as needed.

Look beyond the team

Encourage team members to find ways of cooperating with other departments and outside agencies in order to discover new perspectives and new ways of doing things. One organization encourages team members to grab coffee with a person from another department or agency to discuss work/team challenges “havruta-style.”

Reward mensches

Reward employees who go out of their way to help their team members. Those who help others are more likely to receive help from those they help. One organization created a “Mensch of the Month” award. Teams vote on the most helpful person that month and place a small plaque on the winner’s desk for a month until the next vote.

Our organization feels more siloed than ever.”

Respondent

RESOURCE

Beyond Collaboration Overload
Rob Cross, Harvard Business Publishing

PURCHASE PUBLICATION
Survey Story

Collaboration and Camaraderie at JCC Greater Boston

THE INSIGHT
When JCC Greater Boston began taking the Leading Edge survey in 2019, not all of the feedback was easy for managers to hear. However, the survey data inspired a commitment to action in manageable and prioritized ways on collaboration, among other areas.

THE INVESTMENT
To drive greater cross-agency management alignment and to build management skills, JCC Greater Boston developed Bonim (“builders”), a cross-organizational team of 50 managers and leaders who participate in trainings, who support each other, and who work together to address organization-wide challenges.

THE IMPACT
As part of a strategic effort to cultivate more collaboration, Bonim has helped foster feelings of belonging and pride. It has helped JCC Greater Boston cultivate greater trust across the organization and elevated a feeling that well-being matters and is being prioritized. This infrastructure has provided a catalyst for problem-solving, a sense of partnership among departments, and a feeling of camaraderie that everyone is invested in each other’s success and part of the same team. Bonim’s spirit of collaboration was critical when JCC Greater Boston faced severe labor shortages around the summer camp season. The Bonim group worked collaboratively to free up staff (including themselves) to step into a variety of camp roles, enabling the JCC to run a highly successful camp in spite of a summer of extreme hiring shortages.
Direct Management

Strong Point

Employees overwhelmingly feel respected by their managers (although fewer feel that their managers make them better)

Interestingly, the feeling of respect doesn’t always translate into effective management or talent development; while 90% of respondents agree that their manager treats them with respect, just 70% agree that the feedback their manager gives them is useful for their growth.

Growth Area

Almost a third of employees (31%) don’t agree that they have enough input on decisions that affect their work

And the 69% favorability score in this sample is slightly below Culture Amp’s U.S. Benchmark.

Every time I have shared concerns with [my manager], [they] responded with empathy and care and handled my concerns appropriately."

Respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>my manager treats me with respect</th>
<th>My manager is generally available to respond to my concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I have clarity around what I am expected to do and by when</th>
<th>My manager keeps me informed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am appropriately involved in decisions that affect my work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Insight

Employees on smaller teams have more favorable experiences of direct management—especially regarding input into decisions that affect them.

The same pattern repeats for the other questions in this factor, but with more modest spreads of six or seven points between the top and bottom groups.

A similar pattern plays out in the Professional Leadership factor, for questions related to leadership communication. The reason for both may be simple: Fewer people mean fewer people per leader to consider, inform, and build strong relationships with. Individual contributors on smaller teams can expect to experience more interactions, and a larger proportion of the interactions, with their leaders.

Take Action

Make opportunities for leaders and managers from different departments to compare notes

One large organization implemented informal “leader network hub” meetings where executives would meet with a cross-section of department heads and managers from across the organization. It was developed to enhance collaboration and information-sharing, and to be an opportunity to collaborate, to hear the impact of decisions on the day-to-day work, and for leaders to contribute their input into the decisions being made in the organization.

Make decision-making more empathetic

As organizations grow, the process and structure around decision-making changes. As a result, an individual who used to make a decision may not be the right person to make the same decision anymore. Empathetic leaders are clear about how decision-making is changing and can address that decision-making should not be made by consensus. Be clear about how decisions are made, and when that needs to change and why. When a new person starts/moves roles, let the team know that person’s decision-making responsibilities in the future along with their role responsibilities. Also let the team know who used to make this decision and why it’s changing. Ensure that prior conversations are had with individuals before team announcements so they understand and are on board with the changes.

Establish an if/then information-sharing rule

It’s hard to remember when you should update your team and which information to share, so having a process pre-prepared will make it easier to manage. Create a simple “if-then” rule for yourself so you know when and how to share important information with your team. Come up with a trigger that reminds you to take action and what that simple action is to take. Examples: If I’m invited to a cross-departmental meeting, then I will block 30 minutes on my calendar to email a summary of key points to my team, or if my manager shares news with me about company strategy, then I will immediately add it to our team meeting agenda.
Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, & Belonging (DEIB)

**Strong Point**

**Belonging**

A strong majority of employees feel that they belong at their organizations. This is an important strength because it is not only a top five Engagement Driver, but also a top five Retention Driver. There are some notable discrepancies by identity (discussed below), and there is certainly room to grow from 77% favorability, but it is a relatively strong place to start, especially for a question so strongly tied to engagement and retention.

**Growth Area**

**The organization’s commitment to DEIB**

The favorability reported by employees in this survey overall for “My organization values diversity (for purposes of answering this question diversity is defined as the representation of all varied identities and differences)” lags Culture Amp’s U.S. Benchmark by nine percentage points at 74%. And the scores are slightly lower for “My organization enables people from all backgrounds to do well” and “My organization demonstrates a genuine commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion.” Favorability scores for these questions were lowest for younger employees.
Key Insight

Organizations can increase employees’ feelings of belonging by paying attention to groups particularly less likely to feel like they belong.

The two questions within this factor with the highest favorability scores—“I feel like I belong at my organization” and “I feel comfortable discussing my background, beliefs, and cultural experiences with my co-workers”—are also the questions presenting the best opportunities for organizations to invest effort in improving, even though other questions in the factor have lower favorability. The other four questions explore general impressions about the organization, but these two questions are direct measures of the employee’s personal feelings of belonging and inclusion, and one of them is a top driver of both engagement and retention.

Inequities related to identity differences are key drivers of who feels less belonging.

- **People of Color** tend to experience less belonging—and especially **Black employees**.
- Among Jews of Color, **Black Jews** are especially less likely to feel like they belong at their organizations.
- **LGBTQ+ employees** are less likely to feel like they belong at their organizations.
- **Non-Jewish employees**, overall, experience less belonging than Jews.

Take Action

Focus on “culture add” when hiring

To build a diverse team, change language from “culture fit” to “culture add” when hiring. Looking for a candidate with “culture fit” introduces ambiguity into the recruiting process because it can signal that you are seeking traits and backgrounds that fit into an existing culture, rather than someone who will add to the culture. Shift your focus away from “being like us” to what they can contribute to your culture that is missing and that is beneficial or a bonus to what currently exists.

Check tools and systems for inclusivity

Ensure that internal tools and systems are designed to support everyone equitably. One organization set up a team to evaluate their internal systems to ensure that their tools and processes were fair and accessible to everyone. The organization’s compensation and promotion systems were configured to show pay differences and promotion density by ethnicity, gender, and other demographics. The team checks all tools, systems, and internal processes regularly to make sure everyone is included.

Consider emotion-focused training

Train on more than just skills to help employees become more self-aware. One organization sends their emerging leaders to “manager essentials training” to help people with high potential become more emotionally intelligent. This training, which focuses on developing self-awareness and empathy, enables managers to build stronger relationships with their direct reports. To apply this to smaller groups or teams, you could have your entire team have emotional intelligence training. A low-cost option would be to have your team members read a recognized book on the topic (e.g., Dan Goleman’s book on Emotional Intelligence) and discuss learnings and takeaways as a team.
Focusing on Follow-Through at Sixth & I

**THE INSIGHT**
Sixth & I’s 2021 survey results pointed to a clear need to focus more on DEI, among other things, to ensure that the organization’s commitments were not just theoretical, but felt by the team and community. Building on a culture of strong management and organizational alignment, the leadership team mapped out a strategic plan to address multiple growth areas, including actualizing their value of justice in a lived way.

**THE INVESTMENT**
By adding new dedicated staff roles and budgeted dollars to address these areas of growth, the leadership team at Sixth & I evaluated and enhanced equity in their compensation. With the goal of having a team and board more reflective of the city they serve, they reviewed hiring processes and board requirements for proposed interventions to make them more equitable and inclusive. Working with an outside consultant, they convened a DEI working group, as well as facilitated full-staff discussions, to make conversations about diversity, equity, and inclusion a mainstreamed and prioritized discussion topic and work area.

**THE IMPACT**
Both during and after these initiatives, Sixth & I leaders earned their team’s trust regarding their values, as demonstrated by a 100% favorable score around 3 of the 5 questions in the organizational alignment factor for two straight years. But after implementing a values-aligned set of concrete DEI changes, Sixth & I also saw a significant improvement in favorability for “My organization values diversity”—showing that the team now sees those values becoming reality more than ever before.
Employee Enablement

**Strong Point**

**Daily progress**
Over three-quarters of employees (79%) feel that most days they make progress with their work. This question is moderately correlated with Employee Engagement. It is also a Retention Driver, being number six on the list of questions most correlated with wanting to leave the organization.

**Growth Area**

**Matching the amount of people with the amount of work**
This question has long been a pain point for a majority of respondents in past surveys, and historically in our field. Only 38% of employees feel that there are enough people to do the work they need to do. It’s unsurprising that this should be true at the smallest organizations, and indeed, for employees at organizations of 6 to 10 employees, the favorability score is just 30%. Yet in no team size group do employees report a majority favorable score; even for organizations of 200+ team members, the favorability score for this question is just 39%. This suggests that the best solutions may have to do with leaders and managers keeping goals, activities, and workloads focused and right-sized for their teams, rather than necessarily adding more team members.

- **Most days I feel that I am making progress with my work**
  - 79%
  - -5% from 2021

- **I have the resources I need to do my job effectively**
  - 71%
  - -6% from U.S. Benchmark

- **Our systems and processes generally support us in getting our work done effectively**
  - 64%

- **There are enough people to do the work we need to do**
  - 38%
  - -7% from U.S. Benchmark

- **I have access to the information that I need to do my job effectively**
  - 79%

- **I believe my workload is reasonable for my role**
  - 65%
  - -7% from U.S. Benchmark

- **Workloads are divided fairly within my team/department**
  - 58%
Key Insight

Executives and managers perceive staffing problems

Aligning work plans and expectations with available resources can help mitigate them. For an overwhelming majority of the survey questions, the pattern regarding job levels is that executive team members respond more favorably than average; individual contributors respond less favorably than average; and managers are in between, or sometimes on one side or the other of that divide, depending on the question. However, for “There are enough people to do the work we need to do,” this pattern is reversed.

There are enough people to do the work we need to do

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EXECUTIVE TEAM MEMBERS</th>
<th>MANAGERS</th>
<th>INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are enough people</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fact that managers and executives respond with such low favorability suggests that whatever the barriers are to addressing this persistent feeling of understaffing, awareness among professional leaders is not the problem.

Probably relatedly, two other questions in the Employee Enablement factor also break the usual job-level pattern:

I believe my workload is reasonable for my role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EXECUTIVE TEAM MEMBERS</th>
<th>MANAGERS</th>
<th>INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I believe my workload</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have the resources I need to do my job effectively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EXECUTIVE TEAM MEMBERS</th>
<th>MANAGERS</th>
<th>INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have the resources I</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional leaders (particularly managers) feel squeezed around staffing and resources

To some degree, this may be a structural feature of the nonprofit field, where even successful organizations might struggle to fund sufficient staffing to accomplish their missions. Nonprofits have long been rewarded for minimizing “overhead.” Boards and funders have a role to play in addressing what many professional leaders and managers seem to be experiencing as a persistent challenge around adequate staffing by ensuring that the overall goals they set or fund have adequate staffing and resources to achieve them.

