

Community-Centers in Israel During the Covid-19 Pandemic-

A Collective Impact

Etti Isler-Green:

P.H.D student, West University of Timisoara

CEO of the Israeli Federation of Community Centers

Head of the B.A Program in Education at the College of Management

July 2021

Abstract

The of Covid-19 epidemic is a natural disaster crisis on a global scale. Despite extensive experience in emergency operations that the Israeli community – centers have accumulated during war times, they were required to develop original methods in order to make their services accessible to the communities especially in periods of social distance and closures. This study examined the implementation of collaboration models by community-centers, that enabled joint action whether multi-sectoral or single-sector, using the unique assets of each sector or organization. The research was based on Qualitative survey of community- centers in five local authorities, trying to find out which model assisted most effectively in the functioning of the centers during the crisis.

"A Door closes, a Window opens"

Introduction

This study was conducted while the Covid-19 in Israel, is in remission, and a kind of routine returns to the lives of the Israeli population.

A look at this period shows endless activities performed by third sector organizations. The focus of the study, are the community- centers have always been the forefront of the recruits during routine and emergency periods.

No emergency in the past prepared the community- centers Covid-19 emergency, with its special characteristics.

The essential basis of unity, which distinguishes the communal world– has been reversed, and distance was required instead.

This study will examine the performance of the community-centers in Israel, during the outbreak of the Covid 19 Pandemic, through qualitative research conducted in a sample of five cities. The study will try to find out what was their secret of success, and try to formulate work methods and collaborations for the future.

The Spread of the Covid- 19 pandemic in Israel

The Corona Virus (Covid 19 – in its scientific name), first broke out in Wuhan Province, China in late 2019. In January 2020 the World Health Organization (WHO) announced that Covid 19 is a pandemic with fears of international spread. On March 13, 2020, the WHO announced that Europe has become the center of gravity of the pandemic. Until the end of March 2020 the USA had become the country with the largest number of positively diagnosed people. The USA was followed by Brazil, India and the rest of the Third World countries.

In most countries where the virus has broken out, a policy of closure and isolation had been decided upon.

On January 23, 2020, after it was discovered that the virus had spread outside China, the Israeli Ministry of Health (MOH) issued guidelines on how to treat the person developing the symptoms of the disease; On January 30, returnees from China were required to remain in quarantine for fear of contracting the virus, and flights from China to Israel were banned. On February 17, quarantine orders were extended to returnees from Singapore, Thailand, Macau, Hong Kong and South Korea. On February 18, the Israeli prime minister stated that the State of Israel had succeeded in preventing the virus from entering its territory.

About ten days later, on February 27, 2020, the first coronavirus patient who was not in quarantine was discovered in Israel. The patient had returned from Italy four days earlier, leading to the first cases of infection in Israel.

As a result of these and other cases, by the end of February 2020, more than 5,000 Israelis had been sent to quarantine. At the end of March 2020, the number of confirmed coronavirus patients in Israel stood at 4,347: 80 of them are in serious condition; 81 of them are in moderate condition; Sixteen of them died. There were also 134 recoveries reported.

In the following months, the virus continued to spread in Israel, and a series of restrictions and precautions were taken against it. The restrictions included: extensive closure, social distancing, and the obligation to wear masks.

The first positive turnaround in Israel occurred in the middle of April 2020, when for the first time since the outbreak of the virus, the number of confirmed recoveries daily was higher than the number of daily confirmed cases (209 recovering compared to 158). From this date onwards, the restrictions on gathering, commerce and activity outside the home came into effect, until the almost complete release of the restrictions that came into effect at the height of the spread of the virus.

On December 20, 2020, a national vaccination campaign was launched after the State of Israel began receiving millions of doses of vaccines it had purchased from Pfizer. (1)

The rate of serious morbidity as well as of infected has decreased dramatically. On 25 March, Health Minister Yuli Edelstein announced, (2) that more than half the population completed two doses of vaccinations.

