






Myers - JDC - Brookdale Institute  
מאירס - א'וינט - מכון ברוקדייל

**Research Report**



*To facilitate easier navigation within this document, open the bookmark feature by clicking on the "Bookmarks" tab or by using the F6 key*

Myers-JDC-Brookdale Institute    William Rosenwald Institute for Communal and Welfare Workers    JDC-FSU Department

## **Hesed Evaluation Study: Jewish Identity, Community Orientation and Voluntarism**

**Report Number 6:  
An Integrative Perspective  
of Training and Development  
of Hesed Workers and Volunteers**

**Miriam Barasch ♦ Malka Korazim ♦ Iaroslav Youssim**  
*JDC-FSU Department                      Myers-JDC-Brookdale Institute*

**Research Consultants:**  
Prof. Jack Habib and Prof. Yaakov Ukeles,  
*Myers-JDC-Brookdale Institute*  
Prof. Armand Laufer, *University of Michigan*

**Content Consultants:**  
Dr. Amos Avgar and Aliza Kol-Fogelson, *JDC-FSU Department*

**The research team also included:**  
Maria Alesina and Nadia Zinger, *the William Rosenwald  
Institute for Communal and Welfare Workers*  
Sima Zalberg, Esther Katz, *Myers-JDC-Brookdale Institute*

S-120-04



Myers-JDC-Brookdale  
Institute



William Rosenwald Institute  
for Communal and  
Welfare Workers



JDC-FSU  
Department

# Hesed Evaluation Study: Jewish Identity, Community Orientation and Voluntarism

## Report Number 6: An Integrative Perspective of Training and Development of Hesed Workers and Volunteers

Miriam Barasch • Malka Korazim • Iaroslav Youssim  
*JDC-FSU Department*      *Myers-JDC-Brookdale Institute*

### *Research Consultants:*

Prof. Jack Habib and Prof. Yaakov Ukeles,  
*Myers-JDC-Brookdale Institute*  
Prof. Armand Laufer, *University of Michigan*

### *Content Consultants:*

Dr. Amos Avgar and Aliza Kol-Fogelson, *JDC-FSU Department*

### *The research team also included:*

Maria Alesina and Nadia Zinger, *the William  
Rosenwald Institute for Communal and Welfare Workers*  
Sima Zalberg, Esther Katz, *Myers-JDC-Brookdale Institute*



Myers-JDC-Brookdale  
Institute



William Rosenwald Institute for  
Communal and Welfare Workers



JDC-FSU  
Department

# Hesed Evaluation Study: Jewish Identity, Community Orientation and Voluntarism

## Report Number 6: An Integrative Perspective of Training and Development of Hesed Workers and Volunteers

Miriam Barasch  
*JDC-FSU Department*

Malka Korazim  
*Myers-JDC-Brookdale Institute*

Iaroslav Youssim

*Research Consultants:*  
Prof. Jack Habib and Prof. Yaakov Ukeles,  
*Myers-JDC-Brookdale Institute*  
Prof. Armand Laufer, *University of Michigan*

*Content Consultants:*  
Dr. Amos Avgar and Aliza Kol-Fogelson, *JDC-FSU Department*

*The research team also included:*  
Maria Alesina and Nadia Zinger,  
*the William Rosenwald Institute for Communal and Welfare Workers*  
Sima Zalcborg, Esther Katz, *Myers-JDC-Brookdale Institute*

**Hesed Evaluation Study: Jewish Identity, Community Orientation and Voluntarism. Report Number 6: An Integrative Perspective of Training and Development of Hesed Workers and Volunteers.** Miriam Barasch, Malka Korazim, Iaroslav Youssim; Myers-JDC-Brookdale Institute and the William Rosenwald Institute for Communal and Welfare Workers. Jerusalem. 2004. 24pp.

This report is the sixth in a series of publications that present findings from an evaluation study of Hesed Community Welfare Centers in the former Soviet Union. It presents an integrative perspective on human resources and professional training at Hesed Centers based on the data collected from Hesed workers and volunteers. It focuses on the background characteristics of the respondents, their views of their work at Hesed, and their participation in training. The report also refers to the issues concerning their unmet needs for training.

Myers-JDC-Brookdale Institute  
P.O.B. 3886  
Jerusalem 91037 Israel

Tel: 972-2-6557400  
Fax: 972-2-5612391

Web site: [www.jdc.org.il/brookdale](http://www.jdc.org.il/brookdale)

The William Rosenwald Institute for  
Communal and Welfare Workers  
20 Mochovaya Street  
St. Petersburg, Russia 191928

Tel/fax: 7-812-2796216; 7-812-2750732

E-mail: [inst-cww@peterlink.ru](mailto:inst-cww@peterlink.ru)

## Abstract

This report presents findings from an evaluation study of Hesed Community Welfare Centers in the former Soviet Union (FSU). The study was initiated by the JDC-FSU Department and was conducted by the Myers-JDC-Brookdale Institute in cooperation with the William Rosenwald Institute for Communal and Welfare Workers in St. Petersburg, Russia.

After nine years of experience and development, the JDC-FSU Department decided to conduct an evaluation study of the Hesed Centers, using a comparative case study approach. The evaluation focused on the following aspects:

- ◆ Hesed Centers as a lever for Jewish renewal and renewal of the Jewish community
- ◆ The linkage of Hesed Centers to municipal services, other Jewish community organizations, and key community figures
- ◆ The volunteers and their work at Hesed
- ◆ Welfare services provided by Hesed
- ◆ Training for Hesed's workers and volunteers.

The study addresses these issues from the perspectives of various groups – Hesed's directors, administrative/program workers (hereinafter: program workers), volunteers, home care workers, and clients, as well as community representatives.

Data were collected from 1,561 Hesed workers (445 administrative and program workers, and 1,116 home care workers), 1,022 volunteers, and 1,876 clients, using self-administered questionnaires; they were collected from 74 community representatives through in-depth interviews. The respondents came from eight cities in three republics: Russia, Ukraine and Belarus. Additional data were collected from the centralized database of the network of Institutes for Communal and Welfare Workers.

This report presents an integrative perspective on human resources and professional training at Hesed, based on the data collected from Hesed's salaried workers (program workers and home care workers) and volunteers. It focuses on the background characteristics of the respondents, their views of their work at Hesed, their participation in training, and their unmet needs for training.

## Findings

### *Socio-demographic Characteristics of the Respondents*

- ◆ Hesed's work force – program workers, home care workers and volunteers – has a high level of education.
- ◆ The volunteers are older than the salaried staff and have somewhat more seniority at Hesed.
- ◆ The volunteers view their work at Hesed in a manner that is similar to that of the program workers. Both see it as an opportunity for professional development and view Hesed as a place where they can utilize their skills.