But leaders and managers, whose job it is to work within resource constraints, can also do much to address these challenges

They can set clearer priorities, adjust workloads, and sunset projects that do not advance the mission as well as others. They can also build in some amount of redundancy in staffing so that there is resilience in their team’s capacity.
**Set priorities**
Prioritize workload by assessing your team’s day-to-day priorities. One organization had managers begin the week with a check-in about that week’s agenda. This way the team was able to know exactly what was the absolute priority for that week and what may have to be shifted.

**Conduct a work cycle audit**
Take a look at your annual work cycle. One organization took stock of all departmental work cycles to determine times when additional support was needed and when cross-departmental collaboration could provide the necessary support. They hired temps, interns, and virtual assistants to help during busy times.

**See what’s in the toolshed**
Take inventory of the tools and resources people use, to identify those that are most valuable. One organization documents all the systems being used, and each department gives a rating on each tool. Based on the rating, they decide which tools to start, stop, and continue using. This could be rolled out to frequently used resources and vendors as well.

"We are running lean with no redundancies. We can get the work done if no one is ever sick or out of town or has car trouble. If someone does, we scramble to keep up. If two people are out sick, forget it."

Respondent
Learning & Advancement

Strong Point
Most employees feel they have opportunities for challenging and interesting work

Growth Area
Professional development and advancement
Between 2021 and 2022, the overall favorability score for “My organization provides me with sufficient opportunities for professional development—e.g., training, conferences, community of practice, etc.” has dropped from 64% to 59%. The trend is in the other direction for “I have opportunities for advancement at my organization” (a three percentage point rise since last year), but it remains the case that a majority of employees do not respond favorably. For this question, the favorability score is starkly below Culture Amp’s U.S. Benchmark.
Key Insight

People's history of promotion (or not) strongly contributes to their perceptions of future opportunities

For many questions in the survey, employees who indicated that “I have been promoted to a new role at least once” rate questions more favorably than employees who indicate that “I have been in the same role the entire time” or that “I have moved laterally (to a new role, same level) at least once.” The lateral movers are the least likely to respond favorably to many questions, with small gaps, but for one question in this factor, the gap is large:

I have opportunities for advancement at my organization

I have been promoted to a new role at least once

52%

I have been in the same role the entire time

39%

I have moved laterally (to a new role, same level) at least once

31%

Team size also plays a role in employees’ perception of opportunities. For most questions in the Learning & Advancement factor, employees at small organizations are more likely to respond favorably:

But regarding opportunities to advance in the organization, the pattern reverses, albeit with a modest gap:

I have opportunities for advancement at my organization

I have opportunities to develop new skills at my organization
**Take Action**

**Expand career conversations**

Hold more regular career-focused conversations with employees. One organization has mid-year career conversations that focus solely on development and career planning. These conversations are led by the employee so that they are encouraged to take ownership of their development. They are provided with a simple template to complete as a guide for the conversation. The employees are encouraged to include a discussion of their personal and job-related goals so the manager can give recommendations for individual skills development opportunities.

**Conduct growth-oriented “stay interviews”**

Learn before employees churn. One organization uses stay interviews as a way for the organization to re-engage with employees and their long-term goals. Stay interviews can be held at specific times in the employee lifecycle where employees are encouraged to discuss their career development needs as well as any blockers to their long-term success at the organization. In departments where there are higher rates of turnover, it can be helpful to have a skip-level meeting (i.e., meet with your manager’s manager) intermittently throughout the employee lifecycle.

**Use an internal job board (This works well for larger organizations)**

Ensure all employees are given a fair chance to move into new roles within the organization. After receiving feedback that opportunities were not being made available to employees on merit, one organization set up a jobs board. All open jobs are posted internally, enabling employees to apply based on perceived skill fit. All applicants are considered before external recruitment is commenced.

---

"While I do think there are opportunities to advance, it is unclear what they are and what the process might look like. If I knew I was working towards advancement, that would make me work harder in my role to achieve that.”

Respondent
Survey Story

Advancing as a Learning Community at Shalom Austin

THE INSIGHT
When Shalom Austin first began taking the Leading Edge survey, their Learning & Advancement scores were consistently lower than they would have liked. Coming out of the 2019 survey season, they made a commitment to address this area of growth.

THE INVESTMENT
With the support of a Chief Learning and Engagement Officer and dedicated funding, Shalom Austin took on the strategic work of investing in staff learning and advancement in a robust way. They developed a model called Training Tuesdays, a bimonthly learning series that provides training around topics that will interest staff across departments, roles, and tenure. This model ensures that all staff benefit from learning and development opportunities, not just those in management or senior leadership roles. Shalom Austin recently presented on this learning model at “JPro22: Going Places Together, In Partnership with The Jewish Federations of North America.”

THE IMPACT
With a strategic focus on the topics and skill areas that are most valuable to the collective rather than an individual department or role, Training Tuesdays allows everyone to grow and advance, and fosters a culture of learning more broadly. Staff members now make requests or recommendations for Training Tuesdays topics, and even when they aren’t best for the all-staff model, it is an indication of a growing commitment to and partnership around learning and advancement as a strategic priority, and an appetite for development that benefits the entire organization.

I have opportunities to develop new skills at my organization

+26%
for Shalom Austin since 2019

VISIT SHALOM AUSTIN WEBSITE
Organizational Alignment

**Strong Point**

**People know their work makes a difference**

An overwhelming majority of employees responded favorably to “I know how my work contributes to my organization’s mission, strategy, and goals.” This 89% favorability score remains just under the Culture Amp U.S. Benchmark of 91%, which was also the favorability score for this question in the Employee Experience Survey of 2021. Even in what appears to have been a difficult year, most people can see the value of their work.

**Growth Area**

**Many employees feel a lack of open and honest communication**

Nearly half (43%) of employees did not agree that “At my organization there is open and honest two-way communication.” This 57% favorability score is markedly below Culture Amp’s U.S. Benchmark of 70% for this question. Since this is a top five Engagement Driver with low favorability, it represents a high-leverage opportunity for the field to improve. (See also the Collaboration and Professional Leadership factors, in which communication is also a major theme.)
Key Insight

There is a leadership disconnect regarding open and honest communication

Executive team members are 21 percentage points more likely than managers to respond favorably to “At my organization there is open and honest two-way communication.” (Individual contributors and managers respond favorably at nearly the same rates.)

At my organization there is open and honest two-way communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOP-5 ENGAGEMENT DRIVER</th>
<th>SPREAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE TEAM MEMBERS</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTORS</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGERS</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The picture of leadership disconnect is reinforced by data from the 2022 CEO Survey. Of the 222 CEOs who took the CEO survey—these are the topmost professional leaders of most of the same organizations that took the 2022 Employee Experience Survey—84% agreed that “Our organization prioritizes transparent communication.” Members of executive teams are less likely to perceive communication problems than other employees, and CEOs are the least likely of all to be aware of them.

Take Action

Listen first

Employees will listen better when they also feel heard. Leaders should seek employees’ ideas and ask their feelings and concerns throughout the decision-making cycle. This doesn’t mean that each employee gets a vote on each decision, but rather that the organization recognizes and hears how people are feeling. The process of listening to employees will differ based on the organization’s size, operations, and needs, but the important point is that gathering input should be proactive. Managers should engage individual employees, ideally one-on-one or in small groups, to draw them out. This is as much about building trust and engagement as it is about getting honest and detailed feedback. Both are vital, and both require real conversation.

Use internal communication channels better

Use internal communication channels to align on team decisions. Create channels and tools specific to your organization that:

- Allows teams to understand where communication will come from.
- Gives them notice on when a decision will be posted.
- Gives them opportunities to debate and discuss potential outcomes.
- Sets a deadline on when a response is required.
- Gives guidance on the final decision being made (e.g., highest/lowest votes, polls, post-analysis of the commentary by the leaders, etc.).
- Shares the decision once it is made and any changes to process, procedures, and policies.

Use information-flow exercises

Identify the blockers to information flow through a series of questions the teams agree are holding them back. Publish summaries to both share learnings and create accountability. When company teams get together regularly and look at their daily operations and opportunities for greater efficiency, they identify specific information blockers in the process. Assign the teams to contribute to the exercise. Each team then assesses and identifies responses to these questions:

- When was our own team the blocker for another team, via information withheld or taking too long to complete a task?
- How can we do things differently to ensure this is prevented in the future?
- What can we commit to now—one action to ensure change?
Professional Leadership

**Strong Point**

Most employees believe their organizations will appropriately address sexual harassment and discrimination

While these favorability scores (84% and 80%) could certainly be higher, a strong majority of employees perceive their organizations as appropriately accountable in this regard.

See more under Appendix D: Organizational Policies

**Growth Area**

Confidence in leadership

70% of employees agree that “I have confidence in our leaders to lead the organization effectively.” That’s a clear majority, but it’s seven percentage points lower than the favorability score for the same question in 2021, and eight percentage points lower than Culture Amp’s U.S. Benchmark. Since this question is a top five Engagement Driver, it represents a clear opportunity for growth.
**Key Insight**

**Improving leadership means improving communication**

How can leaders improve their teams’ levels of confidence in their leadership? The other questions in this factor provide at least part of the answer. Almost 1 in 3 employees (31%) do not agree that “The leadership team’s actions are consistent with my organization’s values.” More than 1 in 3 employees do not agree that “Our leaders generally communicate openly and honestly with employees;” that “I believe leaders will support the organization in taking action as a result of this survey;” or that “I am kept appropriately informed about major decisions and events happening at my organization.” All of these questions are about communication between leaders and their teams—listening, responding, and keeping people informed. **Strong communication skills are a core competency of effective leadership.**

For most of the questions in this factor, smaller organizations have much more favorable experiences, and the same pattern strongly holds for the Collaboration factor. Whether between departments or between leaders and their teams, it’s inherently easier to have stronger communication within a small group than within a large one.

**Take Action**

**Schedule open forums**

Hold regular open forum meetings with senior leaders. This gives the entire staff a way to hear from the CEO and pose questions about the state of the organization, when they normally don’t have that access.

**Allow for anonymous questions**

Make space for feedback and questions from all employees. To facilitate questions at all-hands meetings, one organization created an anonymous communications channel (using its internal communication software). Employees ask questions anonymously prior to all-hands meetings. The questions are then answered by leadership at these meetings. Employees feel that their voices are heard, and they can express their opinions without connecting their name to the question. This could also be done at the team level prior to team meetings.

**Host lunch drop-ins**

Increase visibility and accessibility of leaders by holding regular lunches (in-person or virtual) hosted by executives. At one organization, executives have one lunch a month with a team that is randomly selected. Leaders have an opportunity to meet and get to know employees from different departments. Leaders connect with employees outside of day-to-day activities, and employees have a chance to get to know leaders on a more personal level.

**Our leaders generally communicate openly and honestly with me. I know that this experience is not felt to be true for others on the team. Different leadership team members have different management styles and share different information with their teams, which sometimes leads to tension, confusion, or discomfort.”**

Respondent

---

**RESOURCE**

“It’s Not Nagging: Why Persistent, Redundant Communication Works”

Kim Girard, HBS Working Knowledge

[READ ARTICLE]
Survey Story

Growth Mindset at 70 Faces Media

THE INSIGHT

In previous years, 70 Faces Media didn’t widely share survey insights or action plans to address those insights with the team. This past year, 70 Faces Media shared with their team an honest assessment of where they were on their organizational culture journey and invested in the people and systems necessary to improve.