Following the success of the vaccination campaign, (3) the State of Israel gradually exited the closures and life almost completely returned to normal, including the opening of cafes and restaurants, cultural and sporting events, schools and universities, hotels and even flights abroad to certain destinations.

Crises Management

According to Mitroff (2004),(5) different types of crises differ from each other typologically: Natural disaster or physical environment Crises, Failure of technological systems Crises, Human – created Crises.

General (retired) Giora Eiland (2020) (6) counted some more contemporary types of national crises, relevant to the State of Israel: war, terrorist attacks, cyber attacks, extreme climate or various epidemics.

Piotrowski (2006) (7) examined the definition crisis in the wake of Hurricane Katrina and its impact in New Orleans, In August 2005. In view of the intensity of the storm's impact, Piotrowski argued, that a crisis should be addressed from a point of the theory of the "origin of chaos", and therefore as the intensity of the event is unpredictable, the response and the degree of control over it was limited.

Moreover, disasters expose existing failures and conflicts within the organization and in the connections between the organization and supporting and assisting systems.

The Covid- 19 crisis which belongs to the first category, is a global epidemic that has affected most of the world's population, has changed world order created new life patterns, mainly in the fields of work from home, on- line commerce, on-line services, recreation, online formal and non-formal education.

These changes have created innovative areas of practice, and require re-examination and research resulting from the new situation created. All the players on the public ground, were called to the flag- Government and public entities of the first sector, business organizations of the second sector, as well as social organizations of the third sector, which the community – centers are at their core.

National crises such as wars, natural disasters, terrorist attacks and economic crisis that have affected the State of Israel throughout its years of existence have always required, in addition to the actions of the central government, social and public mobilization for action, and taking local supportive actions and social initiatives.

Experience in Functioning in National Emergencies

Throughout its existence, the State of Israel has had to deal with national emergencies for security reasons. Since its inception, the State of Israel has participated in seven military wars against enemy states; There were two intifadas; Missiles and rockets were launched at its citizens massively from the North in the 1980s, the first Gulf War, the Second Lebanon War, and the middle of the last decade from the Gaza Strip, in addition there have been constant waves of nationalist terrorism against her. Due to this unique situation, Israel has accumulated unprecedented experience in rapid transitioning from routine to emergency, and this experience is reflected in various capabilities and advanced organizational and technological systems. Eiland. G (2020)

The Readiness of Civil Society Organizations, to deal with the Covid -19 Pandemic

According to Shcmid (2000) (8), the government of Israel like many others in the world, was caught unprepared to deal with a pandemic of this magnitude.

The "National Emergency Authority," have been neutralized of its powers, and there were no "work-folder " to deal with the crisis in real time. Furthermore, The Covid - 19 pandemic caught Israel's **Civil Society Organizations** of the Third Sector in the middle of an ongoing crisis of ere forced to fight for their lives, to fight over sources of funding they needed in order to finance the activities they wanted to carry for the sake of the community members.

Shcmid (2020) describes the great frustration and gap between their necessity and society and the Israeli government's recognition of the needs and assistance required for their functioning.

Prof Shcmid found in his study, that Israeli Third Sector organizations engaged in aid understood that they were facing a particularly challenging period, in which on one hand they would be forced to increase their activities but on the other hand will have to operate under strict and restrictive conditions.

From NPOs providing food, to NPOs that help the elderly or youth in need, the third sector had suffered a severe blow: the scope of work has increased, while donations have shrunk.

According to Katz and Feit (2020) (9) There was a decline in the percentage of volunteers in the Civil Society Organizations (CSOs).

As for volunteer activity in CSOs, the percentage of volunteers has declined from 31.4% of the general population in 2019 to 8.1% in 2020, and contributions of households to CSOs have decreased in 20%, compared to 2019.

In order to survive and be able to continue to provide the social services they used to provide instead of the government for many years, CSOs applied for financial aid from the government, but their needs were not met by the government that has not put in place assistance plans for the CSOs. As a result, their activity almost shut down during the period of the Covid 19 pandemic.

