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>> Hello and welcome. I'm Jennifer Laszlo Mizrahi, and I'm president of RespectAbility, a nonprofit organization which fights stigma and advances opportunities for people with disabilities. I am so thrilled that all of you have chosen to join us today, where we're going to hear from Kerrien Suarez who is just a terrific speaker and we're going to talk about equity and intersectionality and performance metrics and we're really going to be dealing with a lot of really important things. Before we get started, though, I really want to say why this topic is so important to me personally and to our organization RespectAbility. And that is because our organization is really completely devoted to equity, not equality, equity. Equality is where everybody gets the same thing and equality is a good thing but it is not the best thing. The best thing is equity, where people get what they need so they can not only survive but can also thrive. And we believe that that is important for people of every background, whether they have a disability, whether it's physical, mental health, sensory, cognitive, or otherwise, or whether it is racial or ethnic or gender identity or orientation or anything like that, we believe in equity. And racial justice and fighting racism is a very, very important part of that, and it's frankly very important for the disability community to think about that for a variety of reasons.

So why am I speaking about this given than I have white privilege, that I am somebody of many privileges and not somebody from our team who is African‑American, for example? It is because there have many studies about advancing equity and what it shows is that it is very important for the CEO of an organization to make a stand and say that it is important to their organization in every aspect of what that organization does. And whether that's around disability inclusion or racial justice and equity or any other kind of equity, it is very important for the CEO to take a stand. Does that mean that I am perfect on these issues? Far from it. In fact, I've made a lot of mistakes, and I'm on a journey. I have apologized when I've made mistakes. But apologies are not ever enough. It's all about the action. Is it perfect? Am I perfect? Is the organization perfect? Absolutely not. We're on a journey. So what we're doing today is we're sharing how we're going about that journey and the lessons that we're learning from the terrific work that is being done on equity by Kerrien and her team. So I want to show a couple of things to you.

First of all, if you look at your screen, you'll see RespectAbilities commitment to equity. That commitment is actually on our website. That is a board approved policy. It is in our staff handbooks. It is in our leadership handbooks for our national leadership fellows, and I believe, we believe, that it is important for every organization to be very public and very specific and call out the different kinds of equity when you're trying to really make a movement on these issues. So I just wanted to share that policy with you. You don't have to read it now. You can refer to it. But that is our commitment, and we hope that every organization listening will also make their own commitment that works for their organization and you be as expansive and inclusive as possible with that.

The second thing, that I want to show you is how we're tracking data. Because it is very important, when you deal with equity issues, not to just sit around and do what I call analysis paralysis. Hey, let's sit and talk about the problem. Talking about the problem is important. Addressing the problem is important. But holding yourself accountable takes tracking actual data. And the data needs to be across a different sectors of the human talent that enables an organization to go forward. So in our organization, for example, at this point in time, 30% of our Board of Directors are people of color. This is our Board of Directors and our Board of advisors, and our teams actually meet together as one. We don't have separate meetings, the Boards of directors and advisors meet collectively and are equally important in part of the conversation. 30% people of color. 47% have a disability. That is extremely important to us because we are a nothing about us without us organization which means that we want people with disabilities to lead the disability movement. That's very important. And 10% of our Board are members of the LGBTQ community. You'll see for our staff that we have even larger percentages of people of color, people from the disability community and people from the LGBTQ community. Then we have what is, to us, a very important program. That is our national leadership program. That is an intentional human pipeline talent stream for people we believe will be at the forefront of the disability movement in the future, whether they're working in nonprofit management, running for public office, or serving in government or leading in communications efforts, these are the people that we are investing in because we believe they are the future. And when it comes to them, we prioritize people with lived experience from multiple marginalized communities and, hence, there are two kinds of fellows. We would like to have only one kind of fellow, by the way let me just say. We would like to be able to pay all of our fellows $15 an hour. That is an aspirational goal for us as a relatively new organization. However, in the recent two years, we've been able to pay at least 20 fellows $15 an hour and all other fellows get a stipend plus free lunch. And so we break down that as you can see, we prioritize people who have lived experience with multiple minority communities and want to lead those particular communities in terms of the paid fellowship. So 90% of those paid fellows, again, that's over 20 people, have been people of color, and 100% are people who have lived disability experience and 40% are from the LGBTQ community. So you see that prioritization but you also see how much we appreciate people who are willing to work for stipends, many of those fellows who are working for stipends are also getting academic credit at their colleges, and many of them are still in college.

One in five people overall have a disability. Just to mention that people with disabilities can be some of the most talented people on earth, and they can come from the most diverse backgrounds possible. So I want to lift up that Clarence Page, for example, a Pulitzer Prize winning author, a columnist for the Chicago tribune who lives with ADHD, or Harriet Tubman, one of my favorite American heroes for what she did to help free slaves, most people don't know this but she lived with epilepsy and had seizures. Frido Kahlo, fantastic artist who lived with Polio. So you see a number of these different role models from diverse ethnic backgrounds who are some of the most talented people in the world are people of color with disabilities. No disability organization, in fact no organization, should ever want to miss out on that extraordinary talent.

As I mentioned, disability impacts every demographic. So this slide has some different things highlighted in blue. So every one of those is a link to African Americans, Latinx community, Hispanics, women with disabilities, and LGBTQ, those are heroes and role models from each of those different communities. So later I encourage to you look at those links and go to the lists and the bios in the background of exciting individuals and real heroes.

There are over 6 million students with disabilities in American public schools today and approximately half of them at this time are people of color. And so if the disability community does not care about these issues, this is going to be a major, major problem, because what we see is because of structural racism that these students tend to be going to schools that do not have enough special education teachers do, not have enough counselors, they are not getting the appropriate diagnosis and early intervention that they are needing and they are, in many, many cases going into the school to prison pipeline. And I hope that everyone who is on from an organization will pay attention to this, because racism and structural racism is a very big problem in terms of our schools. It's especially a problem for students with disabilities who are in under-resourced schools. We do recognize that parents with students with disabilities who are from diverse backgrounds have a lot of challenges advocating these systems because, frequently, the parents have to really put up a huge battle get resources for their students, for their kids, and so you see here that we have a toolkit in Spanish for parents of children with disabilities, very important that that exist. And if you look at the intersectionality, you see, unfortunately, that 750,000 people that we know of with disabilities are currently incarcerated. And you can see here, in the top issue that we at RespectAbility work on is employment. And here you see slides that show us that if you're African‑American and working age in America that they have over a 70% employment rate on average but if you're black and have you a disability, only 28.6% are employed. And look at the numbers also for Hispanics with disabilities and for others with disabilities.

This intersectionality is really important, so getting these racial justice issues right is very, very important. Which is why I'm so thrilled that Kay is with us here today. I'm going to be turning it over to her in just a second to take about awake to woke to work, building a race equity culture. And I will just say that her organization equity in the center is a fantastic organization. We're very thrilled to have her consult to us. She's really a fantastic leader with a very strong background. You can see her background there on the slide. And Kerrien, I'm going to turn it over to you. Thank you so much.

>> No, thank you, Jennifer, for that gracious and generous introduction. I'm really happy to be here with your team virtually and with everyone else online. I'm Kerrien Suarez, executive director of equity in the center, and I look forward to sharing the race equity cycle with you, talking a little bit about what it talks to build a race equity culture and answer your questions. I did want to start by piggy-backing or building on what Jennifer started with about what respectability and ‑‑ where she is in her journey as a leader. It is have critically important for there to be buy‑in to race equity work from the top down, and Jennifer touched on some really important things. A couple of them being that no one is perfect in this work and that we're all on a journey. Myself included, those of us who are practitioners in this space continue to make mistakes and learn every day and so we do have to extend ourselves as humans some grace as we continue to learn the things about race and racism, as well as other identities, that we don't learn in our society as part of our upbringing. We're not socialized to be inclusive in all spaces because our society, as Jennifer pointed out, in terms of structural racism and structural exclusion of many individuals across identities. Equity is actually not the goal of American society. So this is something we're all learning together. So thank you Jennifer for having me today. And I look forward to sharing our work with you.