## *Participation in Training and Views of Training Needs*

### **Participation in Training**

- ◆ The rate of participation in training was higher among the salaried staff than among the volunteers. Yet it is important to note that, in absolute numbers, the volunteers constituted a large group, so that their coverage by training was quite significant.
- ◆ Differences in rates of participation in training were also found among Hesed departments.
- ◆ There were differences found among Hesed Centers regarding the rates of participation in training for each of the three staff groups: program workers, home care workers and volunteers. In addition, differences were found in the rates of participation in training for different types of work and by proximity of the Hesed Center to a training institute.
- ◆ All of the respondents had someone to whom they could turn for help at Hesed in solving problems. This indicates the existence of rudimentary supervision for people who are not in training. However, this issue should be further investigated.
- ◆ The complementary data from the network of Institutes for Communal and Welfare Workers show that the extent of training as measured by number of days is higher among the salaried staff than among the volunteers. The volunteers receive shorter training sessions than do the salaried staff.

### **Need for Additional Training**

- ◆ The rate of respondents who said they require additional training is higher among the program workers than among the home care workers, and higher among those who had participated in training in the past than among those who had not. It could be that exposure to training raises awareness of training needs. In addition, a perceived need for additional training might be related to the area of training previously received.
- ◆ Social work and psychology were the main topics requested for additional training.
- ◆ The expressed needs for more training focused on professional caring skills, and less on community orientation and Jewish values.

### **Discussion**

- ◆ The current interest in social work and psychology training needs among those who had participated in training might be related to several factors: It was very rare for people to study these topics during the Soviet era, such that there is general interest in these topics in post-Soviet society as a whole. These topics are emphasized by current training programs, and exposure whets the appetite of participants for more. In addition, knowledge about these topics is very relevant to the skills required for performing caring roles at Hesed Centers. If, during the early stages of Hesed's development, emphasis was placed on providing instrumental care, Hesed workers and volunteers are now more attuned to the emotional and social needs of their clients.
- ◆ Although all training was reported as being provided “in-service,” after the respondents had begun their work at Hesed, the location of the training varied. While most of it was held at one of the training institutes, an additional and substantial amount of training was provided “on-the-

job”<sup>\*</sup> at Hesed, by both institute and Hesed staff. Initially, training focused mainly on skills in order to meet immediate needs; at present, there is an increasing need for system training that develops not only individual staff, but the organizations as a whole.

- ◆ The extent of training of both Hesed workers and volunteers is quite broad; however, emphasis was reported to be placed on salaried workers.
- ◆ A more in-depth study of training needs is required to gain an understanding of the issues facing the people who work and volunteer at Hesed, and of the assistance required to improve their performance at work. In the current study, the focus was on the perspectives of the staff regarding their training needs. Future studies should include information on the perspectives of the Hesed directors, JDC representatives and professionals from the training institutes regarding training needs.

---

\* That is, coaching on site.

## Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the many individuals and organizations that contributed to this study.

We wish to thank the JDC-FSU Department in Israel and its Director, Asher Ostrin. Special thanks to Amos Avgar, former Director of the JDC-FSU Welfare Department (1991-2001) and current Director of World JDC Welfare Programs, for initiating the study, and to Aliza Kol-Fogelson, former Director of the JDC-FSU Welfare Department (2001-2004), for their ongoing support.

Our thanks also go to the members of the steering committee for their input: Jenny Brodsky, Nadia Zinger, Benny Heller and Gila Staum.

We wish to thank Jack Habib, Yaakov Ukeles and Armand Lauffer, who served as research consultants and provided professional guidance throughout the study.

Special thanks go to Arthur Aksim and Maria Alesina of the William Rosenwald Institute for Communal and Welfare Workers, St. Petersburg, as well as to Sasha Kantor and other colleagues at the Myers-JDC-Brookdale Institute, for their support and professional assistance.

We are grateful to the field staff in St. Petersburg, Nizhnii Novgorod, Kiev, Odessa, Vinnitsa, Dnepropetrovsk, Minsk and Vitebsk for their assistance in implementing the fieldwork.

Finally, we are grateful to the Publications Unit of the Myers-JDC-Brookdale Institute for editing this report.



# Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
1.1 Background of Hesed	1
1.2 Hesed's Guiding Principles	2
1.3 Background on the Network of Institutes for Communal and Welfare Workers	2
2. Study Goals and Methodology	4
2.1 Goals of the Survey	4
2.2 Methodology and Data Collection	5
3. Socio-demographic Characteristics of the Respondents	8
4. Respondents' Views of Their Work at Hesed	9
4.1 Seniority	10
4.2 Motivation for Working at Hesed	11
4.3 Contacts between the Salaried Workers and the Volunteers	12
4.4 Job Satisfaction	13
4.5 Sense of Belonging to the Jewish People	14
5. The Respondents' Participation in Training and Views of Training Needs	14
5.1 Participation in Training	14
5.2 Complementary Data on Training from the Training Institutes	17
5.3 The Need for Additional Training	18
Bibliography	20

## List of Tables

Table 1: Response Rate of Volunteers, by Hesed Center	5
Table 2: Response Rate of Home Care Workers, by Hesed Center	6
Table 3: Respondents among the Program Workers, by Hesed Center	6
Table 4: Work Force, by Hesed Center and Type of Staff	8
Table 5: Selected Socio-demographic Characteristics of the Respondents, by Type of Staff	9
Table 6: Employment Characteristics, by Type of Staff	10
Table 7: Factors Motivating the Decision to Work at Hesed, by Type of Staff	11
Table 8: Salaried Workers (Program Staff and Home Care Workers) and their Contact with Volunteers, by Type of Staff	12
Table 9: Volunteers and their Contact with Salaried Workers (Program Staff and Home Care Workers)	13
Table 10: General Satisfaction with Work at Hesed, by Type of Staff	13
Table 11: Professional Training, by Type of Staff	14
Table 12: Respondents Who Underwent Training during the Previous Two Years, by Department	15
Table 13: Rate of Respondents Who Underwent Training during the Previous Two Years, by Hesed Center and Type of Staff	16
Table 14: Rate of Respondents Who Underwent Training during the Previous Two Years, by Proximity to a Training Institute and Type of Staff	16
Table 15: Number of Days of Training, by Type of Staff, as Recorded in the Database of the Network of Institutes	17
Table 16: Areas in which the Respondents Required Additional Training, by Type of Staff	18

# 1. Introduction

This report is part of the Hesed evaluation study; it focuses on the training and development of salaried workers (administrative/program workers and home care workers) and volunteers at Hesed Community Welfare Centers in the former Soviet Union (FSU). The study was initiated by the JDC-FSU Department and conducted by the Myers-JDC-Brookdale Institute in cooperation with the William Rosenwald Institute for Communal and Welfare Workers in St. Petersburg, Russia. The report is based on findings from interviews with salaried workers and volunteers; separate comprehensive reports have presented findings for each of these groups.

This report presents an integrative perspective on human resources and professional training at Hesed, based on the data collected from Hesed's salaried workers and volunteers. It focuses on the background characteristics of the respondents, their views of their work at Hesed, their participation in training, and their additional needs for professional development. On the issue of training, the report also uses complementary data from the centralized database of the network of Institutes for Communal and Welfare Workers (see below).

## 1.1 Background of Hesed

When the AJJDC re-entered the FSU at the end of the communist era, it found an aging Jewish population with severe economic and health problems. Municipal, state and Jewish services to the elderly were inadequate, and effective intervention was not forthcoming from the state or from local agencies.