While the business sector was in the center of focus, when it came to flowing financial aid, CSOs were left without answers, and the government ignored their needs because "they are not "businesses" and their wealth is not money". Shcmid (2020).

Bode and Brandon, (2014) (10) explained the tension between governments and NPOs in demands of governments for more accountability from NPOs, as a result of the expansion of partnerships between them.

The Readiness of Israel Community- centers for dealing with the Covid- 19 Crisis

The Second Lebanon War (SLW) lasted 34 days from 12 July 2006 to 14 August 2006.

According to the State Comptroller's Report (11) on the home front's deployment during the Second Lebanon War, The Israel Association of Community Centers (IACC) in the North Region which is the main operator of community- centers in the north of Israel, focused during the Second Lebanon War on activities in four main areas: distributing food and equipment; organizing camps for children, caring for the elderly and those with special needs; and evacuating residents to refresh accommodation in the center and south of the country.

At the end of the war, the IACC examined its performance during the war, in order to formulate a work theory in case of further war. (Ben- Noach. 2008). (11).

Covid- 19 Pandemic as a different kind of crisis, presented the community- centers with a whole kind of challenge.

Community- centers had to struggle in many fronts at the same time: They needed to protect the rights and salaries of their employees, to conduct alternative activities in accordance with the circumstances and limitations to keep maintaining of the buildings and facilities throughout the crisis, and to prove again and again their critical necessity in helping all those directly affected since the outbreak of the pandemic (the elderly, the jobless, children, toddlers, and so on).

The community- centers found themselves in an unfamiliar crisis situation characterized by a need to take immediate actions under circumstances of uncertainty. (Lerbinger, 1997) (12).

Fowler et al (2007), (13) argued that the managers' perception of readiness, for crises in organizations, is higher than that of the employees, and that organizations of the third sector are characterized in higher perception of readiness than organizations of the business sector.

Beck, U. (1992) (14) argued that the success of an organization dealing with crises, depends not merely on its capability to respond, but also on its ability to produce a changing response in the face of constant changes.

Crises such a war or Pandemic create what Beck defined as "risk community", where community -centers CEOs, had to function with anxiety to the health of their own and loved ones, along with the general health.

The success of an organization to successfully deal with such a crisis depends on its conduct and not on the characteristics of the crisis itself (Tofler 2004) (15). In fact, the need to deal with situations of uncertainty characterizes any activity in an organizational environment (Beck, U. 1992).

Community- centers at Covid- 19 Pandemic Times

The Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) including community – centers, depend on the government and its sources of funding for their continued existence, as 41% of their budgets is based on government support.

Despite all the difficulties, community- centers worked to bring community activity to the doorstep. They tried to create full accessibility, while maintaining the ministry of health regulations and protecting the health of customers and teams.

Ideas and innovations that came up in one center, were very quickly spread between all the community-center, regardless their affiliation with different operating frameworks.

The author of this study believes, that this may be due to the fact that all community-centers in Israel belong to the IFCC the Israeli Federation of Community Centers, an umbrella organization, that unite them, and they are used to exchanging information and sharing practices.

Despite the deep economic crisis encountered by third sector organizations, the government has been unable to set criteria for distributing grants over many months, and has exacerbated the situation of the organizations even more.

Over 50% of the organizations put their employees on unpaid leave, and until the date of this research, it is not at all clear whether they will have anywhere to return to. 25% of the CSOs stopped working altogether. (Shcmid 2020).

In the current crisis, more than ever, the helplessness of the members of the NPO's boards to use their ties with government ministries in order to gain the requisite support for the CSOs to continue to survive. (Bibu and Isler 2019). (16)

There is no doubt that the Covid- 19 crisis marks only the tip of the iceberg in a suspicious and distrustful relationship between the government and Civil Society Organizations.