Next slide. Thank you. So equity in the center, I'm not going to read what's on the slide, I'll just give you the quick overview, has been around publically since 2017. It started originally in 2015 as an idea that a group of Annie E. Casey grantees came up with when they were part of a cohort learning program designed to think through the lack of diversity at the highest levels of the social sector. So they got together essentially to talk about talent pipelines. And after about nine months together, they landed on structural racism as the primary reason for the lack of diversity at the highest levels of the social sector, so looking at the CEO level and the Board level, and they proposed as a group equity in the center as a field‑based solution to support the sector, so non profit organizations and philanthropic organizations, and building what we now call a race equity culture. But the vision for the work is that race equity be achieved in society. And our strategy for making progress towards that is supporting organizations in driving equity inside of their teams and organizations and coalitions with the aspiration that the cumulative effect of organizations building the race equity culture would be to shift society broadly over time. So we focus on providing organizations with tools and resources to support them in their journey and our first attempt at doing that was a way to woke to work building a race equity culture and that's what we're going to spend some time talking about today.

Next slide. By the end of the webinar, you'll have a clear sense of our research, get an understanding of the race equity cycle, how organizations progress through it and get some insight into the levers that are part of the race equity cycle. So the levers are sets of best practice that is we found organizations used to advance organizational culture towards equity. And our hope is that you then go back to your organizations and use some of that in your planning as you move to work forward. We find it helpful to ground discussions like this one in definitions because often in discussions of diversity, inclusion and equity or race equity, there are as many definitions as the terms we're using as they are there are people participating in the conversation. So for the purposes of the webinar today, I just wanted to ground us in some definitions. So equity in the center uses this is definition of race equity which is on the slide, and the way I'll speak to that in more simple terms is this. If race equity were to be achieved in American society, if we disaggregated all social outcome indicators by race, so education, income, criminal justice, housing, all of the things our collective work is designed to provide for all Americans, there would be no disparity by race and currently race is the biggest driver of disparities across social outcome indicate sews we're a quite far from that. And in discussions of equity, that's why we center race, because race is the bigger driver of inequity. So if you focus on race, the experiences and the outcomes for folks of other identities will also be lifted in that process.

Inside of organizations, we define race equity as the state that would be achieved if you disaggregated all organizational data by race, so staff engagement, performance, compensation, promotion, retention, investment of professional development dollars, level of seniority from the most junior position to the most senior position. If you disaggregated all of those indicators by race, there would be no disparity. And in general, in organizations, there is a racial leadership gap which we'll talk about in a bit. So I'm grateful to Jennifer for sharing the data about RespectAbility to start because on all indicators of diversity of variation, you all are above the average for organizations. We look for, hopefully, at minimum, proportional representation for people of color and folks of other identities inside of organizations and you exceed representation in the general population for the identities we reviewed earlier today.

So for race equity lens, what we mean when we talk about applying a race equity lens, is at every point in your organization work, at any inflection point, when you are identifying a new organization to partner with, raising a new fund for investment in a particular project, hiring a chief executive, hiring a middle manager or a junior employee, you would pause and consider the potential disparate impact of the decision you're about to make by race. And so it is really calling that question at key points which means threading a race equity lens or applying a race equity lens in your work. And lastly a race equity culture, that's what equity in the center talks about all of the time and we define it as being proactively focused on driving equity inside of the organization as well as advocating outside of the organization for the adoption of policies and processes that would drive race equity in society broadly. And I realize I'm talking fast. So those folks who have questions, please feel free to put them in the chat box and I'll address them as I go along. So this line speaks to what I referenced add little bit earlier, the racial leadership gap. So what you see here is a combination of data from Board source and from building movement project. So on the left‑hand side of the slide, you see the current representation of people of color at the CEO level, at the Board level, and in board chair positions, relative to the percentage of individuals who are in American society broadly. And so the difference between representation at the top of nonprofit organizations and philanthropic organizations because this table speaks to both, is what we call the racial leadership gap. So over the past three or four decades there's been a belief that if you recruited more diverse individuals into the sector, they would quote‑unquote naturally, over time, rise to the top. And so what you see on the left‑hand side demonstrates that that has not taken place in the past several decades. There have been a lot of strides made in diversity in the workplace, particularly among women, and there are a pretty standard set of responses or cause that people think underlie this data and that's what the other two graphics on the slide speak to. So often when we talk about the lack of diversity at the top of the sector, people will say, well, folks of color may not be interested in the top job and so what building movement project did is they asked in their survey of over 4,000 individuals about two years ago now, are you interested in the top job at your organization? And if you are a person of color, you were more likely to say yes than your white colleagues. So that speaks to the fact that the aspiration is there.

And on the right hand side of the slide, this speaks to what’s probably ‑‑ not probably, is the most common reason that people say there is a lack of diversity at the highest level of the social sector which is education and qualification. So what this slide illustrates ‑‑ or this chart illustrates is that there isn't a statistical difference in the level of education and qualification of people of color versus their white colleagues in the social sector. And this a set of data that focuses on people who are currently employed in the social sector versus the population at large. So you're looking at a set of folks who are able to get jobs, and so when you look at the folks who are employed in our sector, there isn't a statistical difference in qualification or education. So building movement projects theory and equity in the center theory is that structural racism is why you don't see people of color moving up to the highest level of organizations in the nonprofit and the philanthropic sector and so our approach to closing that gap is building a race equity culture. So we believe that if organizations are intentional build about building a race equity culture inside of their teams and their broader organization that over time you would see this gap close. Inside of organizations and across the sector. Next slide, please.

And this is the race equity cycle. So when we started doing our research back in 2017, what you see on the slide was an arrow that went from diversity to inclusion to equity. And what we learned overwhelmingly over the course of 2017 is that is not how organizations shift their culture. So the way we do research is we convened over about five meetings around the country in 2017, over 150 nonprofit leaders, philanthropic leaders and DEI consultants to talk about how does an organization actually transform its culture, what are the inputs, what are the processes, what are some of the trainings that folks used. And that's how we generated the race equity cycle. So we reframed diversity and inclusion and equity as awake woke and work for a couple of reasons. First, DEI has come to be an acronym that can be used as a check box by organizations. So we support DEI, we have a DEI committee, we believe in diversity. That doesn't actually mean that organizations believe in equity. So we shifted that language to awake, woke and work. So awake is traditionally called diversity. And at that stage of an organization's development, they're very focused on the transactional elements of diversity and equity. So how many different types of people do we have working in an organization? So characteristics of an organization at this stage would be partnerships with universities that are tied to particular racial or ethnic communities, so HBCUs or Latinx serving institutions or professional affinity groups with whom organizations can partner, essentially to pull candidates in to the pipeline, but the thinking ends there. What organizations aren't thinking about at the awake stage is what is the lived experience of those individuals of color once they become part of the organization? The focus during the awake stage is really on assimilation to the organization's dominant culture which overwhelmingly in the social sector is aligned to white cultural standards. So we'll reach out to diverse folks, pull them into the organization but then they're expected to assimilate and do things the way we do things around here which is sort of the colloquial definition of how you talk about culture. Folks aren't thinking about what is the lived experience of the people like inside of the organization and is it different than that of their white colleagues. Do people feel they can bring their full selves to work. And bringing your full selves to work is intersectional and complex and by focusing on race we don't mean to diminish any of those identities but we focus on race in this conversation because it's the biggest driver of disparities but acknowledge that all of us live in an intersectional context, and the lived experience of individuals inside of an organization is complex, but at the awake stage, organizations aren't at the point in their development where they can acknowledge that and have an intentional conversation about what that means for being a part of the team. So at the woke stage, what is traditionally called inclusion, an organization is thinking about what is it like for people of color or people with a range of identities, what is their experience like inside of the organization, and what is their experience like outside of the organization? How does their lived experience directly tie to this organization's ability to fulfilling its mission, which is particularly important, and a social mission focused organization, such as RespectAbility, and so that's why the numbers you were sharing earlier, Jennifer, are really important. Because there is no for us without us. Valuing the lived experiences of folks of different identities is critical to an organization's ability to serve that population. So at the woke stage an organization, actively transforming its culture to be inclusive of the lived experiences of people of color. Naming those experiences as different from the white dominant standard and having a conversation about what that means in terms of how we do our work together, how we work with our partners how we serve our population. Lastly the work stage, what is generally called equity, is the stage at which organizations are proactively mitigating inequity inside of their organization and outside of the organization. So one example we give about the work stage is frequently when crises happen in the state, so the crisis at the border, the shooting of unarmed black men, you know, in the current climate, you can pick any number of issues. So an organization will also often make a public statement about something that's happened or happening. And frequently inside of organizations, the person whose lived experience aligns with the current crisis, so someone who is from an immigrant background or somebody who is black in the case of a shooting of unarmed black man will often be asked to draft that statement. So at the work stage what you see is an organization is that you don't rely on the people of color inside of the organization to be the advocates at those inflection points. But the organization has built up the internal capacity on equity, such that there's full member of the team, regardless of the identity, can step out as allies and draft statements or make statements publically when things like that happen. So those are just a couple of examples.