In an effort to respond to these needs, and to facilitate the development of viable Jewish communities, the Hesed model was developed as a multi-faceted outreach service network. Hesed Centers provide assistance and basic welfare and social services to the elderly, disabled and other needy groups among the Jewish population in the FSU. With emphasis on a concentrated package of integrated, essential services, Hesed responds to its clients' most pressing needs, promotes the effective use of limited resources, and supports the dignity of the individual.

The first Hesed Center was established in 1993 in St. Petersburg by Dr. Amos Avgar of the AJJDC. Since then, approximately 170 Hesed Centers have been established throughout the FSU, together serving over 250,000 clients in cities and the periphery.

Hesed Centers offer a host of complementary services addressing multi-dimensional needs: nutrition (food packages, meals served in communal dining rooms or delivered to the homebound, fresh food); health (medical consultations, medicine); self-care and mobility (home care, the loan of rehabilitation equipment, home repairs); and socialization (Warm Home, day centers, libraries, clubs and cultural programs). Special needs are addressed through winter relief; the "Hesedmobile," which reaches clients in the periphery; and activities for the visually and hearing impaired.

## 1.2 Hesed's Guiding Principles

As conceived by Dr. Avgar, the model operates on three basic principles: Jewish values, community orientation and voluntarism. Hesed serves to reinforce Jewish communities by networking among local Jewish structures, using them as levers to promote social welfare and strengthen communal ties. It re-establishes the connection to Jewish tradition by incorporating Jewish values into all services. Over time, Hesed has developed to become, particularly in mid-sized cities, the focus of Jewish life.

Clearly, limited funding and the pressing needs of older people make the elderly the primary target population. Yet from the beginning, the approach has been community-wide. Hesed was designed as a center integrating various local organizations and services, and strengthening voluntarism within and for the community. Today, a considerable proportion of Hesed's activities are based on voluntarism. Hesed views all members of the community, including its clients, as resources, and mobilizes them to the fullest possible extent as volunteers.<sup>1</sup>

Beyond community and voluntarism, Yiddishkeit (Jewish values) is the third principle on which the Hesed model is based. As part of the JDC's overall goal of "returning" Jews to the Jewish people, Hesed services and activities place a great deal of emphasis on Jewish heritage, culture and traditions. Therefore, the goal of the Hesed model is not only to provide material needs, but also to respond to the population's often unarticulated needs for developing a community and returning to its Jewish traditions. As a result, one can find many Yiddishkeit-based elements in Hesed Center programs and activities; indeed, Yiddishkeit permeates the centers' environment in many ways.<sup>2</sup>

The direct aim of the JDC is thus not only to provide welfare services in the FSU, but also to assist in the development of strong, viable Jewish communities capable of providing the gamut of services, including care for the needy. For this reason, each Hesed Center is run by local professionals and a board composed of community leaders and business people. Prior to Hesed, the concept of a board was non-existent in the FSU. The idea was to create a local decision-making structure in order to increase, in a more democratic fashion, the responsibility of the community to its members.<sup>3</sup>

## 1.3 Background on the Network of Institutes for Communal and Welfare Workers

Any evaluation of Hesed Community Welfare Centers would not be complete without relating to the network of Institutes for Communal and Welfare Workers.<sup>4</sup>

In order to develop the Hesed model of a multi-faceted outreach service network based on the guiding principles of Jewish values, community orientation and voluntarism, the JDC established

---

<sup>1</sup> Avgar, A. and Avraham, E. 2001. *JDC-FSU Welfare Report 1999-2000; Hesed: From Model to Movement*. JDC-FSU Department, Jerusalem.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Barasch, M. 2002. *Training for Welfare*. St Petersburg.

the William Rosenwald Institute for Communal and Welfare Workers in St. Petersburg in 1994 as the training framework for Hesed's staff and volunteers. At the time, no other suitable training framework existed in the FSU: Jewish communities were just beginning to emerge, voluntarism and community work were unknown concepts, and there were no schools of social work.

The mission of the William Rosenwald Institute for Communal and Welfare Workers has been to train Jewish professionals, paraprofessionals and volunteers to effectively implement welfare and communal services based on Jewish values and in the Jewish spirit. It has since expanded into a network of autonomous regional training institutes throughout the FSU; these institutes assist in meeting training needs as identified in the field and, at the same time, are a "hot house" for creative thought and initiative in the areas of communal development and social welfare. Because the welfare theories and approaches developed previously in the FSU were ineffective, the William Rosenwald Institute integrated models from abroad (and developed new concepts) regarding training and professionalism.

This network of institutes has already trained over 6,000 welfare workers and a similar number of volunteers in the following areas:

- ◆ Management and leadership
- ◆ Social work
- ◆ Voluntarism
- ◆ Home care
- ◆ Health and rehabilitation
- ◆ Nutrition
- ◆ Information technology
- ◆ Supervision and consultation
- ◆ Community organization
- ◆ Jewish culture and traditions

The institutes offer a range of courses and conferences appropriate for various types of voluntary and paid personnel with different levels of knowledge and experience. All programs are provided as in-service courses offered at regular intervals during the year in order to minimize the disruption to the students' professional responsibilities. The training is held both at institute facilities and "on the job" at Hesed Centers as part of the institutes' outreach. In addition, most Hesed Centers carry out additional in-house training initiatives. It should be noted, however, that limited funds mean many of these courses are fairly minimal compared to similar courses in Western countries.

The institutes also integrate models from abroad, applying these approaches in a way that is appropriate to the system that exists in the FSU. As new know-how has developed in the FSU over time, the institutes have established more and more partnerships with other training institutions.

As a result of changing needs in the field, increasing professionalism, and the expansion of services, there is a constant need to upgrade the professional level and Jewish knowledge of Hesed workers.

Furthermore, ongoing staff training is required, due to the emigration of senior and middle management, as well as the turnover of lower level workers (because of the level of salaries and the general improvement in work opportunities in some regions).

Instructors at the institutes are specialists from the FSU and elsewhere. Many of the local staff trainers are graduates of previous training courses at one of the institutes.

In addition to direct training, the institutes also create and publish methodical materials that they distribute to seminar participants. Their pedagogical libraries and recently-developed Web site are helping to develop needed skills in accessing information, providing audio-visual training, and enabling the empowerment of the individual; this, in turn, is increasing the effectiveness of social services in the FSU.

The institutes also have a research and evaluation department, which conducts ongoing research on the social and health conditions of the elderly, and on social and medical services in the FSU, well as an evaluation of Hesed programs and institute study courses.

## 2. Study Goals and Methodology

### 2.1 Goals of the Survey

After nearly a decade of experience, the Hesed network has proven to be an effective response to the urgent needs of Jews in the FSU, acting as a resource and model for local Jewish welfare organizations.<sup>5</sup> Over the years, an internal evaluation has been conducted on an ongoing basis in order to improve the provision of welfare services. However, it is equally important to assess whether the guiding principles are still as integral to the process as they were at the outset.