Despite the great complexity and many contradictions in the relationship between the third sector, community centers included, with the authorities, the community centers stood at the forefront during the Covid- 19 Pandemic crisis. Not only they were full partners, they even led the s emergency measures derived from the crisis, while they themselves encountered existential difficulties, stemmed, mainly, from the unable relationship with the central and local government, as described in Almog-Bar, (2020). (17)

Shemid (2020) emphasizes in his study, the need to formulate patterns of collaborations between organizations of the third sector among themselves, and between the government and the business sector in order to be able to act jointly, especially in emergency situations, assuming that the whole will always be double the sum of all its parts.

Therefore, we shall examine three models of collaborations, aimed at producing a common social impact, which were presented on Collaborations (Shitufim 2020). (18) Common to all three is the joint action whether multi-sectoral or single-sector, using the unique assets of each sector or organization.

These models, will serve as a theoretical framework for examining joint community action in order to answer the research question.

The wisdom of the Croud in the Service of the Community Model A:

The wisdom of the crowd based on Surowiecky. J (2004(18) is a joint action, based on collective intelligence, that combines perspectives from both social and business sectors.

Surowiecky attributes great power to the wisdom of the many, and argues that the many are smarter than the few, and can influence and shape businesses, cultures and countries and even the daily life of the individual better than the wisdom of a few experts.

In this method, the government addresses the public, detailing the challenges involved in developing new capabilities, implementing advanced tools, changing existing laws, and more. Seeking information and feedback from the public. These moves create transparency and public participation in government's activities contributing to community development.

Baeck et al (2019) (19)

Describe in their study, how collective intelligence is used by organizations such as "GoodSam" and "Pulsepoint" to mobilize vital aid such as trained responders, in life-threatening emergencies and by governments, such as in Taiwan through a volunteer-run citizen engagement platform that can be used to mobilize medicines and food in regular or crises times.

Strategic Cross-Sectoral Partnerships: Model B:

In recent years, the use of inter-sectorial collaborations, around the world as well as in Israel, has expanded, in a model called "New Governance", which is a model for the organization of partners: governmental, social, and economic bodies, that create collaborations between the public, business and civil society.

The New Governance offers the participation of a larger public, social activism, public responsibility and participatory democracy. (Osborne, 2016) (20)

Shemid and Almog -Bar 2016) (21)

found in their research, that the connection between the three bodies in the model of New Governance creates a successful partnership that is also effective in achieving its mutual goals.

It is a partnership that manages to bridge the gaps of organizational, cultural, and different institutional logic, differences of view, ideology, and values, while maintaining the unique identity of each of the partner organizations.

The partnership creates an integrative connection of processes, structures, governance patterns and leadership styles adapted to the unique organizational personality of the partnership as an organizational creation that goes beyond traditional and conservative organizational patterns.

It is a partnership that fulfills not only its official goals but creates social, economic, technological and other added values that generate a different kind of organizational dynamic that creates a synergistic impact in examining the whole greater than the sum of its parts.

Model C: Cooperation of Several Players from the same sector, or from different sectors in order to promote a targeted goal – creating an impact-- space

Kania and Kramer (2020) (22)

distinguish between two types of collaborations, when a partnership is defined in this context as "an attempt by organizations to solve social problems in a collaborative way". Among the set of models they describe, the recommended method rises is the one they propose to call Collective" Initiatives Impact "

In this model, emphasizes the attempt to lead a broad social impact, as the creators of the model describe it, an ongoing framework of action for a common agenda of a group of key players from a variety of fields/sectors, while uniting all components on the way to an effective sphere of influence: starting from the work assumptions, required prerequisites and the core of the activity, in order to solve a social problem in a particular social field.

The Research Question

Despite the great difficulties described in the literature, did the community centers succeed in being the "locomotive" that led the Community and Society in Israel during the Covid-19 crisis.

The author of this study argues that the reason for their success was the collaborations they have managed to spontaneously create during the crisis management, and it is important to clarify the collaborative model used, in order to draw lessons for the future. Therefore, the research question that was frased, is:

What was the model that was successfully operated by the community- centers during the Covid 19 Pandemic, and can be taken as an example for dealing with similar crises in the future?