Around the outside of the circle you see‑‑

>> Can I stop and just ask, I do absolutely.

>> Sure.

>> So what I heard you say was with these different stages there's sort of it is an evolution, not a revolution, that people are kind of moving through a journey from one set to another and I wondered because I thought that your talking about who how to draft a statement who drafts a statement was a very important example. I wonder before you even go forward if you can give some more examples of sort of common pitfalls and maybe ways to address them? And I know that we have dealt with instances where we wanted to put out a statement that impacted someone from the African‑American community and some people felt that it was wrong for the statement to come from me because I'm somebody with white privilege and other people were telling us no, somebody of color from the team should be both the person who writes it and should be the person who says it. So obviously equity is not physics. It is not like gravity where there's an absolute, you can prove this is the one and only way to do it. So I just wondered if you could give us a few more examples and sort of ways for how to sort of navigate what can be complex waters where those of us with white privilege sometimes feel what I know there's a book called white fragility, that some of us, we feel awkward or we're going to make a mistake and sometimes they don't engage in these issues because they are afraid if they put their toe in the water, they're going to make a mistake and make people offended.

>> Yea, Thank you. That's a great question and I know we've talked a little bit about this before, there are ‑‑ it's not a science. So there is no perfect scenario or in, like, scenario A and scenario B, the answer is not always going to be the same. But I encourage folks to lean into that awkwardness, because part of doing DEI or race equity work is learning to be comfortable with discomfort. So if we don't do the uncomfortable thing, we're never going to make any progress, and we're socialized not to do the uncomfortable thing. So this is a process for unlearning for all of us. And I would disagree with the critics who say that it is the responsibility of the team members of color to draft those statements. It is not the responsibility of people who are oppressed in any scenario, disability, or race or gender, it is not the responsibility of the most marginalized to dismantle a system that is designed to oppress them. It is the responsibility of the people who hold the privilege. And we all hold privilege in a range of dimensions depending upon the scenario. It could be educational privilege, income privilege, if not race privilege. So when you think about ally-ship, we also awe have a responsibility to be a ally in a given situation wherever we hold our privilege. So I would say to those folks that have pushed back on making statements that it is critical for white allies to make statements and be part of the conversation and the dialogue and activism for race equity. White dominant culture or white supremacy culture as it is sometimes called is not going to be dismantled without white people. So to say that you shouldn't be talking about it I think is very shortsighted. In an organization that has built a race equity culture and is evolving from woke to work, what you might see is that individuals who are part of the team who aren't a member of the group that, you know, is under attack at any given moment, so let's say it's a white colleague, who would write the statement, the hope and the goal is within building a race equity culture is that that individual will have developed a level of capacity and fluency on race equity or more than one member of your would team have developed a level of fluency and capacity where they could recognize the situation draft a statement and they potentially vet it with colleagues, for example. The goal is that if you have built a race equity culture that you're talking about these things. You're talking about what's happening what is happening at the border. You're talking about the shooting of unarmed black men or of the situation that just happened over the weekend with the pregnant mother and her children and the police over a $0.99 doll. So that you're fluent and you're talking about these things and have you a level of comfort with someone on the team who has privilege in that situation, drafting the statement and then potentially getting feedback from colleagues. But what you would not do is presume that the people of color are going to lead that work and do all of the emotional labor. So that would be my feedback on that point specifically.

Often in these cases what colleagues will ‑‑ and what folks will do and I know you've shared that you've done this yourself, is you reach out to colleagues of color who are in a similar like peers, and get feedback and advice on how to handle a particular situation. Some organizations that are white led when it comes to public issues around race will share the statement of another organization that is led by people of color and have a very brief statement that says we're in full support of whichever community is under attack at that this moment, we're sharing the statement of, you know, ABCD, which is released, blah, blah, blah, this is their work. That's another way to handle it. So lifting it up and we talk like lifting up the voices of the folks from the community that is being marginalized in a particular instance.

A couple of other examples, I guess, for pitfalls would be early stages of the work. When you found or ‑‑ or launch a race equity task force, for example, and this may also be the case when folks focus on ability inside of organizations, you voluntell a person of color to lead that work. And sometimes people of color are people of a range of identities, people from the LGBTQ community, for example, will raise their hand to work on these issues when the organization shifts its focus to them but when an organization that is building a race equity culture will do is recognize that it is not that individual's responsibility and identify cross functional leadership for those who are of task forces to ensure that the work of the task force is divided equally across identities and across the organization from a functional and operational standpoint. And like I was talking about earlier in terms of the importance of the chief executive buying in to race equity work, it is important for the leader of a race equity task force or a DEI task force to have positional power. Because if you don't have positional power, then you can't drive through the necessary body of work that the task force is holding and often what organizations will do in addition to making a person of the color the head of the task force is making the person who is the head of the task force a junior staff person with no positional power and authority. And that is a recipe for the task force not to advance the work because the person running the project or the initiative doesn't have the positional power to engage the organization in setting and then reaching goals. They don't have the power to hold folks accountable. So those are just a couple of examples.

>> That's a challenge issue because we see this with disability but that we always say nothing without about us without us. Or just nothing without us. And we want people with disabilities to really control the future for people with disabilities. And if there was a disability inclusion initiative and an organization they might not have any people with disabilities inside the organization or they might have only one that might be the most junior staff person. So what do you do in a place, and I'm sure there's a lot of organizations that say we care a lot about race equity, and the only person of color in our organization is the receptionist, so how do you deal with that sort of situation when you want to move something like this forward?

>> I think you need to take a hard look at your organizational culture and ask yourself why the most junior person in the organization is the only person of color. Implicit bias play as role in that. It's not a coincidence that the most junior person, and I think we talked about this before, I've worked places where the receptionists were black or people of color and the chiefs executives were white, and that's not about education and qualification, that's about structural racism and implicit bias. So my first response to that would be you need to take a hard look at your organization's culture and why the only person of color who is allowed to or can work here answers the phone. And it's not because you couldn't find people of color who had comparable levels of education to others who are more senior in the organization. And if you couldn't, it's likely because you sourced candidates through homogeneous social networks and all of this is well documented.