Just as *hesed* is a concept deeply rooted in Jewish tradition, the manner in which a service is provided by Hesed is no less important than the service itself.<sup>6</sup> With this in mind, the JDC-FSU Department decided to conduct an evaluation study of the Hesed Centers, using a comparative case study approach and focusing on the following aspects:

- ◆ Hesed Centers as a lever for Jewish renewal and the renewal of the Jewish community
- ◆ The linkage of Hesed Centers to municipal services, other Jewish community organizations and key community figures
- ◆ The volunteers and the voluntary work at Hesed
- ◆ Welfare services at Hesed
- ◆ Training for Hesed's workers and volunteers.

---

<sup>5</sup> Kol-Fogelson, A. 2002. *FSU Welfare 2001; Stepping into the New Millennium*. JDC-FSU, Jerusalem.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

## 2.2 Methodology and Data Collection

The study was conducted at eight Hesed Centers in three republics: Russia – St. Petersburg and Nizhnii Novgorod; Ukraine – Kiev, Odessa, Vinnitsa and Dnepropetrovsk; and Belarus – Minsk and Vitebsk.

The data were gathered from six source groups: Hesed clients, Hesed volunteers, Hesed home care workers, Hesed administrative/program workers (hereinafter: program workers), Hesed Center directors, and key figures in the Jewish community, the goal being to gather information from a number of perspectives and thus receive as broad a picture as possible about Hesed Centers.

The source groups were sampled in various ways. The clients, volunteers and home care workers were randomly sampled from the files of Hesed's database at the eight centers in March, 2001.

A total of 2,400 of the 65,449 clients in the database were randomly sampled (300 from each Hesed Center that was examined). Each client in the sample was contacted by telephone and asked to complete a self-administered questionnaire in a group at the Hesed Center; those who agreed to participate but were unable to complete the questionnaire with the rest of the group were interviewed in person. There was a high response rate: 1,876 (78%) of those sampled completed the questionnaire, 15% of them in a group at Hesed and 85% at home during a face-to-face interview.

A total of 1,609 of the 2,400 volunteers in the database were randomly sampled (300 from each Hesed Center with more than 300 volunteers in the database, and all of the volunteers from each Center with fewer than 300 volunteers) (Table 1). Each volunteer in the sample was contacted by telephone and asked to complete a self-administered questionnaire in a group at the Hesed Center; those who agreed to participate but were unable to complete the questionnaire with the rest of the group were interviewed in person. A total of 1,022 volunteers (64% of those sampled) completed the questionnaire, 88% in a group at Hesed and 12% at home.

**Table 1: Response Rate of Volunteers, by Hesed Center**

	Total Volunteers in the Database	Sample	Response Rate	
			N	%
St. Petersburg	833	300	258	86
Nizhnii Novgorod	86	86	55	64
Kiev	458	300	172	57
Odessa	198	198	71	36
Vinnitsa	65	65	59	91
Dnepropetrovsk	342	300	206	69
Minsk	358	300	187	62
Vitebsk	60	60	14	23
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,400</b>	<b>1,609</b>	<b>1,022</b>	<b>64</b>

A total of 1,116 of the 1,444 home care workers in the database were randomly sampled (200 from each Hesed Center with more than 200 home care workers in the data base, and all of the home care workers from each Center with fewer than 200 home care workers) (Table 2). Each home care worker in the sample was contacted by telephone and asked to complete a self-administered questionnaire in a group at the Hesed Center; those who agreed to participate but were unable to complete the questionnaire with the rest of the group were interviewed in person. A total of 763 home care workers (68% of those sampled) completed the questionnaire, 97% in a group at Hesed and 3% at home.

**Table 2: Response Rate of Home Care Workers, by Hesed Center**

	Total Home Care Workers in the Database	Sample	Response Rate	
			N	%
St. Petersburg	376	200	126	63
Nizhnii Novgorod	57	57	19	33
Kiev	352	200	193	97
Odessa	166	166	139	84
Vinnitsa	98	98	22	23
Dnepropetrovsk	173	173	142	82
Minsk	165	165	96	58
Vitebsk	57	57	26	46
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,444</b>	<b>1,116</b>	<b>763</b>	<b>68</b>

All of the program workers were asked to complete a self-administered questionnaire (N=445); there were no refusals. Ninety-three percent completed the questionnaire in a group at Hesed, and 7% did so during a face-to-face interview at home. Table 3 presents the number of program workers responding at each Hesed Center, and the percentage they comprise of the total number of respondents in the study.

**Table 3: Respondents among the Program Workers, by Hesed Center**

	Respondents	
	N	Percentage of All Employee Respondents in the Study
St. Petersburg	65	15
Nizhnii Novgorod	10	2
Kiev	102	23
Odessa	102	23
Vinnitsa	40	9
Dnepropetrovsk	61	14
Minsk	55	12
Vitebsk	10	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>445</b>	<b>100</b>



To ensure the precision of the research measures, we gave a weight to each respondent that expresses his probability of being included in the sample. Within the client, volunteer and home care worker samples, the same method of weighting was used. The following is an example from the volunteer population.

The sampling proportion of the volunteers was given according to the size of the volunteer population at each Hesed Center, the number of respondents among the volunteers at each Hesed Center, the total number of respondents among the volunteers at all eight Hesed Centers, and the total number of volunteers at all eight Hesed Centers:

$$w_i = N_i/n_i * \Sigma(n_i) / \Sigma(N_i)^7$$

As we did not randomly sample the program workers, there was no need to give a weight to these respondents.

The questionnaires for each of the source groups were developed by the staff of the Myers-JDC-Brookdale Institute, together with the staff of the William Rosenwald Institute for Communal and Welfare Workers, with input from a number of experts in Jewish communal surveys and survey instruments. All data were gathered between October and December, 2001. The field work was conducted by staff from the William Rosenwald Institute for Communal and Welfare Workers training center in St. Petersburg, together with staff from the regional institutes in Minsk, Kiev and Dnepropetrovsk.

This report focuses on human resource issues, which were investigated in a similar fashion for each of the three groups. As some groups were asked questions not asked of other groups, and in order to enable comparisons to be made, this report presents analyses of only those variables that were identical for at least two of the three groups. However, in some cases, when direct questions were lacking, we indirectly derived the values for the respondents' variables from the values for other variables; this is indicated in the tables where relevant.

The findings presented in this report are primarily from frequency distributions, cross tabulations and mean score analyses. All of the differences between groups are statistically significant ( $P < 0.05$ ) except where indicated ("not significant" or "N.S."). Supplementary data on participation in training activities from the national database of the St. Petersburg training center were also utilized.

---

<sup>7</sup>  $w_i$  – the weight given to the respondents from Hesed Center  $i$ ;  $N_i$  – the size of the volunteer population from Hesed Center  $i$ ;  $n_i$  – the number of respondents from Hesed Center  $i$ ;  $\Sigma(n_i)$  – the total number of respondents from all eight Hesed Centers;  $\Sigma(N_i)$  – the total number of volunteers from all eight Hesed Centers.