THE INVESTMENT

70 Faces Media elevated the portfolio of a senior team member to include dedicated attention to Employee Engagement, talent development, and organizational culture. They have worked hard to elevate underrepresented voices across departments, and doubled down on internal communications by leveraging Slack in a more robust way. They have also begun to roll out more robust systems for project management and are actively focused on building momentum around cross-department collaboration. And in recognition that culture is owned by everyone at an organization, a cross-team staff task force will support idea generation and accountability to take action around this year’s survey data.

THE IMPACT

With more open and honest two-way communication and visible efforts to address topics most important to staff, 70 Faces Media has seen growth in their staff’s confidence in the organization’s leadership, and a more open culture of feedback and collaboration. More of the staff now feel that diversity of opinion and experience are valued and believe there is commitment to fostering a culture where that diversity is centered and celebrated. There is a collaborative spirit of growth and partnership around 70 Faces Media’s journey to being a great place to work.
Psychological Safety

**Strong Point**

**Most people feel safe taking risks in their work**

This is a rare area in which the sample of Jewish nonprofit teams taking the Employee Experience Survey significantly outperforms Culture Amp’s U.S. Benchmark. Leaders and managers should celebrate this strength and build on it.

**Growth Area**

**Comfort sharing dissent about the organization’s work and feeling heard and respected**

Last year, we asked employees whether they were “comfortable sharing potentially unpopular opinions at work.” Only 51% of employees responded favorably. Based on feedback from some stakeholders, however, we slightly changed the wording of the question this year to clarify that we’re only talking about opinions directly related to work. The new phrasing reads: “I’m comfortable sharing potentially unpopular opinions about how to do our work.” (Emphasis added.) This year, with the new phrasing, the favorability score is 65%. A clear majority feels comfortable sharing potentially unpopular ideas about the work. Still, with more than a third of employees (35%) not agreeing, this is an area worth addressing further.

Perhaps relatedly, almost a third of employees (31%) also did not agree that “When I offer my opinion, I feel that it is heard and respected.” This question’s overall favorability score dropped 6% from 2021 to 2022, and, at 69%, is now 9% below Culture Amp’s U.S. Benchmark.

---

**It is safe to take risks on my team**

- e.g., try new things, share new or different perspectives, ask tough questions, etc.

78%

+12% from the U.S. Benchmark

**I feel comfortable speaking up if my values were/are ever compromised**

76%

**When I offer my opinion, I feel that it is heard and respected**

69%

-6% from 2021

-9% from the U.S. Benchmark

**I’m comfortable sharing potentially unpopular opinions about how to do our work**

65%
**Key Insight**

The higher you rank, the safer you feel

The relationship between job level and favorability scores for Psychological Safety questions is clear. Here is one example, but all other questions in this factor show broadly similar patterns:

- I'm comfortable sharing potentially unpopular opinions about how to do our work
  - **EXECUTIVE TEAM MEMBERS**: 82%
  - **MANAGERS**: 72%
  - **INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTORS**: 62%

- When I offer my opinion, I feel that it is heard and respected
  - **EXECUTIVE TEAM MEMBERS**: 82%
  - **MANAGERS**: 68%
  - **INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTORS**: 68%

Interestingly, for “When I offer my opinion, I feel that it is heard and respected,” there is no gap between managers and individual contributors—but a disconnect between executive team members and everyone else.

For those in powerful positions in their organizations, it can be difficult to understand what it’s like for someone who has less power in the organization. But being aware of this asymmetry can help them take action to improve it. Broadly speaking, leaders can look for opportunities to support and celebrate appropriate risk-taking among individual contributors, actively solicit lower-ranked employees’ ideas and critical feedback about the work, and make people feel valued for sharing their perspectives, regardless of which perspective becomes realized in the final work product.

**Take Action**

Institute the platinum rule

The “golden rule” says to treat others as you want them to treat you. To create a culture where employees feel safe and comfortable sharing unpopular opinions, one organization updated the “golden rule” to make it the “platinum rule”—to treat others the way they want to be treated. All managers were tasked with taking the time to find out their team’s preferences for frequency of check-ins, style of communication, type of feedback, etc.

Welcome healthy conflict

Ask questions in a way that does not shut down creativity. One organization trained their managers to ask questions in a different way. Instead of “Why did you do this?” ask “What was your thought process?” They further encouraged their teams to ask questions of managers and leaders. The dialogue created a culture where healthy conflict was welcomed. This led to employees feeling empowered to come to their managers with those wacky ideas, which sometimes prove to be invaluable.

Hold a process hackathon

Bring together diverse perspectives to improve organizational processes. One organization holds an annual hackathon to improve processes. Each department chooses their least-favorite process (large departments can choose more than one). Cross-functional teams are formed with people from different departments and each team discusses how to improve one process. In addition to helping to improve efficiency, this also leads to greater empathy with colleagues.

**RESOURCE**

“How a Lack of Negative Criticism Can Make NGO Employees Feel Unsafe”
Gali Cooks, Stanford Social Innovation Review
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## Salary & Benefits

### Strong Point

No question in this factor is strong, but it’s good that at least a majority of employees agree that “My employee benefits generally meet my needs.” Even here, however, this question had a favorability score that was seven percentage points higher in 2021.

### Growth Area

Every question in this factor is a growth area, but it is particularly clear that **many employees feel they need more information about how compensation works at their organizations**—both regarding how salaries and raises are currently determined and regarding what steps the organization is taking to review and improve this process for the future. *Every employee wants to earn more money, but evidence suggests that it matters even more for employees to feel that the compensation process is fair and rational—rather than how much money, on an absolute level, they earn.* Salary issues may be particularly important at this time, with inflation being both high and highly salient in media and discourse. Employees may be more likely than at other times to feel insecure about their personal and family finances and their financial futures. More information about compensation procedures and trajectories could help people feel at least somewhat more secure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Favorability Score</th>
<th>Change from 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My employee benefits generally meet my needs</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe my salary is fair relative to similar roles at my organization</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand how salaries and raises are determined at my organization</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization has worked or is actively working on our approach to compensation</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Insight

Departments and salary transparency

Employees working in human resources departments report favorability scores for Salary & Benefits questions 20 to 30 percentage points higher than the favorability scores of employees in many other department types. Finance departments also yield higher-than-average favorability scores. This is easy to understand because these departments work with and have visibility into compensation at the organization.

The lowest favorability scores for this factor come from Marketing/Communications and—lowest of all—Teaching. Only 46% of teachers agree that their employee benefits generally meet their needs; only 39% agree that their salary is fair relative to similar roles; and only 30%-31% agree that they understand how compensation is determined at their organization or that their organization is working on improving its compensation practices.

Unsurprisingly, there is also a large difference in favorability within the Salary & Benefits factor by job level, with higher-ranked employees much more likely to respond favorably.

Take Action

Implement Salary Bands with these six steps

In Salary Bands: Valuing Talent with Intention and Transparency, we lay out six steps to more transparent, rational, and equitable compensation. Most employees don’t understand how pay decisions are made at their organizations. That’s a big problem because research suggests that employees care more about whether they feel pay is fair than they do about the absolute amount they are paid. Read the guide for full explanations and examples. The six steps are:

1. Create a compensation philosophy.
2. Complete a job analysis.
3. Benchmark with market data.
5. Determine salaries and raises.
6. Share the bands with your team.

Conduct frequent pay calibrations

Instead of yearly pay calibrations, consider more frequent check-ins. This approach of more frequent salary checks is based on the thinking that the moment you realize an employee deserves a raise, they should receive it. The longer between that realization and the raise, the more time the employee has to feel that their contributions are not being fairly compensated. In a highly competitive job market this can lead to regrettable turnover that could have otherwise been addressed.

Say what you pay

Be clear on the salary range when advertising new roles to promote fair pay across the organization. Candidates shouldn’t have to feel their current earning is a criteria in whether or not they get the job. By being clear on what someone can expect in the role, candidates can self-select whether they wish to be part of the process and ensure no one is unduly wasting their time.

- This practice allows people to decide to apply for a role with all the necessary information. Someone with deep passion for what you do who is less motivated by salary will not be overlooked. It also ensures equity of pay from the outset. Simply matching or boosting current pay can perpetuate gender or ethnicity pay gaps over time.

- Being transparent with equal pay for equal work demonstrates a culture of equality from the point of entry into the business and helps embed that as a value throughout the employee lifecycle.
The Board

Strong Point
A very strong majority of employees who interact with their organization’s board feel respected by board members.

85%

I feel respected as a professional by board members at my organization

Growth Area
A quarter of employees who interact with the board do not agree that board members and professional leaders work together effectively. A 75% favorability score is not an indicator of a big problem, but it is notable.

75%

At my organization board members and professional leaders work together effectively

I really feel that the board members I interact with are genuine colleagues and thought partners, and really care about the work that we do at [my organization]. They are actively invested (financially, professionally, emotionally) in the success of our work and in the empowerment of the staff to do their best work, and that is something I see, and am grateful for, every time I interact with members of our board.”

Respondent

NOTE
The two questions in this factor were only presented to employees who indicated that they interact with the board. Over 1 in 4 (27%) respondents indicated that they interact with the board, and were therefore presented with these questions.

RESOURCES
Board-Staff Interactions FAQ
BoardSource
DOWNLOAD PDF
13 Tips For Facilitating Teamwork With A Nonprofit Board of Directors
Forbes
READ ONLINE ARTICLE
Key Insight

Executive team members are slightly more likely to respond favorably to both board questions than managers or individual contributors

All three job levels are included among employees who said they interact with the board, and while executive team members and managers are a higher proportion of these board-interacting employees than they are of the whole sample, they are still a minority of the employees who interact with the board; 52% of employees who interact with the board are individual contributors.

I feel respected as a professional by board members at my organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>84%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MANAGERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE TEAM MEMBERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTORS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At my organization board members and professional leaders work together effectively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>81%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE TEAM MEMBERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTORS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employees in Marketing/Communications departments are least likely to say they feel respected as a professional by board members. When it comes to perceptions of the board-professional partnership, employees in Lobbying/Public Affairs, Teaching, Marketing/Communications, and Programming/Direct Service Provider departments are least likely to agree that their board and professionals work effectively together.

Take Action

Encourage board members to show up to the organization’s programming, or volunteer for the organization, if and when appropriate³

This provides an authentic, natural way to show board members some of the work of the team in action, and to build more points of connection among the board, the team, and the work. Moreover, when the board has the opportunity to see the work up close, it often helps in their strategic decision-making and setting of organizational priorities. Some boards may want to create a committee or task force to boost board member attendance and engagement with the organization’s programming.

Encourage the board to show gratitude to the team

Create opportunities to raise staff visibility to the board, and opportunities for board members to show appreciation to the team. In the case of smaller organizations, it could be in the form of handwritten notes or in-person thank you meetings or calls. For larger organizations, it could take the form of sending gifts or throwing gratitude lunches or other events and celebrations recognizing the work and dedication of the staff. Depending on the type of organization, some boards may want to create committees or task forces on staff appreciation. This can be especially helpful for larger and remote organizations, where team members have fewer opportunities to interact with the board.

Align the board and professionals regarding values

CEOs and boards can periodically review organizational values and ensure that professionals and boards are aligned about what the values are and how the mission and work serve those values. Conversations that reground the work in values and vision can be a useful jumping-off point for conversations between the CEO and the board about long-term strategy and organizational priorities. These conversations can also set up interactions between board members and team members to be conducted on the basis of the explicitly shared values. Articulating organizational values and translating them into the way the organization works is also an excellent way to onboard new board members into multiple levels of their work as board members.

³ When this is not an option, informal meetings between board members and staff can also help.
Well-Being

TOP FIVE DRIVERS
Employee well-being is one of the most important factors for engagement, retention, and quality work. Two of the 5 questions in this factor are in the top five Engagement Drivers.