>> We're seeing ‑‑ we do see a lot of this in nonprofit organizations, obviously, and in some cases the culture was set by a CEO who then leaves and then a new CEO comes in, may also be white, but may want to change things. And so structurally, what do you think some of the first steps might be if they've decided hey, new sheriff in town, we're going to fix this but what you're looking at is an almost only white office. Or Board of Directors.

>> Or Board of Directors. As we go through the deck, I'll give you some tactics that foundations can use. But to start, and I believe this is page 25 of our paper, awake to woke to work building a race equity culture, which you can find on our website, I believe it's page 21 or 25, there's a list of things like how to get started. So a few of them would be creating a shared language on race. So going back to the example of the organization that might have a receptionist of color and no other staff of color. A place to start the conversations might be with some definitions, like some the definitions I shared earlier in the presentation, some of the definitions in the paper. When we say diversity, what do we mean? When we say inclusion, what do we mean? When we say equity, what do we mean? So starting by making sure we're all talking with the same thing. Another place to start would be having a consultant come in and do some foundational training to support building a shared language on historical structural racism as well as on implicit bias, how it stems from historical and structural racism and the way it shows up in our daily work. So, for example, in our assumptions about who can have which job, who is qualified and credible to hold certain positions. Because people of color, just like the building movement project data says, are equally credentials and qualified but there's a reason that they're not getting the jobs and that is tied to implicit bias which grows and has its roots in historic and structural racism. And oppression, any ism is about ability, race, gender operates at four levels. So personal or internalized, your personal beliefs and values around race and what it means in our society, interpersonal, how those values inform your interaction with other people, that's where micro aggressions occur, that's where stereotyping and implicit bias lives, judgments you make about people based on your personal beliefs, institutional, how racism and structural barriers are threaded into institutional practice. So, for example, you can't apply to have a job here if you don't at least have a bachelor's degree or you can't apply to a junior position if you haven't had at least one internship in this sector and internships up until now have overwhelmingly been unpaid, meaning have you to be affluent or at least middle class to afford to work for free. So that's a structural barrier that would be demonstrated in the institutional practice. And then at the fourth level is structural. So just our broader society, how all of these systems work together to exclude people. And so having a consciousness, beginning to develop an understanding of and consciousness of race and racism at all four of those levels and having a conversation about how though show up inside of an organization. So people will often do foundational trainings like race forward, racial equity institute, crossroads training to give folks an orientation to structural racism and then start to pull the thread from that to what does this mean for our organization. Is that helpful?

>> Very. Very helpful.

>> Let me just say that a lot of people are sending questions. We'll get to them but before we finish the webinar‑‑

>> Okay.

>> Before we finish the webinar. So you can go ahead Kerrien. But, for example, someone was asking, how do you define structural racism which I think you were just getting at and they were asking about will they have the ability to get the slides and how do you manage a Board of Directors who is not in tune to these issues and is represented of an all white board.

>> Yes. And we'll get to ‑‑ we can move on to the next slides and we'll start to talk about the Board.

Did I go the wrong way?

>> Okay. So these are all of the levers which we identified as part of the race equity cycle and essentially it is just steps of best practices where we found clusters of the net organizations had used to shift their culture toward race equity. So I'm going to start with senior leaders, looking at our time, so we're at 2:13, so I think we're doing okay, but I can start with senior leaders and then based on some of the feedback we can talk about the Board, if that makes sense.

>> Yes.

>> So if you advance the slide, we’ll start. Is that the right one?

>> Go ahead one more.

>> So for each of the levers that we'll discuss, we have a slide that gives you a snapshot of what an organization looks like that are in this lever at the awake, woke, and work stages. And so we have three buckets of characteristics that we identify. So personal beliefs and behaviors, policies and processes, and data. And so personal beliefs and behaviors really speaks to like the personal or internalized and interpersonal level that I was talking about earlier. Policies and processes speak to the institutional and structural level in the organization and data speaks to both but we call it out because organizations need to as they do this work begin to disaggregate their data and track it.

So senior leaders, in terms of personal belief and behavior, this is where at the awoke stage you have folks who say, you know, they believe diverse representation is important but don't feel comfortable discussing issues tied to race, which you mentioned earlier, Jennifer. And in American society is completely normal. That's how we're socialized. You're not supposed to talk about it because it doesn't really matter it anymore, the playing field is level. So we're socialized not to talk about race.

In terms of policies and processes, we talked a little bit about this earlier. But the responsibility for the work would live in HR and be focused mainly, as I said before, on recruiting diverse people. We'll often say that race equity initiatives or DEI initiatives live and die in HR. You cannot successfully transform culture around race equity without the involvement of HR but the work has to be cross functional. This is the work of every division, not just HR. And then in terms of data and organization would have started to gather data about race‑based disparities generally in the populations they serve, often at the prompting of funders as we well know. But what they won't have done is flip the lens or the mirror back on themselves and disaggregated their own data. So Jennifer, you shared some great demographics upfront but not every organization can do that and that would be a first start, looking at who works there, what percentages, and disaggregating by brace race as much as possible.

Next slide, please.

This is at the woke stage. So here, you see senior leaders beginning to prioritize an environment where, as I said earlier, the different lived experiences of folks are valued and seen as assets to the team. In terms of policies and processes, use to evaluate or really reevaluate hiring and promotion policy that often ignores systemic inequities, like access to college or access to unpaid internships and rethink what it means to be qualified to work in your organization. And here's where you'll see organizations frequently start to blind their resumes, and blinding can go so far as not just to remove people's names and the institution where they studied, but blind the names of some of the organizations at which they worked, if they were identity‑based organizations to focus exclusively on skills. And I do have a couple of examples from organizations we've worked with who go so far as to blind this process until the second round of interviews so you don't actually see a resume until the person is about to come in for an interview. Excuse me.

And for data, you begin to disaggregate internal staffing data to identify where race‑based disparities exist, often in terms of level, as you were mentioning earlier, Jennifer. And then you can begin to also look at longitudinal impacts in the communities you served over time. And so there's a little bit of an inside‑out to the data part. So looking at the community you served while also looking internally at your own teams which is what organizations tend not to do that well. Next slide, please.

>> I actually advanced early.

>> Oh, you got it.

>> Yes.

>> This is it and so here at the work stage is where you would begin to see leaders modeling a responsibility to talk about race dominant culture and structural racism inside and outside of the organization. And I think this ties to what you were talking about earlier, Jennifer, in saying that I don't know‑it‑all. Like none of us know‑it‑all. Like this is what I know. I know structural racism is an issue. I feel like it is at play here and we should talk about how this shows up in our work and in our partnerships, for example. And policies and procedures, that's where you would be reviewing personal and organizational oppression and ensuring that members of the team have their tools to analyze, have tools to analyze your contribution to structural racism. So there's a lot in there. And so the way that you would do that is basically through training and building the organization's internal capacity to talk about, respond to, and navigate issues of race. And data, I think this is where I think I misspoke earlier, this is where you would see the longitudinal outcomes in the community, as opposed to at the woke stage where you would be able to look at the disparities inside of the organization. And most organizations are not at this stage. 75% of the organizations with which we engage and whom we surveyed are at the awake stage. So what you see here is pretty advanced and most organizations aren't doing it.

Next slide, please.

And these are just snapshots of what works in some organizations. And I realize this is hard to see, so Jennifer has shared earlier that the slides will be posted on the RespectAbility website so hopefully you can read them there. So at the awake stage as I had mentioned earlier, folks will have disaggregated data, and in this case, it's leadership for educational equity, to identify how many people of color, how many folks of different identities participated in their program, that was kind of like a foundational level of data analysis they did at the awake stage.