### 3. Socio-demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

The work force at the eight Hesed Centers that were studied constitutes about 4,300 people, over half (56%) of whom are volunteers. One-third (34%) are home care workers (Table 4). The remaining salaried staff are divided among those at the managerial level, coordinators and program staff.

**Table 4: Work Force, by Hesed Center and Type of Staff**

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Volunteers</b>	<b>Program Staff</b>	<b>Home Care Workers</b>
St. Petersburg	<b>1,274</b>	833	65	376
Nizhnii Novgorod	<b>153</b>	86	10	57
Kiev	<b>912</b>	458	102	352
Odessa	<b>466</b>	198	102	166
Vinnitsa	<b>203</b>	65	40	98
Dnepropetrovsk	<b>576</b>	342	61	173
Minsk	<b>578</b>	358	55	165
Vitebsk	<b>127</b>	60	10	57
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,289</b>	<b>2,400</b>	<b>445</b>	<b>1,444</b>
Percentage	<b>100</b>	56	10	34

The findings presented in Table 4 reveal that the proportion of program staff and volunteers in the total work force differs from one Hesed Center to the next. For example, in Odessa the program staff constitutes one-fifth of the work force, while the volunteers constitute almost half. In comparison, in St. Petersburg the program staff constitutes 5% of the work force, while volunteers constitute 65%.

In this chapter we describe the respondents' background in terms of gender, age, education and primary occupation (Table 5).

**Table 5: Selected Socio-demographic Characteristics of the Respondents, by Type of Staff (in %)**

	Total	Volunteers	Program Staff	Home Care Workers
<b>Gender</b>				
Female	82	73	76	97
<b>Age Group</b>				
Up to 44	21	4	40	33
45-64	47	37	51	58
65+	32	59	9	9
Mean age (years)	56.9	66.4	47.5	49.7
<b>Education</b>				
Higher education (M.A.)	53	64	73	29
Technical education (B.A., B.Tech)	32	24	23	48
High school diploma	12	8	4	20
Did not complete high school	3	4	0	3
<b>Primary occupational field</b>				
Engineering, technical	37	39	41	31
Scientific, academic	5	6	6	4
Work with people (physician, teacher)	25	24	24	27
Business (lawyer, accountant, economist)	13	14	18	8
Arts (musician, artist, actor)	3	4	4	1
Skilled labor (plumber, driver/mechanic)	15	12	5	26

The findings presented in Table 5 reveal the following:

- ♦ The majority (82%) of the work force is composed of women.
- ♦ Most (79%) of the respondents were age 45 or older. However, the volunteers were much older (59% were aged 65+) than both the program staff and the home care workers, who were relatively similar in age (9% of both groups were 65+).
- ♦ Most of the respondents (85%) had a higher education (B.A., B.Tech or higher). The percentage was highest among the program staff (96%), and lowest among the home care workers (77%).
- ♦ Similar percentages of program staff (41%) and volunteers (39%) reported that their primary field of occupation was engineering or technical work. Among the home care workers, the percentage was slightly lower (31%). Similar percentages of respondents reported that their primary field of occupation involved working with people: 27% among the home care workers, and 24% each among the program staff and volunteers. A relatively high percentage of home care workers (26%) reported that their primary field of occupation was skilled work; this percentage was lower among the volunteers (12%), and lower still among the program staff (5%).

#### 4. Respondents' Views of Their Work at Hesed

The study examined several aspects of work at Hesed, such as seniority, motivation for working at Hesed, contacts between salaried staff and volunteers, and job satisfaction.

#### 4.1 Seniority

We examined aspects of the respondents' current positions at Hesed, such as seniority and type of staff position (i.e., volunteer, program worker or home care worker), as reflected in the department in which the respondent worked and whether he had direct contact with clients as part of his job (Table 6).

**Table 6: Employment Characteristics, by Type of Staff (in %)**

	Total	Volunteers	Program Staff	Home Care Workers
<b>Seniority at Hesed</b>				
Less than 2 years	25	16	36	31
2-4 years	38	38	31	44
More than 4 years	37	46	33	25
Mean seniority at Hesed (years)	3.6	4.2	3.1	3.1
<b>Current department or program</b>				
Food programs, Warm Home/Open House	15	27	14	*
Home Care	41	*	33	100
Medical and Rehabilitation	7	13	8	*
Volunteer, Moked or Club	18	32	18	*
Administration/warehouse	4	2	17	*
Other	14	26	11	*

\* Do not work in this department

The findings presented in Table 6 reveal the following:

- ◆ The volunteers have more seniority at Hesed than do the program workers and the home care workers. The average seniority among the respondents was 4.2 years for volunteers, and 3.1 years for both the program workers and the home care workers. Eighty-four percent of the volunteers reported having worked at Hesed for more than two years, while 64% and 69% of the program workers and home care workers, respectively, reported this.
- ◆ Among the program workers, seniority at Hesed did not always reflect seniority in a paid position. Thirty-two percent of the program workers reported that prior to working in their current paid position, they had volunteered at Hesed. Most (75%) of them reported that they had volunteered for up to one year.
- ◆ Relatively high percentages of the volunteers were working in the Volunteer, Moked or Club departments (32%), and in the Food or Warm Home/Open House programs (27%), in accordance with accepted internal procedures at Hesed, which place volunteers in these departments.<sup>8</sup> Generally, volunteers do not work in the Home Care department.. Since information about department assignments was unavailable for a relatively high percentage of the volunteers (26%), there are only partial findings for current placement.

<sup>8</sup> Kaufman, R.; Mirsky, J.; and Avgar, A. 2004. *A Brigade Model for the Management of Service Volunteers in Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*. International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing 9(1):57-68.

#### 4.2 Motivation for Working at Hesed

The motivation for working at Hesed was examined for the volunteers and the program staff. (Motivation was considered less relevant to the home care workers.) As one of Hesed's main goals is to encourage Jewish renewal, the survey examined Jewish as well as non-Jewish motivations for working there. To this end, we presented the program workers and volunteers with a list of possible motivational factors and asked them to indicate whether they found them to be important. The factors included aspects of Jewish identity, personal and professional development, social life, the appreciation of one's work by others, and material benefits (Table 7).

**Table 7: Factors Motivating the Decision to Work at Hesed, by Type of Staff (in %)**

Factor	Respondents Reporting the Factor Played an Important Role in the Decision to Work at Hesed		
	Total	Volunteers	Program Workers
<b>Jewish identity</b>			
Satisfaction with caring for Jews	82	83	81
Maintaining contact with members of the Jewish community	67	70	62
A sense of belonging to the Jewish people	78	81	73
Involvement in Jewish culture	79	79	78
<b>Professional aspects</b>			
Personal development	65	61	74
Interesting work	78	72	92
Utilization of one's abilities and skills	78	73	89
Appreciation of one's work	76	78	72
Continuing to work in one's area of specialization	42	44	39
<b>Social relations</b>			
Making friends with new people	84	83	88
Participating in Hesed activities	77	80	72
<b>Material benefits</b>			
Hesed's assistance in the future	45	50	32
Hesed's current social assistance	46	57	18
Good salary and employment benefits	59	-	59

The findings presented in Table 7 reveal the following:

- ◆ Relatively high percentages of the program workers and volunteers reported that factors related to Jewish identity played an important role in their decision to work at Hesed. For example, around 80% cited satisfaction with caring for Jews as a major reason for working at Hesed, and nearly 80% cited involvement with Jewish culture.
- ◆ High percentages of the respondents in both groups cited professional motives, although the percentages were higher among the program workers: 92% and 89% reported that interesting work and the utilization of their abilities and skills, respectively, were important factors in their decision to work at Hesed, compared to 72% and 73%, respectively, among the volunteers. The

vast majority (74%) of the program workers reported that personal development was an important factor in their decision to work at Hesed, versus 61% of the volunteers.