The Methodology

In order to provide an answer to the research question, community- centers in five local authorities of different regions, sectors, and socio-economic level, through interviews and observations.

Community- centers all over the country, in all segments of the population, through the entire period of the Covid 19 Pandemic outbreak and even during closures imposed, have initiated situation- adapted activities, having original thinking, which were

developed with great agility, out of a desire to do good with the community, to maximize opportunities for closeness, help and encouragement.

The Research Tools:

The research was based on Qualitative information, which included open ethno-graphic in-depth interviews. The participants were assured that their anonymity would be maintained, and that the data would only be used for this study.

As stated, the issues were examined in community- centers, located in a representative sample, of all local authorities, of Israel. For the purpose of the study, they will be marked with the letters A-E.

The findings are based on observations and interviews.

The Research Population:

CEO of the local community- centers net work

CEO of a community- center (or branch in small settlements).

All together 10 CEOs were interviewed in 5 local authorities.

The Findings:

Local Authority -A

A Large- sized city in the center of the country, number of population is 450,000 people. The Socio-Economic rating is high. The number of community- centers:23.

The network of community- centers is spread throughout the city, and the work in it was carried out in a completely smooth manner, while coordinating local and state bodies.

The city's many activities were marked "door closed, window opened". The city took a decision that nothing is going to stop community activity.

The organizing factor of the community activity, which is the Municipality's Community- centers Division, has proceeded with the activity.

The focus of responsibility and activity was transferred from the municipal hotline to the neighborhoods, most of which operate community centers.

Neighborhood managers were appointed. Sports and cultural activities were organized in the street and in public parks. Ideas from the field were adopted and immediately implemented.

An online activity was conducted through Zoom, including social gatherings, gymnastic classes, Yoga and Pilates included, and lectures in various areas of interest. Neighborhood tours took place subject to restrictions.

WhatsApp groups have been set up to connect neighbors, so that people in closures can keep up to date and maintain human contact with the outside world.

Purchasing food for elderly who were not allowed to leave the house was done in collaboration with other NPOs, and volunteers from high schools and the youth movements.

Assigning a teenage phone friend to senior citizens who were left alone in their apartment, was also carried out by volunteers from high schools and the youth movements.

Internet connection and installation of computers including Zoom cameras for distance learning and maintaining family ties, was carried in collaboration with the authorities and other NPOs.

Another channel which was created during this period, was assisting local businesses in sales promotion during Covid 19 conditions, and digital marketing.

The interviewees noted, that although they have received assistance and cooperation from all municipal divisions, their relationship with the governmental ministries was less close.

The community- centers CEOs expressed a desire to keep community activity going, even in "field conditions".

Local Authority -B

A medium- sized city in the center of the country, number of population is 225,000 people. The Socio-Economic rating is low. The number of community- centers:11.

Community-centers focused on events and recreational activities, in an attempt to maintain personal and community morale.

CEOs said that the centers tried to "keep their existence and not vanish".

The public space was left physically empty, but digital spaces were created to complete the communal dimension. "The activity has gone out to the public spaces and to the homes".

Music, acrobatics and shows for the whole family were organized all over the settlement.

Meetings were organized between isolated seniors and their grand children and families, in the open air.

Performances of local artists were broadcast live. As the population is religious, ceremonies of Shabat receipts candle lightings and prayers were held in each neighborhood, under the house. Traditional holiday dishes such as donuts and were distributed to the community.

Sing along meetings were held by local artists, Sport activities for the elderly were held in the open air.

The activity of the community centers spread in all the neighborhoods of the settlement, was conducted under the guidance of the municipal company, that led the operations in cooperation with other sectors – municipal business and state, as well as other organizations of the third sector.

CEOs thought that the reason for the success of their activity was due to the fact that they did not have to deal with state authorities who are perceived as bureaucratic and difficult to collaborate with, but only with local elements with whom they have a common language.