At the woke stage, they spoke and communicated around diversity and issues of equity, and the purpose of programming and relationship to issues of equity. Members of the team, managers, as well as folks on the staff were actually giving scripting and support to support internal and external conversations about equity and how it tied to their work. The Annie E Casey foundation also has a good example or is a good benchmark here. They have a communications guide, it's an internal document, but it basically scripts staff for how to talk about race‑based disparities in the population they serve and there are like prompt questions and prompt responses and that's the level of specificity that they provided when they began training their staff.

And lastly, at the work stage, this is something we talked about a lot. In our working session recently, which is coaching, so Lee did a pilot program where all of the senior executives and all of their VPs got an equity coach. And what equity coaching is and how it is different from leadership coaching is that it works with someone to think through how inequity, implicit bias and all of the other manifestations of race in our society show up in our day to day interactions. So where an organization's culture and work on equity, and in addition to HR, is in every day conversations in the hallway, in check‑ins, in team meetings where some people are dismissed and some people are heard, where some people get opportunities and others do not, and where micro aggressions occur. And so what equity coaching allows you to do is think about how to shift your management practice to center equity. And so eventually Lee actually expanded the program to the whole organization and it continues to this day. What I won't do is pretend that doing this is not expensive. That's a ‑‑ most of these things cost money but that is one that‑‑ it is expensive but it is quite effective.

Next slide. So now we'll talk about the Board of Directors. And I see there are some questions here.

>> Yes. There's questions about can you define structural racism, there's a question about what if you're a majority Latinx‑organization, how would you recruit African Americans.

>> Yes.

>> And there's again a question, again, about the Board which goes directly to your next slides.

>> Okay. So I think we got the structural racism, we're about to get to the board. That, the Latinx question which I greatly appreciated is very loaded. So my initial response would be that Latinx organizations need to come to grips with the antiblackness, not just in the organizational culture but in Latinx culture. And that's an ongoing conversation I have with colleagues who are working in the Latinx community, a conversation I have with colleagues who are in organization that aren't identity base. But being Afro Latinx is something that has only fairly recently been embraced. And is it so in order ‑‑ my short answer would be in order for a Latinx organization to increase its ability to attract and retain African Americans or Afro Latinx folks, it would need to address antiblackness in Latin culture and that's extremely loaded and I'll leave it there but perhaps we can come back to it.

Board of Directors, we talk about boards a lot in these sessions and I know Jennifer when we did a session back in May, I think it came up a number of times in our convening here in DC, because board members are the least proximate to the work of the organization, period, you know, just in terms of their day to day engagement with any organization. And they're also often least proximate to the issues of race that we're talking about. Sometimes in an organization, like respectability, which is identity based you'll have great representation of the community you that serve on the Board but in terms of organizations generally, Board members are not very proximate. And so this discussion about race is very challenging if you're dealing with individuals who live in a predominantly ‑‑ who live and don't go outside of predominantly white spaces by virtue of their privilege. So dealing with boards is challenging for that reason. Dealing with boards is also challenging because you don't engage with the board the same way as with your staff, so when you think about education or you think about learning goals you might have for a board, the way you have to frame them out is completely different than how you would do it for the staff because you just don't engage with the board as often. But what we will say is that it is important, as much as you can, to set learning goals for boards and for staff that are as parallel as possible because what can happen with race equity work or DEI work is that the staff gets significantly beyond the Board and then that can lead to challenges of its own. But I'll come back to that. But just to start, the snapshot here is very similar to the awake snapshots for senior leaders for the depth of which individuals are thinking about race. So here, Board of Directors are not comfortable discussing issues of race, frequently what folks will say here or share from their Board meetings is in all white or predominantly white board context of an organization that serves predominantly black and brown individuals, board members will not understand why discussing race is of any significance to the organization. And that's a place that people can stay for years. Policies and processes. I'm sure folks will recognize this, boards are often focused on just like organizations, recruiting more diverse individuals, struggle with finding those who are qualified and then sometimes in retaining them. What is a complicating factor for boards in terms of policies and processes is if your board is a fund‑raising board and if have you to write a $20,000 check to be on the board, that can complicate diversity issues on the Board because folks will often feel like they can't identify high net worth individuals of color, but they are out there if that's one of your criteria. Often similar to what we see for recruiting for just your every day job inside of your organization, it's the homogenous social networks that are a barrier to increasing diversity at the level of the board. And, again, focused on getting a diverse CEO, for example.

And data have limited understanding about race disparities in the population that they serve and that, again, is not uncommon for boards because boards are not frequently fluent in data analyses of the population that the organizations serve generally in terms of programs. But just speaks to sort of where they are in terms of thinking about it.

Next slide, please.

At the woke level, Board members would be ‑‑ would be creating and sustaining practices such as shared norms and values, to foster an inclusive environment that values diverse viewpoints in the decision making process, similar to how on the team, you value diverse viewpoints on just the attainment of the mission. The policies and the processes would include evaluating board membership to eliminate requirements that reflect systemic inequities and reinforce dominant culture, such as minimum donation amounts or conventionally prestigious backgrounds. So it has been a challenge for many organizations to move away from having a large give or get, if that's been a critical part of their fundraising strategy.

We have seen organizations founded on social justice values, never have a give or get and never have board members write large checks. They either are giving a stretch donation based on each individual board member's capacity or they're bringing other gifts to the board. And by conventionally prestigious background, we mean, you know, Ivy League, super successful, sort of your typical Board member profile, most people know what I'm talking about. And those are ‑‑ those reinforce structural inequities. And I can use myself and my colleagues of color as an example. Many of us are often called on to serve as boards because we went to certain schools and it's like the same type of minority or, yeah, person of color. It's the person with the most white dominant background that will get access to those privileged spaces. So beginning to think outside of those standards for recruiting broad members. Data. And here you'd be analyzing and disaggregating data to identify some of the root causes of race‑based disparities that effect the organizations programs and the populations they serve. And also beginning to think about some of that data for the team internally as well.

Next slide.

At the work stage, this is where you see boards sort of driving this process. Many boards who are at the woke stage but definitely at the work stage have an active race equity task force or equity committee where a board member is very involved in supporting the organization and supporting the board more broadly in its learning goals. In terms of policies and processes, the organization or the board would show a willingness similar to senior leaders to review personal and organizational oppression and name it in their day to day communication on issues involving the organization. And in terms of data what holds the ED or the CEO accountable for performance measures of equity which would be threaded into the CEOs performance evaluation. The best practice is that those metrics would be threaded into the performance evaluation from the CEO down to the receptionist. And that's the way you drive accountability at the enterprise level is to start with the CEO but also to create goals for departments and individuals in departments so that everyone inside of the organization has the best practice would be learning goals around equity as well as like a metric or a measurable goal around equity, potentially on increasing the number of individuals inside of the organization or increasing the energy of diverse individuals at higher levels of the organization.

Just trying to look at some of the questions here.