- ◆ Relatively low percentages of the program workers (39%) and volunteers (44%) reported that continuing to work in one's area of specialization played an important role in their decision to work at Hesed.
- ◆ The anticipation of material benefits was, as expected, much more significant among the volunteers than among the staff. More than half (57%) of the volunteers reported that Hesed's current social assistance played an important role in their decision to work at Hesed, as compared to 18% of the program workers. Half (50%) of the volunteers reported that anticipating a need for Hesed's assistance in the future played an important role in their decision to work at Hesed, while 32% of the program workers reported this.
- ◆ A relatively high percentage (59%) of the program workers reported that a good salary and other employment benefits played an important role in their decision to work at Hesed.
- ◆ It is also of note that a third (32%) of the program workers first joined Hesed as volunteers. Most volunteered for no more than a year. These findings could explain some of the similarities between the program workers and the volunteers regarding the motivation to work at Hesed.

**4.3 Contacts between the Salaried Workers and the Volunteers**

The salaried workers (program workers and the home care workers) were asked whether they had contact during work hours with volunteers, and the volunteers were asked whether they had contact with salaried workers. Those who responded affirmatively were asked what type of contact they had and how often it occurred. Respondents who had contact with other types of staff were also asked to assess the contact, as well as to report whether there were problems in working together (Tables 8 and 9).

**Table 8: Salaried Workers (Program Workers and Home Care Workers) and their Contact with Volunteers, by Type of Staff (in%)**

Contacts	Total	Program Workers	Home Care Workers
No contact	51	29	73
I work with one or more volunteers	27	32	21
I supervise one or more volunteers	16	33	0
Other	6	6	6
<b>Assessment of Contacts</b>			
Poor	3	1	5
Satisfactory	13	4	22
Good	52	49	54
Excellent	32	46	19

\* Among those who reported having contact

**Table 9: Volunteers and their Contact with Salaried Workers (Program Workers and Home Care Workers) (in%)\***

Contacts	Volunteers
No contact	10
I work with one or more salaried workers	25
I work under one or more salaried workers	63
Other	2
<b>Assessment of Contacts</b>	
Poor	0
Satisfactory	15
Good	60
Excellent	25

\* Among those who reported having contact

The findings presented in Tables 8 and 9 reveal the following:

- ◆ Almost all (90%) of the volunteers reported having working contact with salaried workers. The majority (71%) of the program workers reported having such contact with volunteers. A relatively low percentage (27%) of the home care workers reported having such contact with volunteers.
- ◆ The majority (63%) of the volunteers reported working under a salaried worker's supervision. Thirty-two percent of the program workers reported working with one or more volunteers, and a similar percentage (33%) reported that volunteers worked under their supervision.
- ◆ Among those who reported having contact with the other group, a very high percentage (95%) of the program workers assessed their relationships with volunteers as good (49%) or excellent (46%). A similar trend was found among the volunteers regarding their relationships with salaried workers, with 60% describing them as good, and 25% as excellent.

#### 4.4 Job Satisfaction

We examined the degree to which the respondents were satisfied with their own work at Hesed (Table 10).

**Table 10: General Satisfaction with Work at Hesed, by Type of Staff (in %)**

General Satisfaction with Work at Hesed	Total	Volunteers	Program Workers	Home Care Workers
To a great degree	<b>41</b>	33	60	40
To some degree	<b>55</b>	62	38	58
To a small degree	<b>3</b>	4	2	2
Not at all	<b>1</b>	1	0	0

The findings presented in Table 10 reveal that:

- ◆ Almost all of the program workers, home care workers and volunteers (98%, 95% and 98%, respectively) reported being satisfied to some/a great degree with their work at Hesed.
- ◆ More than half (60%) of the program workers reported being satisfied to a great degree, while the rates were lower among the home care workers (40%) and the volunteers (33%).

#### 4.5 Sense of Belonging to the Jewish People

As noted, Hesed services and activities place a great deal of emphasis on Jewish heritage, culture and tradition as part of Hesed's overall goal of promoting Jewish renewal. Its program workers and volunteers assist in various ways in transmitting the Jewish component of its work to Hesed clients.

The study shows that the sense of belonging to the Jewish people is a motivational factor in working at Hesed. It was found that 68% among both the program workers and the volunteers reported that working at Hesed has increased the importance they ascribe to belonging to the Jewish people.

The issue of Hesed's impact on Jewish identity was one of the major topics of the Hesed evaluation study; it is comprehensively examined in the other reports, including one that was specifically devoted to the issue.

### 5. The Respondents' Participation in Training and Views of Training Needs

Hesed seeks to improve the professionalism of its program workers and volunteers, as well as their knowledge about Jewish communities and Jewish history, culture and traditions. Therefore, it provides them with opportunities for training at the network of training institutes, at Hesed itself, and in other frameworks. The respondents were asked to indicate whether they had undergone training, and about their perceived unmet needs.

#### 5.1 Participation in Training

The respondents were asked whether they had undergone professional training during the previous two years and, if so, the number of times (Table 11).

**Table 11: Professional Training, by Type of Staff (in %)**

	<b>Total</b>	Volunteers	Program Workers	Home Care Workers
<b>Number of times the respondent underwent training in the previous two years</b>				
None	<b>34</b>	42	31	24
One or two	<b>40</b>	31	31	57
Three or more	<b>26</b>	27	38	19

The findings presented in Table 11 reveal the following:

- ◆ On the whole, more than three-quarters of the Hesed work force (76%) reported undergoing training during the previous two years.
- ◆ The percentage was highest among the home care workers (76%), and lowest among the volunteers (58%). The program workers fell somewhere "in the middle" (69%). However, it is important to note that because volunteers constitute more than half (56%) of Hesed's work force,



those who reported having undergone training during the previous two years may constitute a relatively large group in absolute numbers.

- ◆ There were differences in the rates of participation in training among the various roles filled by the program workers. We found that a higher percentage (83%) of the coordinators underwent training in the previous two years than did the program, department and technical staff (69%), and the managerial staff (59%). We may assume that among the salaried workers at Hased (program workers and home care workers), the lower percentages are the result of a policy that places greater emphasis on the training of caregiving staff, for whom no alternative training frameworks are available.
- ◆ The percentage reporting having undergone training three or more times during the previous two years was highest among the program workers (38%), lower among the volunteers (27%), and lowest among the home care workers (19%).