See more under Engagement Drivers

Strong Point

People feel supported by their colleagues and managers

Strong majorities of employees respond favorably to “I have colleagues who I can turn to for support” and “My manager genuinely cares about my well-being—e.g., my satisfaction, workload, and/or overall health.” While the favorability score for the latter question in this sample is slightly below the U.S. Benchmark, favorability scores in the 80s for both of these questions show that for the most part, interpersonal relations are doing well.
Growth Area

Disconnecting from work—especially for leaders and managers

More than 1 in 3 employees (40%) did not agree that “I have enough opportunities to disconnect from work.” And while the favorability score for this question has moved up since 2021, there is room to grow.

Unlike many questions in the survey, when higher job levels in organizations tend to go along with higher favorability scores, this question is especially a pain point for managers and executives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I have enough opportunities to disconnect from work</th>
<th>INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTORS</th>
<th>62%</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE TEAM MEMBERS</th>
<th>52%</th>
<th>MANAGERS</th>
<th>49%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPREAD</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This relationship to job level is also evident in the 2022 CEO Survey, which was fielded simultaneously with the Employee Experience Survey. Only 33% of CEOs agreed that “I have enough opportunities to disconnect from work.”

Just as leaders are especially likely to struggle with disconnecting from work, they can also play a strong role in solving the problem. Leaders can help their employees feel that they can disconnect from work by disconnecting from work themselves (and doing what needs to be done to allow the organization to succeed on that basis). Comparing this question in both the Employee Experience Survey and the CEO Survey, we can see that among organizations whose CEOs indicated on the CEO Survey that they have opportunities to disconnect from work, their employees were also more likely to indicate the same:

I have enough opportunities to disconnect from work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEO Responses</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average favorability score for employees of the CEOs giving the corresponding responses</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPREAD</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Key Insight**

Employees at smaller organizations are more likely to report favorable well-being experiences

Here are favorability scores, broken out by team size, for the two well-being questions that are top five Engagement Drivers:

**My organization demonstrates care and concern for its employees**

90% 80% 70%
6 TO 10 11 TO 20 21 TO 50 51 TO 100 101 TO 200 200+

SPREAD: 22%

**I believe employee well-being is a priority at my organization**

90% 80% 70%
6 TO 10 11 TO 20 21 TO 50 51 TO 100 101 TO 200 200+

SPREAD: 23%

One possible reason for these differences based on team size is that in larger organizations, each employee gets a smaller percentage of the leadership’s overall attention. When there are fewer people, each gets more chances to be heard and see their views influence leadership decisions, as well as more chances to build meaningful relationships with organizational leaders in ways that make them feel cared for.

**Take Action**

Create email response policies

Provide clear expectations on when work activity is appropriate after standard work hours. Instead of instituting a ban on emails after work hours, one organization developed clear policies around when someone is expected to respond to an email (or other communication). Having policies around response expectations ensures everyone is on the same page. It also doesn’t inhibit employees from sending ideas outside of normal hours—there is just no expectation that a response will occur until the following work day.

Provide managers with work-life policy training

Help managers role-model effective work-life choices. One organization developed a training program for managers to understand how they can encourage good work-life choices. The training educates managers on current policies and encourages them to make full use of vacation days and telecommuting options. Managers can model a positive work-life blend by making full use of vacation days and flexible work options. Ensure that people understand the options available and encourage their use. Another organization implemented a work-life blend accountability buddy system where team members checked in on each other to make sure they were making time for self-care and were keeping off-hours emails to a minimum.

Institute recharge days

Create “recharge days,” which are distinct from other paid time off and are intended to be used when an employee has worked exceptionally hard on a project, had significant time traveling for work, or feels generally at risk of burnout. This is a low-cost way to offer appreciation for employees’ most intense efforts and to ensure that the team builds in recovery time after a sprint. Set a policy that managers can appoint a recharge day at their discretion. Let the team know when someone is out of the office on a recharge day and why this day was offered to them.
**Survey Story**

**A Culture of Nourishment at IKAR**

**THE INSIGHT**

The work of sustaining a spiritual community especially in a pandemic was taking a toll on the staff at IKAR. People expressed a need for more people to help with the workload and better systems and infrastructure to help staff feel supported and cared for.

**THE INVESTMENT**

With support from an outside consultant, IKAR employees created individualized professional development plans, to meet the needs and goals of each employee. They built more intentional team time into meetings and retreats, and each department received resources to cultivate relationships within smaller groups. In addition to existing office closures, IKAR added in a summer break and self-care days throughout the year, and created standard language for out-of-office email signatures to share with the wider community the importance of time away. They also created greater clarity around paid-time-off policies and more explicitly encouraged team members to take advantage of it. To address workload concerns, senior leaders brought on more staff, and also focused on creating stronger systems, clearer roles, and more transparency and communication to help ensure more reasonable and evenly distributed workloads across departments.

**THE IMPACT**

This more holistic approach to well-being and management has employees feeling less overworked, more connected with each other, more able to take time away, more empowered to take advantage of growth opportunities, and more supported.
Demographics: People

This section lays out the demographics of the 12,387 respondents to the 2022 Leading Edge Employee Experience Survey, and some key insights into how experience differs by these demographics. We first present job-related demographics: job levels and promotions, salaries, departments, workspace arrangement, and tenure within the organization. We then discuss previous professional and Jewish communal experiences. Then we present identity demographics: age, disability, gender identity and sexual orientation, Jewish identity, race, and religion. (Jewish denomination, Jewish ethnicity, tenure within the sector as a whole, employment type, and former Soviet Union (FSU) heritage can be found in Appendix E: Additional Demographics.)
Survey Totals

In 2022, **257 Jewish nonprofit organizations** took the Employee Experience Survey. (This figure counts over 200 professionally staffed Hillel campuses as one collective unit. If each of these were counted separately, the figure would be more than 450 organizations.)

These organizations had a total of **20,223 eligible employees.** (Eligible employees are any full-time or part-time regular employee, excluding consultants, freelancers, and temps.)

Of those eligible, **12,387 employees responded** to the survey—a 61% response rate.
Executive team members are more engaged and have more favorable experiences across almost all factors compared with both managers and individual contributors, who report mostly similar favorability scores to one another. For a few questions, this pattern reverses and individual contributors are more likely to report favorable experiences than managers. (These are discussed in the Employee Enablement section.)

The questions with biggest gaps between favorability scores from executive team members and those from managers are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Leadership</th>
<th>Executive Team Members</th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>Individual Contributors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our leaders generally communicate openly and honestly with employees</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am kept appropriately informed about major decisions and events happening at my organization</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The leadership team's actions are consistent with my organization's values</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe leaders will support the organization in taking action as a result of this survey</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Promotions

About half of employees surveyed (54%) have been in the same role since joining their organizations, and have not moved either laterally or into a promotion.

Since newer employees naturally haven’t had time to advance, it’s also useful to look at Promotion Status exclusively for employees who have been with the organization for two years or more. Among this group, fully 42% of employees have been promoted to a new role at least once.

Key Insight

Those who have only moved laterally (1 out of every ten employees, 10%), are less likely to report favorable experiences generally—especially regarding the Salary & Benefits, Learning & Advancement, and Psychological Safety factors. (See Learning & Advancement for more details about the differences by promotion history in that factor.)

Lateral moves can sometimes be positive for employees, but our data suggests such moves may sometimes lead to employee dissatisfaction. Sometimes lateral moves can mean taking on additional responsibilities without receiving additional compensation. In the past few years especially, as organizations made major pivots in strategy, lateral moves may have involved changing job functions as part of adjustments to the pandemic.

Factor Average Favorability Scores by Promotion History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SALARY &amp; BENEFITS</th>
<th>LEARNING &amp; ADVANCEMENT</th>
<th>PSYCHOLOGICAL SAFETY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All employees surveyed</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees that have been promoted to a new role at least once</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees that have moved laterally (to a new role, same level) at least once</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees that have been in the same role the entire time</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A majority of employees surveyed are paid less than $80,000 per year. Due to rounding, figures do not add up to 100%.

Key Insight

Money can’t buy happiness—but it helps

As we discuss in the Salary & Benefits factor, feeling that compensation is fair and transparent can be as important as the salary amount in absolute terms. Still, those receiving higher salaries are more likely overall to report favorable experiences across most factors of employee experience. Employee Engagement (the full factor average) is presented as one example:

Employee Engagement by Salary Range

A majority of employees surveyed are paid less than $80,000 per year. Due to rounding, figures do not add up to 100%.

NOTE

About 15% of respondents to this survey are paid in currency other than U.S. dollars. In order to simplify the analysis by excluding fluctuating exchange rates, our findings related to salary apply only to the 85% of respondents who are paid in U.S. dollars. The “Not specified” figure of 13% refers to respondents who are paid in U.S. dollars but did not answer this question.
Salary differences have a bigger effect on experience for those at higher job levels

When we look at differences by salary range within the different job level groups, we see that salary seems to make the highest impact on experience for executive team members, a modest impact for managers, and virtually no impact within individual contributors. (The Employee Engagement factor is presented below, but similar patterns appear for multiple other factors as well.)

Employee Engagement (entire factor average):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Level</th>
<th>Executive Team Members</th>
<th>% Engagement</th>
<th>Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$100,000+</td>
<td></td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below $100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Level</th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>% Engagement</th>
<th>Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$100,000+</td>
<td></td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below $100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Level</th>
<th>Individual Contributors</th>
<th>% Engagement</th>
<th>Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$70,000+</td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below $70,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This may suggest that higher job levels tend to bring with them not only higher salaries, but also higher expectations about salary.
Department

More than a third of respondents did not specify their department. Of those who did, the largest groups were Teaching, Programming/Direct Service, Community Organizing/Engagement, Development/Fundraising, General Administration/Support Staff, and Finance/Operations.

I work...

Almost half (45%) of employees surveyed work outside of their home every day, and 3 out of 4 employees (76%) work outside of their homes for at least part of the week.

Work location

Of the people who indicated that they work outside their home (whether every day or for part of the week), we asked where they work outside their home.
Different departments are prominent in different workspace arrangements

The largest department among all-remote respondents is Programming/Direct Service, while the largest department group among those who work in person every day is Teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Remote</th>
<th>In Person</th>
<th>Hybrid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming/Direct Service Provider</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Organizing/Community Engagement</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development/Fundraising</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administration/Support Staff</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance/Operations</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing/Communications</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance/Security</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Practice</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantmaking</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobbying/Public Affairs</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to rounding, figures do not add up to 100%.
### Key Insight

Fully remote workers are more likely to report favorable well-being experiences, even though they’re also more likely to want to leave

At first glance, this higher favorability in well-being seems to be at odds with the fact that remote workers are more likely than average to intend to leave the organization within a year (see "Stayers and Leavers"). One possible explanation is that well-being alone is not enough to drive retention; it may be necessary, but not sufficient. Additionally or alternatively, it may suggest that intention to leave is influenced not only by “push” factors (reasons to want to leave), but also by “pull” factors (reasons to be attracted to a particular other opportunity). Those who work remotely all the time are generally “knowledge workers,” and so they may tend to have higher levels of education, skills, and experience that cause them to perceive more and better opportunities to switch jobs, compared with the aggregate of workers who work in an in-person workplace. A perception of abundant opportunity for knowledge workers may offset their higher average sense of well-being in creating more intention to leave.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I believe employee well-being is a priority at my organization</th>
<th>I have enough opportunities to disconnect from work</th>
<th>My manager genuinely cares about my well-being—e.g., my satisfaction, workload, and/or overall health</th>
<th>My organization demonstrates care and concern for its employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOP-5 ENGAGEMENT DRIVER + TOP-5 RETENTION DRIVER</td>
<td>SPREAD: 10%</td>
<td>SPREAD: 9%</td>
<td>SPREAD: 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I WORK OUTSIDE OF MY HOME EVERY DAY</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>I WORK OUTSIDE OF MY HOME EVERY DAY</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I WORK OUTSIDE OF MY HOME FOR PART OF THE WEEK</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>I WORK OUTSIDE OF MY HOME FOR PART OF THE WEEK</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I WORK AT HOME EVERY DAY</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>I WORK AT HOME EVERY DAY</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Workspace Supplement: Physical Security

For the first time this year, we asked respondents who indicated that they work outside their home with colleagues to respond to two survey questions related to physical security at work. While physical attacks on Jewish nonprofit organizations in North America have been rare, they have happened multiple times in recent years. Employees want to know that their leaders care about their physical safety.