>> I think we've covered them, except for Amehn asked about ableism which is something I think maybe I should answer which is that if somebody is not willing to meet your accommodations then you should go to, you can reach out to RespectAbility or you can reach out to askJan.org which gives free 24‑hour on‑line help to organizations trying to deal with those sorts of issues because obviously there are ADA laws around workplace accommodations in particular. And most accommodations are free or very cheap to meet. So just a snapshot of the board at Year Up. It is really hard for me to read this slide so I apologize. But one of the first things they did at Year Up and that's a program that focuses on getting young people on career paths that will ultimately help them be successful in life. So when they were at the earliest stage of their work, they pulled alumni onto their board, and that’s actually a common practice that worked with students or young professionals as they start to think about expanding the pipeline of board members they’ll go to the alumni of their programs which I think is pretty critical because that ultimately is the population that you're serving and they should be represented in leadership. At the woke stage, I believe, and I apologize, because this is really hard ‑‑ it's hard for me to see. But they engage the board in learning about DEI, set some goals around learning. And developed an onboarding process that would help board members all arrive to the Board table sort of at the same level. And at the work stage ‑‑ sorry the on boarding process was actually at the work stage. At the woke stage they had goals and a learning agenda so that for their board meetings they knew to expect that there would be a component of the meeting that would be devoted to race equity. And then lastly as they progressed to the work stage that's when they threaded into the on boarding process and started running quarterly training sessions for new board members to learn some of the skills and context and shared language that board members who had been on the board for the past few years had shared. And that's not just an issue for boards of directors but it is an issue for senior leaders and for teams more broadly, as you begin to shift the culture of an organization not just around race and create new norms within the team, as you hire people, how do you hire to maintain the new culture, if that makes sense. And so that's an issue for how you onboard board members as well as for how you onboard staff.

All right. Next slide. I was going to go through organizational culture lastly but Jennifer, maybe this would be a good time to check in and see if you would like to take questions from the room, just so I'm not talking so much and we give folks the opportunity to engage?

>> Operator, can you explain how people can ask a question?

>> Ladies and gentlemen, if you’d like to ask questions, you may type them in the Q&A box below in the presentation. After you type in your question, you may press ask to send it.

>> And is there a way to ask by telephone, is there anybody on by telephone who has a question?

>> If you wish to ask questions over the phone, you may press seven pound over the phone and your line will be unmuted.

>> So while folks are on the phone and in the computer sending in any questions, is there any questions live that folks have here?

>> Well, I have a question for our speaker. What kind of resources are there if you have a young professional of color who is interested, getting onto a board or serving in a group capacity like that, is there a place, websites, to sign up for board opportunities or anything like that?

>> I'm going to repeat the question for the benefit of the audience. Let's say you're a young person of color who would like to be in leadership on either a non profit staff or nonprofit board. Are there resources for, you know, for them to go to where they can have better networking or skills building to enable them to move up in that talent pipeline.

>> There are. So in DC there's something called charter board partners which is an organization that was designed to support charter school boards in diversifying their boards and so you can actually sign up for one of their trainings. And then there's a matching process that would then put you on the charter school board. Equity challenges in charter schools is not the purpose of this webinar so I'm not going to go on a tangential rant. But that that is one great program here locally. But I would say that it is the responsibility of the board to go outside of their homogenous social networks to elevate more diverse candidates. So I think I have been a young person who has been interested in joining boards, in some cases, some organizations like Washington performing arts, that's one I support, they have a junior board which is designed for people under 40 and supports the pipeline of diverse talent to ultimately in the longer term join the full board. Many non profits have young professional circles or young professionals advisory boards that individuals could seek out. By overwhelmingly, I would say, it is the responsibility of the board to get outside of their homogenous social networks and challenge their notions of credibility and capacity to steward the resources of organizations because that's the real barrier to diversity at the board level, not the fact that young people can't find these opportunities.

>> Right. Operator, are there any phone calls that are holding with questions?

>> No questions yet over the phone. Again, if you wish to ask questions over phone, you may press seven pound.

>> Or you can text in your questions. But I think we're good to, for the next set, Kay.

>> Sure. And I do see a question from someone who just said, that is interesting, potentially just responding to what I just said but I'm not sure that as a CEO of color with a solely whiteboard, they seem to be looking to me to find people of color because I am a person of color. Yes. Yes. And that's how it goes. Because implicit bias and structural racism. You, as a person of color, should know lots more people of color who would be qualified and credible so let me put all of the responsibility on you, chief executive of color, to find us more persons of color, as opposed to interrogating our existing processes for surfacing board members through our homogenous certain networks and challenging our notions of who is qualified and capable to serve on a board. So I ‑‑ I empathize with the challenge that you're describing. It is it common. Often a CEO of color is considered sort of a check ‑‑ we're doing diversity. We have a CEO of color. Oh, yes, and of course could you find us more diverse board members because we can't find any, like they're unicorns, and they're actually not. So yes. And if you have follow‑up questions, I'm happy to respond.

>> Yeah. I see there's a question here, with advice to get organizations not to excuse the lack of diversity but to deal with it, how quickly does it normally take for tangible change to take place.

>> Well, we like to call this forever work. But in terms of the race equity cycle I can tell you what we found. So like I said before, 75% of organizations are at the awake stage. I think a fair amount are also at the preawake stage but we didn't assess that. So it can take an organization three to five years to move through a stage of the race equity cycle but it can also take up to ten. So it's not uncommon for an organization to stay in a stage for a decade but you can make meaningful progress in three to five years by focusing on this with an intentional plan and devoting resources to it, including assigning someone internally to have it as a part of their day to day role as well as identifying external consulting support.

An organization can enter or leave the cycle at any point so sometimes there can be a shift in leadership or a shift in the funding landscape which means that an organization may actually regress a bit. But it doesn't mean you can't, you know, get back on track and move forward. But yeah, short answer, I would say at least three to five years but potentially up to ten, particularly as you move from woke to work.

>> So can I add on though to that, because sometimes you see that an organization that's white dominant will hire a person or people of color and then they don't stay. So they leave. So can you talk a little bit about that? Because I know that's pretty common.

>> Yeah. Because that's an indicator that the organization is at the awake stage. So at that stage, like we were talking about before, you know, let's get more diverse people in the doors, and you may be making efforts to go outside of homogenous social networks and partnerships to get more diverse people, but you're not thinking about what the lived experience of those people of color is, once they're working there, and so frequently when you disaggregate staff data by race, we found this with the organizations we studied and in the organizations we've partnered since the paper was released, is that if you look at the 12 to 24‑month rate of retention, if you disaggregate that by race, that's where you'll elevate issues around the assumption that people of different backgrounds assimilate to white dominant culture. And so there is a lack of satisfaction, you'll see disparities in race when you disaggregate staff engagement data in terms of do you feel included, do you feel valued, do you feel heard. If you disaggregated viability, I'm sure that's something you would find as well, to the extent people will self‑report. So it is a lack of inclusion. And the boilerplate or standard expectation at the awake stage is that if you come into the organization, you assimilate to white dominant culture, you do things the way we do things around here, and that's very challenging for people of color who have to experience microaggressions and deal with implicit and explicit bias in the workplace. And so I'll often use myself as an example, like I quit a job in the middle of a check‑in because I was tired of the microaggressions. And this is not ‑‑ quitting in the middle of the check‑in is not common but the type of things that I had was tired of as a person of color and as a black person specifically are quite normal. And those are the things that drive the turnover amongst staff of color in organizations that are not thinking about building an inclusive culture for people of color. And for folks who aren't clear on what we're talking about when we talk about White dominant culture, I'd refer you to our paper, we do talk about it in there, but one of the great source documents for white dominant culture is Tama Okun, O‑K‑U‑N, she outlines a set of characteristics that define white dominant culture in the workplace, competition, worship of the written word, a whole set of characteristics. And yeah, so I'd say it's the lack of inclusion and a white dominant culture and an expectation that people assimilate that drives turnover and I think you've heard me say, you know, that job I quit, I was the whitest black person that they could find for the job. And even then, you're dealing with just microaggressions and not wanting to persist or remain in an environment where there are really implicit and explicit messages about your relative value.