The CEOs reported that the fact that many of the employees were sent to unpaid leave, did not slow down the activity, and the means were sufficient to launch activities tailored to the circumstances and limitations.

As for the future- the CEOs were confident, that when a local system is working properly during regular times, producing strong ties within the network, it will probably work properly in crises as well.

Local Authority -C

A Medium- sized city in the center of the country, the number of population is 60,000 people. The Socio-Economic rating is high. The number of community-centers:7.

The community centers are run by a local NPO, which works in cooperation with the municipality and other authority bodies. In this case too, the CEO is experienced, skilled and is very familiar with the community and its needs.

The local NPO is responsible throughout the year on leisure culture. As leisure time has expanded during the times of the Covid-19 spread, the NPO leads and organizes all informal education and community activities.

Informal education is flowing into the community- centers, because they are the only physical available space, that is functioning, while schools are shut down.

The community- center found itself busy enriching the growing leisure culture, as leisure time has increased. Knitting groups, Volunteering in hospitals, Zoom Lecture Series, Book lending services to the home, Online lessons for the entire family, Joint holiday celebrations in open spaces, And that us just a partial list.

The CEOs reported, that the authority's economic stability freed the community-centers from the need to ask for help from external financing entities, and the economic burden was not the real problem, despite the temporary budget halt.

The workers who left for an un paid leave, received assistance from the state and those who remained in service operated the system satisfactorily.

One of the highlights was - the "residents' project for residents" – the community is working for itself. A special model with a digital platform was built.

In the platform, transverse connections were formed between the residents who were working for themselves. The residents cooperated above and beyond what was expected, demand exceeded Supply for participation in this project.

In the CEO's opinion, the strong municipal network and the experience accumulated in handling emergency situations helped provide effective responses to the Covid-19 challenges.

Local Authority -D

A medium- sized city in the center of the country, the number of population is 160,000 people. The Socio-Economic rating is high. The number of community-centers: 12

The community centers are operated by a municipal company, so the activity was fully coordinated with the municipality and other local and governmental entities.

The municipal company is in charge of many sectors in town. The company is labor-intensive. At routine time it provides a lot of assistance to formal education by operating afternoon classes.

During the closures this activity ceased, and there was no longer need to employ so many employees who were placed in an unpaid leave.

The focus shifted to working in cooperation with with the welfare department for disadvantaged and at-risk populations, and in addition, for the health system staff and other essential workers. For this end, designated frameworks for preschoolers were activated.

This activity was added to digital enrichment and studies activities, open space activities and open space sports centers – all in accordance with the restrictions.

In this case, too, the local authority used the organ at its disposal –the municipal company, in order to provide immediate torments for a completely new situation.

The CEOs interviewed, reported that working through a municipal company, networked throughout the city and installed in all community educational platforms produced big advantage due to the short cuts it made over of the government bureaucracy.

The municipal company has a good knowledge of the community and its needs, and it enjoys flexibility in decision-making that enables rapid adaption of the activity towards the new needs that arose due to the outbreak of the Covid-19 virus.

The CEOs noted that financial difficulties still remained due to the decrease in revenues from the community-centers activities which constituted a significant part of their budget.

Here, the community- centers also responded to the completely collapsed business sector, both in terms of population, and business owners.

Local Authority- E

A small and isolated urban settlement. Number of population is 20,000 people. The Socio-Economic rating is Low. The number of community- centers:3

Even in normal times, the community center is the locomotive that leads society, culture and community life in the city.

The time of the Covid-19 pandemic outbreak has sharpened the situation, as it has put much more prominently, the community center at the heart of the activity.

The CEOs reported that the community-center received full cooperation from the local authority, The authority fully backed the centers' operations and fully financed them, considering the community centers CEOs as their "executive arm".

The CEOs mentioned great difficulty in accessing services due to the great geographical distance and Covid- 19 restrictions.

Since the community center in the settlement is the largest and almost exclusive establishment in charge of providing culture leisure and community services– the community centers insistence on maintaining its routine, even if it was a Covid 19 routine.