Key Insight

Almost 1 in 6 (14%) employees who works in-person with colleagues doesn’t feel prepared to act if faced with a physical security threat—and that affects their confidence in their leaders.

Almost three-quarters of these employees (72%) do feel prepared, but there is clearly room for growth related to security preparedness and communication. The gap of 12 percentage points between reporting that there is a plan and reporting that the respondent personally feels prepared suggests that more communication and preparation may be valuable.

Experience gaps by feeling prepared

Even for organizations that never experience an attack, ensuring that employees feel safe and prepared can help them feel that their organizations care about them. Looking at favorability scores according to who does and doesn’t feel prepared to act if faced with a security threat, we see pronounced gaps across many factors and questions in which those who feel prepared for security threats are also more likely to report favorable experiences across the board. The factor with the largest average gap in this pattern is Professional Leadership. By differences of 17 to 20 percentage points, employees who don’t feel prepared to act in a security threat are also less likely (compared with those who do feel prepared) to:

- Have confidence in their leaders.
- Believe that their leaders will take action in response to this survey.
- Believe that their leaders will respond appropriately to reports of sexual harassment or discrimination.
- Believe that their leaders communicate well and keep them informed.

RESOURCE

Secure Community Network website
Tenure at the Organization

One-third of employees (33%) have been working in their organizations for less than two years. Almost 1 in 5 (9%) have been at their organizations for more than a decade. The remaining 44%—those in the middle years of organizational tenure—need more support. (See Employee Engagement for information on the “engagement crater” by tenure.)

**Key Insight**

Turnover has been high—and fully one-third of employees started more recently at their organizations than COVID-19.

In 2021, 12% of employees surveyed were brand new in their jobs (under one year of tenure). This year, that figure is nearly twice as high at 21%, showing a lot of hiring, including both career entry and job switching. (This is what many called “The Great Resignation”—and what Amy Born, Leading Edge’s Chief Strategy Officer, called “The Great Whatever.”)

Furthermore, since 33% of employees surveyed have been with their organizations for less than two years, it is noteworthy that fully a third of employees started working at their organizations after the COVID-19 pandemic had already begun. A large share of workers don’t remember the pre-COVID status quo.
### Previous Professional Experience

Employees chose all options that matched their previous experience, so percentages do not add up to 100%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit organization outside the Jewish sector</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For-profit organization</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit organization in the Jewish sector</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public-sector organization</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish summer camp</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish community center</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify...</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish day school</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillel</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish youth group (e.g., BBYO, NFTY, USY, NCSY)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We asked employees about their previous professional experience in order to get a sense of the workforce pipeline for the organizations we surveyed.
Previous Jewish Communal Experience

We asked employees about their previous non-employment experiences with the Jewish community. Almost one-third (32%) of respondents (including both Jewish and non-Jewish employees) attended Jewish summer camp, and a quarter (25%) participated in a Jewish youth group. Taking Birthright Israel and “Immersive Israel experience (other than Birthright)” together, more than a third (36%) of employees have participated in an immersive Israel experience of some kind.
Looking at these numbers by Jewish identity, it appears that among Jewish employees who took this survey, over half (53%) attended Jewish summer camp; almost half (49%) participated in either Birthright or another immersive Israel experience; 44% attended a Jewish youth group; 42% participated in a campus Jewish experience (Hillel or another); and over a quarter (28%) attended Jewish day school.

Looking at Jewish employees under the age of 40, more than three-quarters (76%) have participated in either Birthright or another immersive Israel experience; nearly two-thirds (66%) participated in either Hillel or another Jewish campus experience in college; 59% attended Jewish summer camp; nearly half (47%) participated in a Jewish youth group; and a third (34%) attended Jewish day school.

PREVIOUS JEWISH EXPERIENCE: Jewish employees

- Jewish Summer Camp: 53%
- Birthright or Other Immersive Israel Experience (Combined)*: 49%
- Jewish Youth Group (e.g., BBYO, NFTY, USY, NCSY): 44%
- Hillel or Another College Campus Jewish Experience (Combined)**: 42%
- Hillel: 35%
- Immersive Israel Experience (Other Than Birthright): 35%
- Jewish Day School: 28%
- Birthright: 26%
- College Campus Experience (Other Than Hillel — e.g., Jewish Student Union, Chabad on Campus, etc.): 24%
- None of the Above: 24%
- Other: 4%

PREVIOUS JEWISH EXPERIENCE: Jewish employees under age 40

- Birthright or Other Immersive Israel Experience (Combined)*: 76%
- Hillel or Another College Campus Jewish Experience (Combined)**: 66%
- Jewish Summer Camp: 59%
- Hillel: 51%
- Birthright: 49%
- Jewish Youth Group (e.g., BBYO, NFTY, USY, NCSY): 47%
- Immersive Israel Experience (Other Than Birthright): 41%
- College Campus Experience (Other Than Hillel — e.g., Jewish Student Union, Chabad on Campus, etc.): 35%
- Jewish Day School: 34%
- Other: 19%
- None of the Above: 9%

* This figure is not as large as the sum of figures for Birthright alone plus other immersive experiences alone, since some respondents reported participating in both.

** This figure is not as large as the sum of figures for Hillel alone plus other campus experiences alone, since some respondents reported participating in both.
Key Insight

There are now (at least) four generations in the workforce together. Don’t undervalue any of them—including older employees.

Employees over 50 tend to report higher-than-average favorability scores across most factors. Older employees are likely to be more engaged than younger employees, regardless of tenure (which plays its own role as well, regardless of age).

While older employees report more favorable-than-average experiences overall, there are a few questions for which this pattern reverses, and older employees are less likely than average to respond favorably. These include “I have opportunities for advancement at my organization” and “My organization has worked or is actively working on our approach to compensation—e.g., creating salary bands, communicating an approach to compensation, defining how raises happen, etc.”

This sense of inability to advance is not because older employees are all highly ranked in their organizations. To be sure, older employees are more likely to be managers or executive members than younger employees are, but two-thirds (68%) of employees aged 50 or older are individual contributors. Moreover, within job-level groups (individual contributors, managers, and executive teams) the pattern persists that older employees are least likely to respond favorably to “I have opportunities for advancement at my organization.”

Salary, too, may reflect ageism; among the employees surveyed, it is both the youngest and the oldest employees who are most likely to receive salaries below $70,000.
Disability

We asked employees to indicate whether they have a diagnosed disability that affects their work. About 1 in every 12 respondents (8%) indicated that they did.

Of the respondents who indicated that they have a diagnosed disability (936 people), we asked them to indicate the type of disability:

**Type of Disability**
Due to rounding, figures do not add up to 100%.

Of the respondents who indicated that their employer is aware of their disability (462 people), we asked them whether their employer provides the accommodations they need.

**NEEDED ACCOMMODATIONS PROVIDED**

Of the respondents who indicated that their employer is aware of their disability (462 people), we asked them whether their employer provides the accommodations they need.
Key Insight

People who indicate having diagnosed disabilities are less likely to be in management or executive leadership (and, relatedly, less likely to be paid higher salaries) and less likely to report favorable experiences for a number of questions:

Job levels by “Do you have a diagnosed disability that affects your work?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>GAP</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTORS</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGER</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE TEAM</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent paid $90K+ by “Do you have a diagnosed disability that affects your work?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>GAP</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I believe that diversity is valued by the organization and there is a genuine desire to make it an important topic, but I cannot pinpoint any clear steps to make it part of our environment or organizational culture. It is talked about, but it is not experienced. Representation has significantly improved, but that is only one element in the process.”

Respondent
Do you have a diagnosed disability that affects your work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Gap</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THE BOARD</td>
<td>At my organization board members and professional leaders work together effectively</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE BOARD</td>
<td>I feel respected as a professional by board members at my organization</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVERSITY, EQUITY, INCLUSION, &amp; BELONGING (DEIB)</td>
<td>I believe my organization creates a safe and supportive environment for people from all backgrounds</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVERSITY, EQUITY, INCLUSION, &amp; BELONGING (DEIB)</td>
<td>My organization enables people from all backgrounds to do well</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVERSITY, EQUITY, INCLUSION, &amp; BELONGING (DEIB)</td>
<td>I feel comfortable discussing my background, beliefs, and cultural experiences with my co-workers</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVERSITY, EQUITY, INCLUSION, &amp; BELONGING (DEIB)</td>
<td>My organization demonstrates a genuine commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These inequities indicate inequities regarding respect, inclusion, and communication, among other issues.

For the gaps related to working with the board, the underrepresentation of employees with disabilities in management and executive teams appears to be related to the gaps in experience. Lower favorability scores for the two board questions were concentrated among individual contributors, while the few employees with disabilities who were in management or an executive team and work with their board reported higher-than-average favorability for the board questions.

According to the CDC, about 1 in 4 American adults has a disability. (This includes adults of all ages.) Looking at adults aged 25–54, the Brookings Institution estimates that about 9% have a disability. Organizations that act on their values by mitigating these issues and closing these gaps can also reap benefits related to attracting, developing, and retaining talented people representing a sizeable segment of the workforce. Among other ways to do so, organizations can consider training all employees on disability inclusion.
Gender Identity & Sexual Orientation

More than two-thirds of employees surveyed (69%) identified as women, 20% identified as men, and 2% identified as another gender identity. Almost 1 in 10 (9%) did not answer this question.

Due to rounding, figures do not add up to 100%.

Gender

Among employees under 40 years old, the percentage who identified as either nonbinary, genderqueer, or “I prefer to self-identify” roughly doubles from about 2% to about 4% (about 1 in every 25 employees under 40).

Gender (under age 40)

Due to rounding, figures do not add up to 100%.

DO YOU IDENTIFY AS TRANSGENDER?

Due to rounding, figures do not add up to 100%.

Around 1 in every 100 respondents (1%) answered either “Yes” or “I prefer to self-identify” to a question about transgender identification.

SEXUALITY

Just under three-quarters of respondents (72%) identified as Straight. About 1 in 8 declined to specify an orientation. About 1 in 8 employees (14%) identified with one or more sexualities other than Straight.
Inequities around gender identity and sexual orientation are strongly visible in employee experience. These inequities take multiple forms:

### Women are less likely than men to report favorable experiences in some areas

For most areas, differences in experience between men and women are small. But here are six questions in which a men/women gender gap emerges of seven percentage points or more:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>GAP</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th>GAP</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salary &amp; Benefits</strong></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe my salary is fair relative to similar roles at my organization</td>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>GAP</td>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salary &amp; Benefits</strong></td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand how salaries and raises are determined at my organization</td>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>GAP</td>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Leadership</strong></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our leaders generally communicate openly and honestly with employee</td>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>GAP</td>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychological Safety</strong></td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m comfortable sharing potentially unpopular opinions about how to do our work</td>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>GAP</td>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychological Safety</strong></td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I offer my opinion, I feel that it is heard and respected</td>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>GAP</td>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Alignment</strong></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At my organization there is open and honest two-way communication</td>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>GAP</td>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the gaps in favorability between men and women are much smaller than the gaps between men/women and the other gender identities represented in the sample.
Nonbinary and genderqueer employees are less likely to feel like they belong

These groups are starkly less likely than average to agree with every DEIB question, including the top five Engagement and Retention Driver “I feel like I belong at my organization”—sometimes with gaps in favorability score in the 20s and 30s of percentage points. These differences likely indicate disparate and discriminatory treatment and expectations from others, both in the workplace and in society more broadly.