>> So first of all, obviously I'm sorry that happened to you and I'm sorry it happens to so many people and I'm sure that there have been times that I have not done a good enough job on those issues myself and it's a learning journey that I am struggling with. You talked just now about the check‑in. And I know we do something that we call a swat analysis, a lot of people do swat analysis where we ask people on our teams, you know, what are the strengths, what are the weaknesses, what are the opportunities, what the are the threats, and we ask people some of these workplace climate issues like do you feel trusted, do you feel respected. But we kind of feel that we we are making it up sometimes as we go along. Is there a best practice for a check‑in to check and make sure people are feeling respected and valued and welcomed and that they're listened to and that when they bring a good idea forward that people are saying, hey, that's a good idea?

>> I think the staff engagement survey, and most folks do one annually, is the sort of the lowest hanging fruit to assess that formally. So do a staff engagement survey, ask some of the questions you just asked, and disaggregate the data by race. I think that's a good place to start. And what you can do with that data once you have it is use it as a basis to start a conversation with the team about the culture, who feels included and who doesn't and what might change.

The other thing is having allies or resources within the organization, that people with different identities, not just with --- are going to ‑‑ to get feedback, because often in ‑‑ nonprofit organizations are resources, most of the people I know who work in non‑profits outside of philanthropy don't even have an HR department. So some people will call it an ombudsman or someone you can go to. Because often what happens, and I have a colleague to whom this happened within the past 14 days, some ‑‑ there was a ‑‑  actually it wasn't a micro aggression, it was just explicit aggression around race. They went to a colleague seeking feedback and ended up getting fired. So its tough, there is no easy answer. I would say start with the staff engagement survey to get insight in to where people are not feeling heard and valued and use the data from that, that survey as a basis for talking about what might change. And thinking about some of the practices that Lee and Leadership for Educational Equity in the previous slide began to thread in which was explicit scripting and training for managers around how to hold the space you're talking about in management conversation. So how to ensure you are managing with an equity lens and that you are not dismissing people. But also giving folks who are a members of the team a place to go when they feel that they need support. That is actually confidential and won't result in retribution, which is not uncommon, like I know of colleagues who have said things about microaggressions in February and it ends up in their performance evaluation in November. So creating an environment where people feel safe and heard and they actually are supported versus not.

>> It is interesting, I want to go back to you said something about the worshipping of the written word, and I just want to say in the work we do at RespectAbility, we absolutely do that because we are in a policy environment where we always have to do things, say things in very few words, and so we spend an extraordinary amount of time with our national leadership fellows working on our worshipping at the written word to make sure that people can write extremely well. So at what point is that a good thing or a bad thing? Because it is the work that we clearly work in that people with disabilities to advance our agenda need to be able to put you know, our arguments in to crisp language very succinctly.

>> Mm‑hmm. And I think that's true for what, like, yes. And I think that's true for a lot of non‑profits. Who do advocacy and other issues, like the written word is part of our day to day daily work life. Where I see examples of folks beginning to I guess be intentional about worship of the written word is around valuing communication that is not written. So sometimes as folks start to get in to culture change work, members of the team will begin to share things like if you well can't write it down or you can't put it in a PowerPoint slide, like the idea is not valued. And in an organization like RespectAbility where multiple communication modalities are valued by design, that may be less of an issue for RespectAbility, but there are other organizational cultures where it's like if you can't succinctly express yourself in a set of bullet points, then it is not valuable, like are you not valued, like your idea doesn't have value if it can't be written down. So I think it's balancing exactly what you say which is we have to write things and write things well‑to‑do our job and to raise funding and to push for policy change, for example, but then in terms of how we work together as a team making sure that multiple modalities of communication are valued. Does that make sense?

>> Absolutely. Absolutely.

>> Cool. I saw someone ask a question about what are examples of a micro aggression. Just a couple of quick examples, for Asian colleagues, making an assumption they're good at math. For me in my past life, someone assumed I was the first person in my family to go to college. Saying something to a woman who wears a hijab like, you know, you're free here, you don't need to wear that. Micro aggressions dismiss people's culture or insult people's culture and they are often inadvertent. But it is sort of death by a thousand tiny cuts, some of my colleagues will say. And I can share and follow‑up, if it would be helpful, there's a PDF that has an example of several micro aggressions that might be helpful.

>> Great. Adam had a question. Adam had a question in the room.

>> Hi.

>> Hi. So it is more of addition to what you were saying about worshipping the written word. There's also the aspect of people with disabilities or learning disabilities related to writing or maybe verbal comprehension or like speak kind of so like that is a very ‑‑ that is really hard for some people, including me. And I think that's a really something to be aware for ‑‑ I'm not a person of color. But as an ally, that's something to be aware of for what you guys are doing. But it's also ‑‑ and it's also, you know, in the disability world, I mean, that's ‑‑ those kinds of disabilities are very common so.

>> Yeah. Yeah. They are. Thank you for sharing that. And it is something that comes up, and I may have mentioned this when we did the panel earlier this year when you released the report, Jennifer, and sometimes when I'm organizations and doing a version of this presentation, members of the team will sort of come out, so to speak, when we're talking about something like worship of the written word, because they do need accommodations around how the organization just does its work that they don't have, and they have challenges in executing their responsibilities because they could need an accommodation or either more time or a different modality to maximize their ability to be successful and it is something that is not, I'm going to make a sweeping generalization, not well addressed in most workplaces. And that goes to I know what we've found in our work and many of my colleagues that when you assess organizations for their equity capacity or their inclusion work, ability, they are least developed around ability.

>> Cheryl Francis asked how does age factor in to equity, are younger people more adept and sensitive to these racial issues?

>> This is a fun question. And it comes up a lot. So short answer, yes. So you look, I am a gen X 'er, there are significant differences between how baby boomers talk about and engage on race, gen X’ers talk about and engage on race, and millennials talk about and engage on race. And what we find in the organizations we go in to talk about this or those who are part of the research is that millennials push on this issue in a way that other generations do not. And some of that just has to do with the context for how millennials operate. They push for a lot of things in the workplace, more money, more benefits, like they push, push, push. And what that has forced many organizations to do is have conversations about race and racism that they might not have otherwise had or they had them earlier than they would have otherwise, because millennials can be unrelenting and their articulation of a need to talk about something now. So I know a number of organizations who have had like conversations about developing a shared language or a training on implicit bias in response to millennial staff members pushing and saying that in their work inside of the organization, they've come in to conflict with folks of another generation who aren't able to respond to the issues of race that they are fluent enough to say when they've the discussion is not about race. So sometimes folks will say, like, okay, we're in a meeting and something happened. And I asked, well, is this about race or what ‑‑ how do you think this ties to diversity? And sometimes folks of other generations are not actually equipped to respond because we're socialized not to ‑‑ not to name that. So yes, it's an issue and we see the number of organizations responding to what millennials have pushed for around race. When it comes to baby boomers, we've worked with some folks who are part of, who are a part of race equity task forces for example who were very uncomfortable because they spent the majority of their life not being able to talk about these issues. So age is something of which to be conscious as you begin a discussion of race. Because someone who is in their 60s has a completely different context for race and racism than somebody in their 20s and their age will factor in to their experience of the race equity process that an organization initiates. Some, for example, a 20‑year‑old might be like oh, this is great, I was waiting for to us talk about this. Somebody in their 60s may be like I absolutely no desire to talk about this, like you're asking me to unbox trauma in the case of a person of color or I’ve just been socialized to pretend that's not the case. So it is something to pay attention to. Thanks for the question.