The collapse of the business sector had also left a void that was filled by the community centers.

The CEOs also remarked that" building a good network throughout the routine times, was critical to function in such a crisis".

Discussion

What is the model that was successfully implemented by the Community-centers during the Covid 19 Pandemic period and might serve as a successful example of similar situations in the future?

In order to answer this question, five community- centers networks in five different local authorities operating community centers in different forms and in different ways, were surveyed through interviews and observations,

The community- centers, discovered throughout the coronavirus period and even during the closures-imposed situation-adjusted activities, original thought, created with

great agility and out of goodwill to benefit the population, maximize possibilities for proximity, help and encouragement.

The community- centers were able to cope with the coronavirus crisis by creating collaborations with other bodies, according to the model that best suited the circumstances that was model C.

Although the Covid- 19 Pandemic was a unique crisis that could not be expected – the training and experience of the managers helped greatly in coping.

There was a sense that the community- centers were accustomed to adapting to a changing reality, even if it was changing rapidly and to places we did not know.

The difficulty was several times greater because many parts of the managerial skeleton were in the un-paid leave, and problems needed ad hoc solutions.

The organizational/social tools that were already in the possession of third sector organizations, the databases and knowledge that the organizations acquired in daily contact with the population they serve, the smooth mechanisms of service and respond to the community's needs, and the efficient organizational structure relative to government ministries – are undoubtedly a considerable advantage in times of crises and emergency.

Based on the current research's findings, the model, which turned out to be the most effective and therefore received the most realizations, is the **Model C-** "shared operating space - initiating an impact space".

Summary Conclusion and Recommendations

The interviewees attribute the success to the seniority and experience of the community-center's CEOs.

In light of the shortness of time and the surprising circumstances of the global pandemic have strengthened the need of organizations to collaboratively solve social

problems. Therefore, this model was the only model that could have produced the desired results.

Third sector organizations, mainly the Community- Centers, were at the core of the activity and created Collective Impact Initiatives.

The close familiarity they have with the community, the ability to conduct themselves without unnecessary bureaucracy, and the extensive experience that they have in working directly with the community – all of these were used by the community- centers that were the arrowhead in all the measures required to meet the challenges of the Covid-19 pandemic crisis.

The community centers followed the course of action indicated according to the model of "attempt by organizations to solve social problems in a collaborative way". The community- centers were the ones who implemented the agenda that developed ad hoc during the Covid 19 Pandemic period and led key players from a variety of sectors to solve social problems, which originated from the world- wide epidemic that has caught the entire world by surprise.

The author of this study agrees with Ben-Noach (2008) that the seniority of the managers, their experience in previous crises training, improvisational skills and ability to function in conditions of uncertainty and changing reality enabled them to brilliantly function in the current crisis.

The author of this study argues, that this model of partnership, by its very nature, can indeed yield the most successful result, at normal times, but it has not always been found to be as possible or effective in reality as in theory at times of crises such as the Covid 19 Pandemic.

According to this study, third sector organization might find increasing difficulty to function without significantly expend their ability to carry out collaborations, and it is recommended for further research to continue in this direction which has not been thoroughly researched yet.