I feel like I belong at my organization

**TOP-5 ENGAGEMENT DRIVER + TOP-5 RETENTION DRIVER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th>NONBINARY</th>
<th>GENDERQUEER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel like I belong</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My organization values diversity (for purposes of answering this question diversity is defined as the representation of all varied identities and differences)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th>NONBINARY</th>
<th>GENDERQUEER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My organization values diversity</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My organization demonstrates a genuine commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion (feel free to leave specific examples and suggestions in the comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th>NONBINARY</th>
<th>GENDERQUEER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My organization demonstrates a genuine commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I believe my organization creates a safe and supportive environment for people from all backgrounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th>NONBINARY</th>
<th>GENDERQUEER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I believe my organization creates a safe and supportive environment for people from all backgrounds</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I feel comfortable discussing my background, beliefs, and cultural experiences with my co-workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th>NONBINARY</th>
<th>GENDERQUEER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel comfortable discussing my background, beliefs, and cultural experiences with my co-workers</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My organization enables people from all backgrounds to do well

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th>NONBINARY</th>
<th>GENDERQUEER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My organization enables people from all backgrounds to do well</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPREAD

- I feel like I belong: 16%
- My organization values diversity: 19%
- My organization demonstrates a genuine commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion: 16%
- I believe my organization creates a safe and supportive environment for people from all backgrounds: 25%
- I feel comfortable discussing my background, beliefs, and cultural experiences with my co-workers: 15%
- My organization enables people from all backgrounds to do well: 33%
Employees who identified as transgender are also less likely than other employees to respond favorably to DEIB questions, with particularly large favorability gaps for “I believe my organization creates a safe and supportive environment for people from all backgrounds” and “My organization enables people from all backgrounds to do well.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Transgender Yes</th>
<th>Transgender No</th>
<th>Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel like I belong at my organization</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe my organization creates a safe and supportive environment</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization values diversity (for purposes of answering this question)</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization demonstrates a genuine commitment to</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization enables people from all backgrounds to do well</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sexual minorities have much less favorable DEIB experiences

Employees who identified as Straight were slightly more likely than average to respond favorably to DEIB questions. Employees who identified as Asexual were near the overall survey average for all DEIB questions, with slight differences in both directions depending on the question. But employees who identified with the sexual identities Bisexual, Queer, Gay, Lesbian, Questioning/unsure, Pansexual, or More than one or prefer to self-identify were all much less likely to respond favorably to all questions in the DEIB factor. The largest differences (by percentage points) in DEIB experience by sexual identity were for the question “My organization enables people from all backgrounds to do well.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Asexual</th>
<th>Heterosexual/Straight</th>
<th>Gay</th>
<th>Pansexual</th>
<th>Bisexual</th>
<th>Lesbian</th>
<th>Questioning/unsure</th>
<th>More than one or prefer to self-identify</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My organization enables people from all backgrounds to do well</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spread: 20%
Psychological safety and gender

Men were most likely to report feeling psychologically safe. Genderqueer employees and employees preferring to self-identify for gender were particularly less likely to report feeling comfortable expressing dissent about their organizations’ work. (There are smaller gaps in psychological safety by sexuality, and almost no gaps in psychological safety between transgender and non-transgender employees.)

I’m comfortable sharing potentially unpopular opinions about how to do our work

| Group                  | Percentage
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONBINARY</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDERQUEER</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT SPECIFIED</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I PREFER TO SELF-IDENTIFY</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representation in leadership

Men are somewhat disproportionately represented in executive teams—they are 20% of employees surveyed, but 30% of the executive team members.

CEO gender makes a difference for psychological safety

For employees in gender identity groups experiencing disproportionately less psychological safety, those working for women CEOs are more likely to report that they feel heard and respected:

When I offer my opinion, I feel that it is heard and respected

| Group                  | Percentage
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NONBINARY OR GENDERQUEER</td>
<td>WORKING FOR A WOMAN CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WORKING FOR A MAN CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSGENDER</td>
<td>WORKING FOR A WOMAN CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WORKING FOR A MAN CEO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salary inequities

Women are disproportionately represented in salary ranges below $60,000. Men are disproportionately represented in salary ranges above $100,000. This may be related to some extent, but not entirely, to men’s disproportionate representation on executive teams.

| Group                  | Percentage
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYEES PAID LESS THAN $60,000 PER YEAR</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYEES PAID $100,000 OR MORE PER YEAR</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jewish Identity, Race/Ethnicity, & Religion

Why three in one?

We present findings on the Jewish identity, Race/Ethnicity, and Religion of the employees surveyed together in one section because the complex nature of Jewish identity makes them difficult to disentangle. Jewishness is related to religion, but many Jews may say they are Jews but have no religion per se. We addressed this nuance by first asking all respondents whether they are Jewish, and only then (in the case of employees who responded “no”) asking them what, if any, their (non-Jewish) religion is. Meanwhile, when it comes to race/ethnicity, it is difficult to understand the experiences of Jews of Color, in particular, without looking at comparison groups drawing from both the religious and the racial/ethnic categories of identity—comparison groups like white Jews and non-Jewish People of Color.

Just over half of the employees surveyed (54%) are Jewish. More than a third (39%) are not Jewish, and a further 7% didn’t answer.

1 in 5 employees surveyed (20%) is Christian/Catholic, and 1 in 15 (6%) is either Agnostic or Atheist (and not also Jewish).

Race/ethnicity among all employees surveyed.

- 71% WHITE
- 54% JEWISH
- 20% CHRISTIAN/ CATHOLIC
- 9% NOT SPECIFIED
- 5% AGNOSTIC
- 2% ATHEIST
- 8% NONE OF THE ABOVE
- 6% HISPANIC/ LATINA/ LATINO/ LATINX
- 5% BLACK/ AFRICAN AMERICAN
- 2% ASIAN/ ASIAN AMERICAN
- 2% MULTIRACIAL/MORE THAN ONE RACE OR PREFER TO SELF-IDENTIFY
- <0.05% NATIVE HAWAIIAN / PACIFIC ISLANDER
- <0.05% NATIVE AMERICAN / AMERICAN INDIAN / ALASKA NATIVE / INDIGENOUS PEOPLES
- 1.5% MIDDLE EASTERN / NORTH AFRICAN
- 0.5% MUSLIM
- 0.4% BUDDHIST
- 0.2% HINDU
- 5% AGNOSTIC
- 5% CHRISTIAN/ CATHOLIC
- 54% JEWISH
- 39% NOT JEWISH
- 7% NOT SPECIFIED

Due to rounding, figures do not add up to 100%.
Jews of Color (JOC) are still underrepresented relative to the Jewish community.

Among Jewish employees surveyed, 7% are Jews of Color (i.e., they identified as belonging to a racial/ethnic category other than “white”). According to Counting Inconsistencies: An Analysis of American Jewish Population Studies, with a Focus on Jews of Color, Jews of Color comprise about 12%–15% of the American Jewish population.\(^\text{10}\) This underrepresentation suggests that Jewish organizations are recruiting Jews of Color at a lower rate than white Jews, and/or failing to retain JOC employees, implying patterns of exclusion and/or failure to engage.

JOC representation among Jews in the survey

JOC are more represented among younger employees

These data match external findings that the North American Jewish community is getting more racially/ethnically diverse in younger generations (see, for example, Pew Research Center’s Jewish Americans in 2020). The largest racial/ethnic categories among Jews of Color surveyed are “Middle Eastern/North African” and “Multiracial/More than one race/Prefer to self-identify.”

\(^{10}\) Other estimates for the population of Jews of Color include 8% total (15% among Jews under 30) from Pew Research Center (2021) and 6% from American Jewish Year Book 2019. Much more quantitative and qualitative research about Jews of Color is available on the website of the Jews of Color Initiative.
### Job levels, Jewish identity, and race

Black/African American, and Middle Eastern/North African employees—both Jewish and not Jewish—are underrepresented on executive teams.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Proportion of Executive Team Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Employees</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern/North African (Jewish)</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern/North African (All)</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern/North African (Not Jewish)</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American (Jewish)</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American (All)</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American (Not Jewish)</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proportion of the groups listed who are managers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jews (All Races/Ethnicities)</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Jews</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Employees</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Jewish (All Races/Ethnicities)</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews of Color</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC (All, Jewish and Not Jewish)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among Asian/Asian American and Hispanic/Latina/Latino/Latinx employees, those who identified as Jewish are proportionately represented on executive teams, while those who did not identify as Jewish are underrepresented.

**Proportion of the groups listed who are executive team members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latina/Latino/Latinx (Jewish)</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Asian American (Jewish)</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Employees</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Asian American (All)</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latina/Latino/Latinx (All)</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Asian American (Not Jewish)</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latina/Latino/Latinx (Not Jewish)</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jews who identified as Multiracial/More than one race/Prefer to self-identify are strongly represented on executive teams.11

**Proportion of the groups listed who are executive team members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial/More than one/Prefer to self-identify (Jewish)</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (Jewish)</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Employees</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jews of Color, and People of Color overall, are underrepresented in manager roles.

**Proportion of the groups listed who are managers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jews (All Races/Ethnicities)</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Jews</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Employees</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Jewish (All Races/Ethnicities)</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews of Color</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC (All, Jewish and Not Jewish)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Black/African American and Asian/Asian-American employees (whether Jewish or not Jewish) are also less likely to have been promoted.

**Percentage of employees who have been promoted at least once**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Employees</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latina/Latino/Latinx</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern/North African</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Asian American</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not discernable from this question how many employees choosing this option would identify as “multiracial,” how many would identify as “more than one,” and how many would identify as “prefer to self-identify.”
There are several factors in which the usual pattern in favorability scores by race/ethnicity is upended altogether—most notably, Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, & Belonging.

I feel respected as a professional by board members at my organization

Multiracial/More than one race/Prefer to self-identify (Jewish) 88%

All employees (who interact with their boards) 85%

Multiracial/More than one race/Prefer to self-identify (Jewish and not) 82%

Multiracial/More than one race/Prefer to self-identify (not Jewish) 54%

Key Insight

There are differences and inequities in experiences of belonging based on race/ethnicity and Jewish identity

The experience of belonging for Jews of Color, and for People of Color overall, is not monolithic. The role of Jewish identity in affecting belonging interacts with different race/ethnicity groups differently. Non-Jewish employees (of all races/ethnicities) in this sample are less likely to feel like they belong. And Black employees in this sample—Jewish and not Jewish alike—are markedly less likely to feel like they belong.

Employee Experience and race/ethnicity: The general pattern

Across the majority of survey questions, the general pattern for experience and race/ethnicity is that employees who identified as “Hispanic/Latina/Latino/Latinx,” “Black/African American,” and “Asian/Asian American” were all more likely than average to respond favorably. (The same pattern occurred in the 2021 survey) This pattern holds for these particular racial/ethnic categories within both Jewish and non-Jewish employees. This pattern may suggest that the work of organizations focused on Jews of Color has helped the Jewish nonprofit sector improve certain kinds of experiences for Jews of Color, as well as many non-Jewish People of Color, working in the field. Alternatively, it may represent employees in these groups having lower baseline expectations about how their experiences will be. (And perhaps some of those with higher expectations have been lost to attrition.)