>> Yeah. I think that was a very important comment, and I see that as we're working with our Board and our team and others that, you know, we really, when we're looking for Board members, for example, we're looking for people to bring something specific to the table, not just be a person that's a certain demographic. So I’ll give you an example, right now, we're particularly interested in learning what's happening to English language learners who disabilities, particularly Spanish speakers who have disabilities for a variety of reasons, one of which that there's a lot of controversy about whether you can become a citizen if you might have eventually be a public charge or not, and if you are a family immigrating to America and somebody finds out that your kid has a disability, will they deny your citizenship overall, even if you're in the country legally, because your child is at risk to be a public charge. So for a variety of reasons we'd like to have more people on our Board who are interested and focused on that set of issues. That doesn't mean that just anybody who happens to be Hispanic and happens to know Spanish is the right person to serve on our Board. It's somebody who particularly is interested in and competent about and brings something to the table around that set of issues. And I know that this is complex, so how do you suggest organizations not just go out and say oh, I'm going to reach out to HBCUs to look for talent but to look for the talent that is completely aligned with the need that your organization has.

>> That's a great question and I think you hit on something that a lot of organizations do, they check the box. So it's like oh, you're a Spanish speaker, then you must be able to also be fluent on all of the issues you that described which may have no connection to that Spanish speaking individual's lived experience. And sometimes with folks of color who have been attracted or recruited to boards, they tend to skew affluent as Board members do and so is there an expectation that they may have a degree of fluency around issues that have nothing to do with their lived experience. So you'll find some boards as well as some staff team doing like a capacity and a skill based analysis to get at what you just said. So we don't need just more diverse people or we don't need just someone who speaks Spanish or has a Latin last name, we need someone with these expertise on issues on immigration or any of the things that you described and outlining, so being explicit about the skills you that need beyond the color of someone's skin or their last name and going out and tapping social networks to elevate those folks. Because those folks do exist. It's just that generally they're outside of the average Board individual's homogenous social network. So I think doing an audit of the capacities and skills needed, not just for the Board, but I see folks do it often for a Board because they're so ‑‑ you have to be so intentional and plan so much around Board recruiting. So the profiles you just described could be articulated, like this is the profile of the individual that we're looking for and that individual is likely an individual of a color who is Spanish speaking, potentially. But it is not just about them being a person of color and Spanish speaking, it's about the lived and professional experience relative to these key advocacy issues you that want to tap for the board. And the same goes for your general team, for your general team. And then when you do recruitment, being as explicit as possible about the profile of the person that you're looking for. So I have seen organizations be successful in doing that. But it takes some upfront work, similar to what you just described about thinking about who you need and why and then planning and research around connecting with the social networks that will surface those individuals.

>> Now, I know that in our organization that we're looking at potentially having a compensation committee and we're potentially going to do a strategic plan and you're going to be addressing our Board of Directors about how and advisors about how we might include some of those things in those different specific processes that we as an organization are coming to, but we're coming down to our last couple of minutes here and I want to be sure you that have a chance to say anything to this important audience of people who have been here with us this afternoon that you didn’t get the chance to say or if there's something you would like to underscore to be sure because we're really grateful that so many people have joined us today on this webinar and we want to be sure that you have a chance to underscore whatever you think is most important.

>> Thank you. Thanks for giving me the chance to do that. I think the only thing I would say, I think he we have about a minute left, is that this is just the beginning of a journey of many years. So what I'm happy to share and follow‑up is a set of resources that we will often share after webinars or after working sessions that would support folks in continuing their journey. It is important to have a well articulated race equity plan. Because as the data showed earlier around the racial leadership gap and as the current state of America shows, aspiration does not get you where you need to be. You have to be planful and intentional, and identify the right supports to show an organization advance in its journey and having clear goals is a critical piece of that. So welcome to the journey, and I'm happy to be a resource and share some of the things we've been working on.

>> Kerrien, this was really fantastic. I just put on the screen how people can find you, how they can follow you on Twitter, what your website is, how they can be in touch. We'll absolutely send them more information. I think this was extremely valuable. I also want to take the opportunity to pitch that on July 22nd we have our Washington, D.C.‑based national training seminar, national seminar from Hollywood to Capitol Hill, it's on July 22nd, we hope everybody who is on the webinar will join us for that. And let me just say that I really appreciate this journey that I am on, on equity. It's a learning process for me. I'm still making mistakes. Still trying to do better. But every day I think that we're getting closer to having a stronger organization. For us it's not about checking boxes. It's about making sure we have the best ideas. And at the end of the day, the more diversity that we bring to our team that can bring their innovation, that can bring their perspective, the stronger and better we are in being able to deliver the value that we hope to deliver as a nonprofit organization. So it is not about checking boxes for us, it is about upping our game to be a much better organization. And so, Kerrien, I really appreciate very much that you joined us this afternoon, and to the 45 people that are still on or whatever, we're so thrilled that you chose to spend your afternoon with us and for those of us who are here in person, a couple of dozen folks, I really appreciate your time as well. So thank you, and thinks to everyone who joined us.

>> Thank you. Thanks so much. I'll see you soon.

>> Thank you.

(Applause)
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**Operator Luke Meneses (02:47 PM)**

Good afternoon! Thank you for joining.

**Suzana Quick (02:49 PM)**

Welcome to the HIIN Think Tank call. We will start at the top of the hour. Thanks for joining!

**Suzana Quick (02:55 PM)**

Please dial in for open and informal discussion today.

**Kavita Bhat (03:02 PM)**

Kavita Bhat AHA HRET HIIN

**Lynn Forsey (03:02 PM)**

Hi everyone! Lynn Forsey-HSAG HIIN

**Elizabeth Perry (03:02 PM)**

Elizabeth PErry, NYS

**Andrea Silvey (03:02 PM)**

Andrea Silvey HSAG HIIN

**Linda Egbert (03:02 PM)**

Linda Egbert Comagine

**Mike Swartwood (03:02 PM)**

Mike Swartwood - Premier HIIN

**Laurie HensleyWojcieszyn (03:02 PM)**

HSAG HIIN

**marty buie (03:02 PM)**

Premier HIIN

**Jim Silva (03:02 PM)**

Jim Silva Comagin Health (formerly HealthInsight)

**Carlene White (03:02 PM)**

Vizient HIIN

**Lana Comstock (03:02 PM)**

Lana, Iowa Healthcare Collaborative Compass HIIN

**Mary Andrawis (03:02 PM)**

AHA/HRET HIIN

**Kate Carpenter (03:02 PM)**

Compass HIIN (Iowa)

**Ashley ODonnell (03:02 PM)**

Ashley O'Donnell Iowa Compass HIIN

**Brenda Johnson (03:02 PM)**

Brenda Johnson, Vizient HIIN

**Wing Lee (03:02 PM)**

NYSPFP, Wing Lee

**Maria Sacco (03:02 PM)**

NY HIIN, Maria Sacco

**Sandy Atkinson (03:02 PM)**

sandy atkinson Iowa Healthcare Collaborative

**Operator Luke Meneses (03:04 PM)**

You can download our handout today by clicking on the Media Library icon on the upper right corner of your screen. It looks like a white piece of paper with one corner folded, and has the triangle in the middle. Go to the shared files folder and hover over the file, and it will present you with the green download icon, which is an arrow pointing downward.

**Suzana Quick (03:07 PM)**

Please dial in for open discussion

**Suzana Quick (03:26 PM)**

Linda (Comagine) can you please dial in. Thanks!

**Suzana Quick (03:31 PM)**

We will move into the open Think Tank next, please dial in :-)

**Leslie Johnstone (03:33 PM)**

Readmissions SME group was from Studer

**Linda Egbert (03:33 PM)**

Thank you Leslie

**Operator Luke Meneses (03:33 PM)**

Lines are open! Please mute your line until you wish to speak. Thank you!

**Kavita Bhat (03:45 PM)**

An example of one of our Mini RCA Process Discovery Tools (HAPI)

**Kavita Bhat (03:45 PM)**

<http://www.hret-hiin.org/resources/display/hospital-acquired-pressure-injury-hapi-process-improvement-discovery-tool>