We also examined the receipt of professional training during the previous two years according to the respondent's department (Table 12).

**Table 12: Respondents Who Underwent Training during the Previous Two Years, by Department (in%)\***

Department	Underwent Professional Training During the Previous Two Years
Food programs, Warm Home/Open House	72
Home Care	79
Medical and Rehabilitation	52
Volunteer, Moked or Club	54
Administration/warehouse	40

\* This Table relates only to those 86% of the respondents who work in these departments.

The findings presented in Table 12 reveal the following:

- ◆ The majority of the respondents who were working in the Home Care department (79%) or in the Food or the Warm Home/Open House programs (72%) reported undergoing professional training during the previous two years.
- ◆ Half (54%) of the respondents in the Volunteer, Moked or Club departments (54%), and half (52%) of those in the Medical and Rehabilitation department, reported undergoing training during the previous two years.
- ◆ A relatively low percentage (40%) of the respondents in the administration/warehouse department reported undergoing training during the previous two years.

Exposure to training was also examined for each Hased Center and according to the Center's proximity to a training institute, by type of staff (Table 13).

**Table 13: Rate of Respondents Who Underwent Training during the Previous Two Years, by Hesed Center and Type of Staff**

Hesed Center	Total	Volunteers	Program Workers	Home Care Workers
<b>Respondents underwent training during the previous two years</b>				
Vinnitsa	74	43	63	100
Vitebsk	81	85	63	80
Dnepropetrovsk	74	61	84	89
Kiev	49	27	75	59
Minsk	86	94	80	75
Nizhnii Novgorod	46	19	80	68
Odessa	70	60	59	95
St. Petersburg	68	63	66	75

The findings presented in Table 13 reveal differences in the rates of exposure to training of the three types of staff at the various Hesed Centers:

- ♦ The highest percentages of program workers who reported undergoing training during the previous two years were in Dnepropetrovsk (84%), Minsk (80%), Nizhnii Novgorod (80%) and Kiev (75%). At all other Hesed Centers, 59%-66% of the program workers reported undergoing training.
- ♦ The highest percentages of home care workers who reported undergoing training during the previous two years were in Vinnitsa (100%), Vitebsk (80%), Dnepropetrovsk (89%) and Odessa (95%). At all other Hesed Centers, 59%-75% of the home care workers reported undergoing training.
- ♦ There was even greater diversity among the Hesed Centers regarding volunteers who reported having undergone training during the previous two years. The highest percentage (94%) was found at the Hesed Center in Minsk, while the lowest percentage (19%) was found in Nizhnii Novgorod, one of the smaller centers.
- ♦ The diversity among Hesed Centers for all groups may reflect varying professional foci among the regional institutes, or differences in local needs.

In addition, we created a variable called “institute proximity” by clustering the eight Hesed Centers into two groups: those located in cities with a training institute (Dnepropetrovsk, Kiev, Minsk, Odessa and St. Petersburg), and those in cities with no training institute (Vinnitsa, Vitebsk and Nizhnii Novgorod) (see Table 14).

**Table 14: Rate of Respondents Who Underwent Training during the Previous Two Years, by Proximity to a Training Institute and Type of Staff**

There is a Training Institute in the City	Total	Volunteers	Program Workers (N.S.)	Home Care Workers
No	67	44	66	87
Yes	67	60	71	75

The findings presented in Table 14 show the following:

- ◆ A higher percentage of volunteers underwent training during the previous two years in the cities with a training institute (60%) than in the cities without a training institute (44%).
- ◆ For program workers and home care workers, no correlation was found between proximity to a training institute and participation in training during the previous two years.

## 5.2 Complementary Data on Training from the Training Institutes

Data on participation in training was available from an additional source. Each of the training institutes collects information on all of its training activities and on the participants in its training programs. Below, we present complementary data on participation in training during the period covered by the study, using a central database from the network of training institutes.<sup>9</sup>

The data from the central database reveal that during the two years prior to the study, a total of 2,713 salaried staff and volunteers from Hesed participated in training programs: 50% were volunteers, 26% were home care workers, and 24% were program workers. If we compare these figures to the findings of the current study, we see that the proportion of volunteers is almost identical. However, the proportion of home care workers is lower (39% in the current study), and the proportion of program workers is higher (11% in the current study). The difference regarding the home care workers may be because a large proportion of the training in home care is performed at the Hesed Centers themselves, and is not always reported to the institutes. The difference regarding the program workers may be attributed to the rate of turnover among these workers (see the data on seniority in Table 6).

The database of the network of training institutes also provides information on the number of days of training for each participant. As can be seen in Table 15, these figures provide a different yet important perspective on the extensiveness of training.

**Table 15: Number of Days of Training, by Type of Staff, as Recorded in the Database of the Network of Institutes (in %)\***

Number of Days of Training	Total	Volunteers	Program Workers	Home Care Workers
1-5 days	<b>65</b>	78	50	55
6-10 days	<b>22</b>	18	26	27
More than 10 days	<b>13</b>	4	24	19

\* The institutes' data base also includes employees who were no longer working at Hesed at the time of the survey; this explains why the number of employees in the table is larger (649) than that in our study of Hesed (445).

The findings presented in Table 15 reveal the following:

- ◆ Relatively high percentages of the program workers (24%) and the home care workers (19%) had undergone more than 10 days of training, as opposed to 4% of the volunteers.

<sup>9</sup> Barasch M. Annual reports of training activities in the network of Institutes (2000-2001).

- ♦ Consistently, half (50%) of the program workers who had undergone training, and more than half (55%) of the home care workers who had undergone training, underwent one to five days of training, as opposed to three-quarters of the volunteers who had undergone training (78%).

The current study did not examine the impact of training on the level of knowledge of the workers, or on client outcomes. However, findings from other studies on training for Hased workers have indicated that there is a relationship between the receipt of training, on the one hand, and the levels of knowledge and client satisfaction, on the other. Zeitseva (2001)<sup>10</sup> found that the level of knowledge of the home care workers regarding care for the elderly increased with the extent of training received, as did the level of satisfaction of the clients with their home care workers.

Lampert (2001)<sup>11</sup> found increased theoretical knowledge about organizational development as a result of training among a group of Hased directors in Belarus. However, the application of this knowledge was limited. There is a need for much more research on training effectiveness.

### 5.3 The Need for Additional Training

The respondents were asked to indicate whether they required additional training in order to work effectively. The majority (70%) of the program workers reported unmet training needs, as did half (51%) of the home care workers (Table 16). One-third (33%) of the volunteers reported a need for additional training; however, as only those volunteers who reported undergoing professional training during the previous two years (58%) were asked about unmet training needs, information on the unmet training needs of this group is incomplete. The respondents who reported unmet training needs were also asked, with an open question, to indicate the areas of need.