For employees who identified as either “Middle Eastern/North African” or “Multiracial/More than one race/Prefer to self-identify,” the picture is more mixed, with these groups reporting a mix of higher-than-average, lower-than-average, and at-the-average favorability scores for different factors. Among employees in the multiracial category, Jews identifying as multiracial report much more favorable experiences than non-Jewish employees identifying as multiracial. In particular, employees who (1) are not Jewish; (2) identify as “Multiracial/More than one race/Prefer to self-identify,” and (3) interact with their boards, are enormously less likely to feel that they are respected as a professional by board members.

There are also several factors in which the usual pattern in favorability scores by race/ethnicity is upended altogether—most notably, Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, & Belonging.
People of Color tend to experience less belonging—especially Black employees

In two questions, Black employees reported markedly lower favorability scores, while other People of Color returned slightly lower favorability scores (differing from the usual pattern of higher favorability than average). In the following tables, race/ethnicity groups are presented in descending order of favorability scores for the questions:

I feel like I belong at my organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOP-5 ENGAGEMENT DRIVER + TOP-5 RETENTION DRIVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE EASTERN/NORTH AFRICAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIRACAL/MORE THAN ONE RACE/PREFER TO SELF-IDENTIFY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIAN/ASIAN AMERICAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISPANIC/LATINA/LATINO/LATINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I feel comfortable discussing my background, beliefs, and cultural experiences with my co-workers

| MIDDLE EASTERN/NORTH AFRICAN                    |
| 80%                                              |
| WHITE                                           |
| 79%                                              |
| MULTIRACAL/MORE THAN ONE RACE/PREFER TO SELF-IDENTIFY |
| 76%                                              |
| ASIAN/ASIAN AMERICAN                            |
| 76%                                              |
| HISPANIC/LATINA/LATINO/LATINE                   |
| 75%                                              |
| BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN                          |
| 68%                                              |

For all four other questions in the DEIB factor, favorability scores from Black employees were the same as favorability scores for white employees, while for other nonwhite race/ethnicity groups, the usual pattern from elsewhere in the survey applied of modestly higher-than-average favorability scores.

Non-Jewish employees experience less overall belonging than Jewish employees

I feel like I belong at my organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOP-5 ENGAGEMENT DRIVER + TOP-5 RETENTION DRIVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JEWISH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT JEWISH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I feel comfortable discussing my background, beliefs, and cultural experiences with my co-workers

| JEWISH                                          |
| 83%                                             |
| GAP                                             |
| 14%                                             |
| NOT JEWISH                                      |
| 69%                                             |

While there are slight differences between how Christian/Catholic, Agnostic, Atheist, Muslim, and other religious groupings of employees experience belonging, the most significant gaps are not between religious groupings, but rather between Jewish and non-Jewish overall—and between different subgroups of how Jewishness interacts with race/ethnicity.

---

12 In addition to the categories shown, respondents to the race/ethnicity question were also able to select “Native American / American Indian / Alaska Native / Indigenous Peoples” and “Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander.” These groups do not appear in tables of responses by race/ethnicity due to the low numbers of respondents who identified with these groups. Including these groups as part of our analysis of how race/ethnicity interacts with employee experience would compromise confidentiality. The responses of the respondents who identified as belonging to these groups are still included within analyses whenever data is presented in ways not broken out by race/ethnicity.
Black Jews are especially likely to feel excluded

Black Jews reported markedly lower favorability scores for DEIB questions than other Jews of Color. In the tables below, showing subgroups of both race/ethnicity and Jewish identity, with the subgroups listed in descending order of favorability score for the survey question specified, there is a pattern that all the Jewish racial/ethnic subgroups report higher favorability scores than all the non-Jewish racial/ethnic subgroups—with the exception of Black Jews:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Favorability Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Jews</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern/North African Jews</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Asian American Jews</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial/More than one/Prefer to self-ID, Jews</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latina/Latino/Latinx Jews</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Asian American, not Jewish</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern/North African, not Jewish</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, not Jewish</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American Jews</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latina/Latino/Latinx, not Jewish</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American, not Jewish</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial/More than one/Prefer to self-ID, not Jewish</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Belonging is the only one of the top five Engagement Drivers in which this magnitude of disparity occurs

Belonging is vital, being not only a top Engagement Driver, but also a top Retention Driver. But it’s also noteworthy that for the other four top Engagement Drivers, differences in favorability tend to be much smaller and/or negligible, no matter how we look at race/ethnicity, Jewish identity, and the interactions between them.
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Demographics: Organizations
Organization Types

Leaders or administrators of each participating organization selected which of the following list of organization types best matched their organization. (Some organizations might fit into more than one category, but each organization appears in only one category below, based on that organization’s self-selection.)

- JCC: 36
- SYNAGOGUE/SHUL/CONGREGATION: 35
- SOCIAL JUSTICE/ADVOCACY: 19
- EDUCATION: 18
- DAY SCHOOL/YESHIVA: 15
- NATIONAL UMBRELLA: 10
- EARLY CHILDHOOD CENTER: 8
- INTEGRATED COMMUNITY: 8
- RELIGIOUS: 7
- CAMP: 6
- FOUNDATION: 6
- YOUTH & STUDENT ENGAGEMENT: 3
- COMMUNITY RELATIONS: 2
- OTHER: 25

The other category includes organizations that cannot fit the rest of the categories. Organizations such as Leading Edge, media organizations, special interest organizations, and more.

Organization Geography

Where They’re Based

While the organizations taking the Employee Experience Survey are all based in the U.S. or Canada, some employees live and work in other countries as well. This year, some employees responded from Israel and Poland. Regardless of location, employees can also take the survey in five languages: English, Spanish, French Canadian, Hebrew, and Russian.
Organization Size

Key Insight

Employees tend to have more favorable experiences at organizations with smaller teams (20 people or fewer)

This pattern recurs to various degrees across many factors and survey questions, but the questions with the starkest differences by team size are those having to do with communication and collaboration, as well as leadership being attentive and responsive to employees and their well-being and feedback.

This pattern is the mirror image of the pattern for CEO experience revealed by the 2022 CEO Survey: for the topmost professionals of mostly the same organizations, those leading larger organizations are more likely to report favorable experiences.

The following are survey questions for which employees working in the smallest team sizes report favorability scores 20+ percentage points above those working at the largest:

Overall, organizations taking the Employee Experience Survey have combined operating budgets totaling $2.5 billion.

Budget sizes in organizations surveyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDER $1M</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1M - $2M</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2M - $5M</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5M - $10M</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10M - $20M</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20M - $50M</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50M - $100M</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100M+</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Team sizes in organizations surveyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 TO 10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 TO 20</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 TO 50</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 TO 100</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 TO 200</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200+</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Internal communication is the main issue

Most of the questions listed above are about communication. Even the well-being questions can be read as relating to employees’ sense that their leaders are listening to them and addressing their needs and concerns. See the Collaboration and Professional Leadership factors for more details, and action steps related to better communication.

There is only one question in the survey in which the reverse pattern occurs (employees at larger organizations report higher favorability). It is “I have opportunities for advancement at my organization.” (There are also a small number of questions in which there are virtually no differences by team size.)
Rabbi Simon S Weltman

Chief Executive Officer

The Talmud (Ta’anit 23a) teaches, “O havruta o mitutah—friendship or death.” This stark teaching speaks to the human need for belonging and community in every aspect of our lives—in our families, in communities, and also in our workplaces. The sense of belonging is expressed through our professional relationships. It is also expressed through common mission and purpose, coming together as a team to impact the world in positive ways. Jewish tradition teaches that the world is imperfect, and requires the world in positive ways. Jewish tradition implies that the world is imperfect, and requires tools to pursue that, including study (to know creation. We are all, in this respect, part of “God’s community.” Our tradition speaks to the human need for belonging and interdependence—we all need rain. They also teach us how to weather times of drought. The Talmud underscores a lesson that we have shared purpose and goal, come together with a shared purpose and goal, and the transformation we accomplish together.

“Anyone who is distressed together with the community will merit seeing the solace of the community.” — Ta’anit 11b

The Talmud underscores a lesson that we have shared purpose and goal, come together with a shared purpose and goal, and the transformation we accomplish together.

How can Jewish wisdom help us create belonging in our organizations?

Alexandra Corwin
Executive Director
Amicus: Jews of Color Torah Academy

There are many aspects that go into the layered task of creating an organizational culture that authentically and seriously values belonging.

One aspect is how an organization frames learning. To paraphrase Ben Zoma in Pirke Avot, Ethics of the Fathers (4:1), “Who learn together and separate from the community.” In his commentary on this text, Derekh Hayim, the Maharal (Rabbi Judah Loew ben Bezalel, 1509–1609) teaches that essence of this text lies in the coming together of the group—in the ways in which the community represents a different type of connection to the divine. The power that exists in coming together, and the steadiness or grounding over time that a community can represent, a container for our vulnerabilities. We can understand both Hillet and the Maharal as presenting a relationship between the individual and the community that is deepened through mutual relationship—attribute a person has the obligation to stick with the community and benefits from communal participation, just as the community has the obligation to create the conditions for individuals to be present and connected and benefits from that individuals’ presence. By recognizing the ways in which a community or workplace and those within it are connected and actualizing a sense of connection, care, and responsibility for one another, we can increase belonging, support individual growth, and increase our communal power.

How do our employees depart? What feelings do we express and undergo through this process? How connected does he or she feel even as they move on? Feeling positive connections to the organization in which a person no longer works facilitates openness and a more ready attachment toward the next organization. A positive departure can boost, not break, the parties involved, leading to a stronger sense of community for all.

How can Jewish wisdom help us create belonging in our organizations?

Alexandra Corwin
Executive Director
Amicus: Jews of Color Torah Academy

There are many aspects that go into the layered task of creating an organizational culture that authentically and seriously values belonging.

One aspect is how an organization frames learning. To paraphrase Ben Zoma in Pirke Avot, Ethics of the Fathers (4:1), “Who learn together and separate from the community.” In his commentary on this text, Derekh Hayim, the Maharal (Rabbi Judah Loew ben Bezalel, 1509–1609) teaches that essence of this text lies in the coming together of the group—in the ways in which the community represents a different type of connection to the divine. The power that exists in coming together, and the steadiness or grounding over time that a community can represent, a container for our vulnerabilities. We can understand both Hillet and the Maharal as presenting a relationship between the individual and the community that is deepened through mutual relationship—attribute a person has the obligation to stick with the community and benefits from communal participation, just as the community has the obligation to create the conditions for individuals to be present and connected and benefits from that individuals’ presence. By recognizing the ways in which a community or workplace and those within it are connected and actualizing a sense of connection, care, and responsibility for one another, we can increase belonging, support individual growth, and increase our communal power.

How do our employees depart? What feelings do we express and undergo through this process? How connected does he or she feel even as they move on? Feeling positive connections to the organization in which a person no longer works facilitates openness and a more ready attachment toward the next organization. A positive departure can boost, not break, the parties involved, leading to a stronger sense of community for all.

Rabbi Avi Killip
Executive Vice President
Nadar Institute
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Appendix A: Survey Methodology

SURVEY DESIGN

Leading Edge developed the 2022 Employee Experience Survey questions using the building blocks of previous surveys and considering current trends in workplace culture. We crafted questions with the primary goal of allowing each participating organization to understand and improve their organizational culture and their employees’ experiences.

The secondary goal of the survey is to help Leading Edge better understand the most common issues and challenges in the sector around organizational culture, the employee experience, and leadership. Most questions were scored (i.e., formatted to capture responses on a five-point Likert scale from “Strongly Agree” to “Strongly Disagree”) with select others formatted as free text responses, multiple choice, or single select.