REFERENCES

1. Meirav Cohen, (2021) "Coronavirus Supervisor: As of today, coronavirus vaccines will not be required in isolation". Walla News 17.1.2021 www.news.walla.co.il/item/3412086 (In Hebrew).
2. 13 News (25.3.2021) "Edelstein: More than 50% of Israeli citizens were vaccinated in the second dose" <https://13news.co.il/item/news/domestic/health/corona-in-israel-1228327>, (In Hebrew).
3. Twizer Inbal, (2021) "For the first time in Israel: 0 coronavirus infections" N12, 23.4.2021 [https:// www.mako.co.il/news-lifestyle/2021_q2/Article-58e2ace349df871027.htm](https://www.mako.co.il/news-lifestyle/2021_q2/Article-58e2ace349df871027.htm) (In Hebrew).
4. Lerbinger, O. (1997), *The crisis manager: Facing risk and responsibility*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publisher.
5. Mitroff, I. (2004). "Think like a sociopath, act like a saint", *Journal of Business Strategy*, vol. 25 no. 4, pp. 42-53.
6. Eiland. G (2021) "Managing the Coronavirus Crisis in Israel". In Hashiloah An Israeli Journal of Contemplation and Policy hashiloach.org. (In Hebrew).
7. Piotrowski, C. (2006). Hurricane Katrina and organization development: Part I. Implications of chaos theory. *Organization Development Journal*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 10-19.
8. Schmid. H (2021) "Reflections on the Relationship between the Government and Civil Society Organizations during the Covid-19 Pandemic: The Israeli Case" De Gruyter | Published online: February 5, 2021 <https://doi.org/10.1515/npf-2021-0003>.
9. Katz, H., and Feit. G. (2020). *Individual Giving and Volunteering in Israel During the COVID-19 Crisis: The Second Wave, Part 2*. Tel Aviv, Israel: The Institute for Law and Philanthropy, The Buchmann Faculty of Law, Tel Aviv University. Search in Google Scholar.
10. Bode. I and Brandon. T, (2014) "State–third Sector Partnerships: A short overview of key issues in the debate" *Public Management Review* Volume 16, 2014 pp. 1055-1066.

11. State Comptroller's Report on the home front's deployment and its functioning in the Second Lebanon War of 18 July 2007, p. 555-556 <https://app.activetrail.com/S/xiwiefetzv.htm>
12. Ben- Noach. (2008) "The impact of community- centers CEOs struggle during the Second Lebanon War on their perception of their self-efficiency" IACC 2008 http://www.matnasim.org.il/_Uploads/3138warserch0708.pdf (In Hebrew).
13. Beck, U. (1992). Risk society: Towards a new modernity. Trans. By Mark Ritter. London: Sage Publications.
14. Almog-Bar, M., and R. Bar. (2020). Volunteering and Social Involvement During the COVID-19 Crisis in Israel: Information, Insights, and Challenges. Jerusalem, Israel: The Center for the Study of Civil Society and Philanthropy. The Hebrew University of Jerusalem and The Network of Israeli Volunteering. (In Hebrew). Search in Google Scholar.
15. Bibu. N and Isler. E (2019) "The Influence of Stakeholders on the Management and Work of a Community Center in Israel". In International Symposium in Management Innovation for Sustainable Management and Entrepreneurship (pp. 271-282). Springer, Cham.
16. "Three models of joint action – three models of action aimed at producing a common social impact", February 2020 in Shitufim- site <https://app.activetrail.com/S/xiwiefetzv.htm> (in Hebrew)
17. Baeck P, Simon Novick B. and Ryan M., "Solving public problems with collective intelligence", Nesta 2019. www.nesta.org.uk/blog/solving-public-problems-collective-intelligence
18. Osborne, S. (2006), "The New Public Governance?", Public Management Review, 8, 377-388.
19. Shcmid and Almog -Bar (2016) "Inter-Sectoral Collaborations in Israel: process Inputs and Outputs-Research Findings and Implications for Policy and Practice". Center for the Study of Civil Society and Philanthropy in Israel December 2016 <http://.sw.huji.ac.il/list/945> (In Hebrew).
20. Fowler, K., Kling, N. and Larson. M. (2007). Organizational preparedness for coping with a major crisis or disaster in business and society. Chicago: March, vol. 46, 1; p. 88.

21. Tofler, A. (2004). The third wave, Bantam books. New York.
22. Surowiecki. J. (2004) The Wisdom of Crowds: Why the Many Are Smarter than the Few and How Collective Wisdom Shapes Business, Economies, Societies, and Nations. Random House 2004.
22. Center for the Study of Civil Society and Philanthropy in Israel December 2016 <http://.sw.huji.ac.il/list/945> (In Hebrew).
23. Kania J. and Kramer M, (2011) "Collective Impact", Stanford Social Innovation Review, 2011