**Table 16: Areas in which the Respondents Required Additional Training, by Type of Staff (in %)**

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Program Workers</b>	<b>Home Care Workers</b>
<b>Areas in which the respondents required additional training (among those reporting they need additional training to work effectively)</b>			
Yiddishkeit	<b>5</b>	8	2
Psycho-social	<b>47</b>	39	56
Health care	<b>21</b>	9	32
Gerontology	<b>10</b>	13	6

<sup>10</sup> Zeitseva, S.G. 2001. *Professionalism: The Basis for Effective Work of the Home Care Service*. Graduate Thesis, William Rosenwald Institute for Communal and Welfare Workers , St Petersburg. (Russian)

<sup>11</sup> Lampert, A. E. 2001. *Seminars on Organizational Development for Hased Directors in Belarus* . Graduate Thesis, William Rosenwald Institute for Communal and Welfare Workers , St Petersburg. (Russian)

The findings presented in Table 16 reveal the following:

- ◆ The predominant area of need for additional training was psychology/social work.
- ◆ The need for additional training in health care was also prominent, primarily among home care workers.
- ◆ Relatively low percentages of the respondents in all departments expressed a need for training in Yiddishkeit.

As noted, the Hesed model is based on three principles: Jewish values, community orientation and voluntarism. In addition, as Hesed aims to provide professional services, it seeks to improve the professionalism of its program workers and volunteers. To this end, it provides them with professional training. As can be seen in our findings, the respondents require more training in areas related to professional improvement than they do in areas related to the three basic principles.

Future training needs were not examined in depth as part of the current study. However, they were a central theme at the annual conference of the William Rosenwald Institute for Communal and Welfare Workers, which was held on March 1-5, 2001, shortly before the completion of the field work for this study, and attended by both Hesed and institute directors.<sup>12</sup> The feeling at the conference was that the ongoing challenges facing the network of training institutes are considerable. Unmet training needs and concrete recommendations for meeting these needs were identified for a range of areas. They included recommendations similar to those made by the volunteers and salaried workers at the Hesed Centers, as well as in additional areas:

- ◆ Knowledge development through the sharing of experience and focused research
- ◆ Broader utilization of advanced technologies, such as distance learning
- ◆ Developing more of an emphasis on training for trainers and mentoring by senior staff across Hesed organizations
- ◆ Strengthening and upgrading training in specific areas, such as management
- ◆ Developing a three-tiered training structure for organizations, directors and program managers
- ◆ Strengthening professional networking and making more extensive use of experienced professionals from Hesed Centers in the training process at the institutes
- ◆ Developing new programs to meet the changing needs of the Hesed Centers, such as addressing staff "burn-out" and local fundraising
- ◆ Expanding training to additional community organizations and developing an integrated approach across organizations for communities.

---

<sup>12</sup> Barasch, M.; and Gershanovich, A. (eds.). 2002. *The Development of the System for Training of Jewish Community Professionals. Proceedings of the Sixth Conference of the William Rosenwald Institute for Communal and Welfare Workers*, St Petersburg. (Russian)

## Bibliography

Avgar, A.; and Avraham, E. 2001. *JDC-FSU Welfare Report 1999-2000; Hesed: From Model to Movement*. JDC-FSU Department, Jerusalem.

Barasch M. 2000-2001. *Annual Reports on Training Activities in the Network of Institutes*. JDC-FSU Department, Jerusalem.

Barasch, M.; and Gershanovich, A. (eds.). 2002. *The Development of the System for Training of Jewish Community Professionals*. Proceedings of the Sixth Conference of the William Rosenwald Institute for Communal and Welfare Workers, St Petersburg. (Russian)

Iecovich, E.; Barasch, M., Kol-Fogelson, A.; and Avgar A. (forthcoming). *Home Care Services and Level of Functioning*.

Kaufman, R.; Mirsky, J.; and Avgar, A. 2003. "A Brigade Model for the Management of Service Volunteers in Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Marketing". February. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing* 9(1):57-68.

Keller-Beach, E. 1982. "Johari's Window as a Framework for Needs Assessment". *Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing* 13(3):28-32.

Kol-Fogelson, A. 2002. *FSU Welfare 2001; Stepping into the New Millennium*. JDC-FSU Department, Jerusalem.

Korazim, M.; Bareket, R.; and Bergman, S. 1997. *Continuing Training in Gerontology: A Survey of Needs*: Research Report. RR-312-97. JDC-Brookdale Institute, Jerusalem. (Hebrew)

Lampert, A. E. 2001. *Seminars for Hesed Directors in Belarus in Organizational Development*. Graduate Thesis, William Rosenwald Institute for Communal and Welfare Workers, St Petersburg. (Russian)

*Tradition; Renewing Our Purpose*. JDC-FSU Department, Jerusalem.

Zalberg, S.; Katz, E.; and Youssim, I. 2003. *Hesed Evaluation Study: Jewish Identity, Community Orientation and Voluntarism. Report Number 1: Findings from a Survey of Hesed Employees*. RR-106-03. JDC-Brookdale Institute, Jerusalem; William Rosenwald Institute for Communal and Welfare Workers, St. Petersburg. (English, Russian)

Zalberg, S.; Katz, E.; and Youssim, I. 2003. *Hesed Evaluation Study: Jewish Identity, Community Orientation and Voluntarism. Report Number 2: Findings from a Survey of Hesed Clients*. S-109-03. JDC-Brookdale Institute, Jerusalem; William Rosenwald Institute for Communal and Welfare Workers, St. Petersburg. (English, Russian)

Barasch, M.; Alesina, M. (forthcoming) *Hesed Evaluation Study: Jewish Identity, Community Orientation and Voluntarism. Report Number 3: Findings from a Survey of Hesed Volunteers*. JDC-Brookdale Institute, Jerusalem; William Rosenwald Institute for Communal and Welfare Workers, St. Petersburg. (English, Russian)

Zalberg, S.; Katz, E.; and Youssim, I. 2003. *Hesed Evaluation Study: Jewish Identity, Community Orientation and Voluntarism. Report Number 4: Findings from a Survey of Hesed Home Care Workers*. S-112-03. JDC-Brookdale Institute, Jerusalem; William Rosenwald Institute for Communal and Welfare Workers, St. Petersburg. (English, Russian)

Zalberg, S.; Katz, E.; and Youssim, I. 2004. *Hesed Evaluation Study: Jewish Identity, Community Orientation and Voluntarism. Report Number 5: Findings from an In-depth Study of Hesed Directors and Jewish Community Representatives*. S-113-04. JDC-Brookdale Institute, Jerusalem; William Rosenwald Institute for Communal and Welfare Workers, St. Petersburg. (English, Russian)

Zalberg, S.; Katz, E.; and Youssim, I. 2004. *Hesed Evaluation Study: Jewish Identity, Community Orientation and Voluntarism. Report Number 7: Hesed's Impact on Jewish Identity and Community Renewal. An Integrative Perspective of Hesed Directors, Employees, Volunteers, Clients and Community Representatives*. S-115-04. JDC-Brookdale Institute, Jerusalem; William Rosenwald Institute for Communal and Welfare Workers, St. Petersburg. (English, Russian)

Zeitseva, S.G. 2001. *Professionalism: The Basis for Effective Work of the Home Care Service*. Graduate Thesis, William Rosenwald Institute for Communal and Welfare Workers, St Petersburg. (Russian).