Questions Breakdown

103 questions
64 scored
9 multiple choice
3 open-ended
27 demographic

WHAT’S NEW

In (re)designing the survey each year, Leading Edge aims for a balance between evolution and continuity. Through our consultations with participating organizations and ongoing review of literature in the field, we learn about new issues and topics each year that can be valuable for organizations, and we adjust the survey accordingly. Even as we embrace the necessity of change, to ensure that organizations are able to track their progress over time, approximately 90% of the questions have remained the same since last year.

Changes to the survey for 2022 include:

- A new question about whether the organization is actively working on its compensation practices.
- A new question about whether the employee feels their manager helps them gain skills and knowledge.
- New questions around inclusion.
- New questions around anti-discrimination policies and preparedness for physical security threats. We have also changed how we ask about Jewish identity, disability, and gender (see Demographics: People).

In addition to question changes, this year we also restructured our analytical tools in order to apply demographic analysis to more elements of the survey results. (See, for example, “Stayers” and “Leavers”, which, for the first time, includes demographic trends regarding who is more likely to want to stay in their organizations and who is more likely to want to leave.)
OUTREACH & ELIGIBILITY

In May 2022, Leading Edge offered its sixth annual Employee Experience Survey to Jewish nonprofit organizations across North America. We invited all organizations that had previously participated in the survey to participate again. We also publicized an open call for registration. Umbrella organizations such as the JCC Association, Jewish Federations of North America, religious denominations, and others also helped us reach out to their individual member organizations.

All self-identifying Jewish nonprofit organizations located in North America that employed six or more team members (any combination of full-time and part-time) and indicated a commitment to acting on survey results to improve employees’ experiences were able to register as participants in the survey.

The registration process was used solely to ensure eligibility and commitment on the part of organizations; Leading Edge provides the survey to organizations at no cost to them.

ADMINISTERING THE SURVEY

We administered the survey entirely online via the Culture Amp employee feedback platform. Employees in participating organizations were sent survey links unique to each individual, and respondents completed the survey within the Culture Amp platform accessed via that link.

PARTICIPATION

257 organizations participated in the 2022 Employee Experience Survey. 20,233 employees were eligible and received links to the survey. 12,387 employees responded—a 61% response rate.

HELPING ORGANIZATIONS USE THE DATA

In order to support organizations in accessing and understanding their data, Leading Edge created a suite of resources, including videos, text, and illustrations. These resources demonstrated how organizations could view and analyze survey data on the interactive Culture Amp platform, as well as how to access ideas for concrete actions to help organizations improve regarding growth areas as indicated by survey results.

In addition to the tools available via the Culture Amp platform, Leading Edge also offered each organization two private, one-hour consultations with an organizational development expert to review its results, identify key themes, and discuss ways to communicate its results and take actions. As of this writing, about 79% of organizations participated in at least one consultation. (Umbrella organizations such as The Jewish Federations of North America, JCC Association of North America, and Hillel International also offered their members consultations tailored for their unique organization type.)

Each organization takes the lead in examining its results and creating an action plan to build on strengths and improve in growth areas; Leading Edge provides guidance and resources to support this work. Ultimately, how each organization responds to its results and follows through on its action plan will determine its level of success in becoming an even better place to work.
AN ORGANIZATION’S JOURNEY THROUGH THE EMPLOYEE EXPERIENCE SURVEY

1. Open enrollment
   Leading Edge invites organizations to participate in the survey.

2. Registration
   Organizations fill out an intake form and receive a Memorandum of Understanding that outlines eligibility and expectations.

3. Administering the survey
   Organizations submit their HR information, prepare their staff for the survey, and liaise with Leading Edge during the survey to make sure their teams have access to the survey.

4. Viewing results
   Organizations gain access to a robust online people analytics platform and a suite of resources to help them navigate the system, as well as an invitation to take advantage of the two complimentary consultations.

5. Consultation 1 (optional)
   Leaders engage with an organizational behavior expert to gain insights into their employees’ experience and determine ways they can become even better places to work.

6. Planning
   Organizations spend time internalizing the outcomes from their first consultation and prepare for their second consultation.

7. Consultation 2 (optional)
   Leaders meet with an organizational behavior expert to delve even deeper into their survey results and determine concrete action steps to implement.

8. Implementing changes
   Organizations implement their action plans determined during their consultations and internal work.

9. Planning
   Organizations spend time internalizing the outcomes from their second consultation and prepare to implement their action plans.

10. Pulse Survey (optional)
    As a way to measure interim progress about the highest-priority metrics, some organizations may choose to administer one or more Pulse Surveys in between Employee Experience Surveys.

11. Next year’s Employee Experience Survey
    Organizations are invited to participate in the subsequent survey season. Some will choose to participate every other year and some participate every year.
HOW THE SURVEY HAS GROWN

From 2016 through 2022, over 45,000 people at 396 organizations have received the Employee Experience Survey.
Appendix B: Participating Organizations

- Organizations that have taken the survey at least once in a previous survey cycle.
In Engagement Drivers, we explain the concept of Engagement Drivers and present the top 10 Engagement Drivers—all those with “Very Strong” correlations of 0.6 and stronger. In the following table, we present a full list of all “Strong” and “Very Strong” Engagement Drivers—all the questions with correlations to Employee Engagement of 0.5 and stronger.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>FAVORABILITY SCORE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
<th>CORRELATION COEFFICIENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WELL-BEING</td>
<td>My organization demonstrates care and concern for its employees</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>0.762841672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL LEADERSHIP</td>
<td>I have confidence in our leaders to lead the organization effectively</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>0.709370935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELL-BEING</td>
<td>I believe well-being is a priority at my organization</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>0.702393885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATIONAL ALIGNMENT</td>
<td>All my organization has open and honest two-way communication</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>0.696798038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVERSITY, EQUITY, INCLUSION &amp; BELONGING</td>
<td>I feel like I belong at my organization</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>0.684135509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL LEADERSHIP</td>
<td>I believe leaders will support the organization in taking action as a result of this survey</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>0.667535159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL LEADERSHIP</td>
<td>The leadership team's actions are consistent with my organization's values</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>0.661483164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL LEADERSHIP</td>
<td>Our leaders generally communicate openly and honestly with employees</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>0.660221492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYEE ENABLEMENT</td>
<td>Most days I feel that I am making progress with my work</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>0.627423536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYCHOLOGICAL SAFETY</td>
<td>When I offer my opinions, I feel that it is heard and respected</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td>0.600303901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATIONAL ALIGNMENT</td>
<td>My organization is generally successful in the pursuit of its mission</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>0.599810694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNTABILITY &amp; FEEDBACK</td>
<td>I am recognized for good work at my organization</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>0.589424599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLABORATION</td>
<td>There is good collaboration between teams/departments in my organization</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>0.583219498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVERSITY, EQUITY, INCLUSION &amp; BELONGING</td>
<td>My organization enables people from all backgrounds to do well</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>0.583390712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL LEADERSHIP</td>
<td>I am kept appropriately informed about major decisions and events happening at my organization</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>0.583385029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVERSITY, EQUITY, INCLUSION &amp; BELONGING</td>
<td>I believe my organization creates a safe and supportive environment for people from all backgrounds</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>0.577441737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATIONAL ALIGNMENT</td>
<td>My organization provides high-quality programs and services to our constituents</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>0.568115346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLABORATION</td>
<td>My team receives high-quality support from other parts of the organization</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>0.560800841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRECT MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>I am appropriately involved in decisions that affect my work</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>0.552654839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEARNING &amp; ADVANCEMENT</td>
<td>I have opportunities to develop new skills at my organization</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>0.547752091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYEE ENABLEMENT</td>
<td>I have access to the information that I need to do my job effectively</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>0.538329934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATIONAL ALIGNMENT</td>
<td>I feel like I am making a difference through my work</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>0.535747682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEARNING &amp; ADVANCEMENT</td>
<td>I have opportunities for advancement at my organization</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>0.532800642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEARNING &amp; ADVANCEMENT</td>
<td>My manager helps me gain skills and knowledge that support my growth</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>0.532478923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEARNING &amp; ADVANCEMENT</td>
<td>My role provides me with opportunities to do challenging and interesting work</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>0.533093862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVERSITY, EQUITY, INCLUSION &amp; BELONGING</td>
<td>My organization demonstrates a genuine commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion (feel free to leave specific examples and suggestions in the comments)</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>0.530130958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNTABILITY &amp; FEEDBACK</td>
<td>Our performance review process helps me grow and improve</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>0.526939498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNTABILITY &amp; FEEDBACK</td>
<td>The feedback I receive from my manager is useful for my growth</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>0.525743006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVERSITY, EQUITY, INCLUSION &amp; BELONGING</td>
<td>My organization values diversity (for purposes of answering this question diversity is defined as the representation of all varied identities and differences)</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>0.524955114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYCHOLOGICAL SAFETY</td>
<td>I feel comfortable speaking up if my values were/are ever compromised</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>0.524585442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYEE ENABLEMENT</td>
<td>I have the resources I need to do my job effectively</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>0.51966306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL LEADERSHIP</td>
<td>I am confident that my organization will take appropriate action if discrimination is reported</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>0.507393777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELL-BEING</td>
<td>My manager genuinely cares about my well-being – e.g., my satisfaction, workload, and/or overall health</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>0.503775708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATIONAL ALIGNMENT</td>
<td>I know how my work contributes to my organization's mission, strategy, and goals</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>0.500195507</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A strong majority of employees report that their organizations have sexual harassment policies, and of those who report this, almost all employees say they know what to do if it is violated. The same pattern holds regarding anti-discrimination policies, except that the majorities are smaller who report that the organization has the policy and that they know what to do if it is violated. There is more room to grow regarding anti-discrimination policies than regarding sexual harassment policies.

The first year we asked about sexual harassment policies (2017), only 67% of respondents knew about their organizations’ sexual harassment policies. In 2018, 76% of respondents knew about the policy. Since 2019, the equivalent percentage has remained in the 82%–86% range.

84% I am confident that my organization will take appropriate action if sexual harassment is reported

80% I am confident that my organization will take appropriate action if discrimination is reported
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Due to rounding, figures may not add up to 100%.

**Jewish Denomination**
- Conservative: 23%
- Reform: 27%
- Orthodox: 10%
- Secular/Culturally Jewish: 15%
- Reform (not specified): 7%
- More than one or prefer to self-identify: 4%
- Non-denominational: 11%
- Reconstructionist: 5%
- Renewal: 7%
- Mizrahi: 1%
- Sephardi: 5%
- Jew by Choice: 6%
- More than one or prefer to self-identify: 3%
- Not specified: 2%

**Jewish Ethnicity**
- Ashkenazi: 77%
- Not specified: 2%
- Yes: 94%
- No: 6%

**Tenure in the Jewish Nonprofit Sector**
- More than 10 years: 31%
- 7 to 10 years: 13%
- 2 to 5 years: 19%
- 1 to 2 years: 8%
- Less than 1 year: 13%
- Not specified: 5%

**Employment Type**
- Full-time employee (30+ hours/week): 78%
- Part-time employee (fewer than 30 hours/week): 17%
- Fellow/Intern/Short-term employee: 1%
- Other: 3%
- Not specified: 5%

**Jews with Heritage from the Former Soviet Union (FSU)**
Jews with heritage from the former Soviet Union (FSU) are underrepresented among organizations surveyed, compared with the American Jewish population. Expert estimates for the FSU Jewish community range from 6% to 12% of the American Jewish community, but people with FSU heritage account for only 4% of the employees surveyed, and among Jewish employees, only 5% have FSU heritage.

Were you or at least one of your parents born in the former Soviet Union?
- Yes: 94%
- No: 6%
- Not specified: 2%