

Webinar: Race to Lead Revisited

30 June 2020 #RacetoLead

Presented by the Building Movement Project (BMP)

Sean Thomas-Breitfeld: Hello, everyone. I'm Sean Thomas-Breitfeld, Co-Director of the Building Movement Project. My Co-Director, Frances Kunreuther, and I will be presenting the findings from the [Race to Lead Revisited](#) report. We will also have a pause after that presentation to answer some clarifying and data questions that may have been surfaced.

I just want to start by thanking our panelists: Margaret Mitchell, President and CEO of YWCA Greater Cleveland, Edgar Villanueva, Senior VP of the Schott Foundation and author of *Decolonizing Wealth*, and Kerrien Suarez, Executive Director of Equity in the Center. After the panel discussion with the three of them, we will then also have a Q&A with the panelists.

I want to talk briefly about the survey. The Building Movement Project conducted a survey on nonprofits, leadership, and race back in 2016. That survey led to the development of the [Race to Lead](#) series of reports, all of which was based on the data and responses of more than 4,000 people working in nonprofit organizations across the country. Last summer, we resurveyed the field and this time we had more than 5,000 nonprofits staff participate. And that data is the basis for the [Race to Lead Revisited](#) report that was just released earlier this month. So we're really excited to have such a robust data set to be able to share some insights with you.

Before we move into the key findings from the report, we want to launch a poll question that is just related to the survey. We're interested in seeing whether you, participants who are on this webinar, participated in the survey, and there's a variety of possible answer options. We invite people to select whichever one feels like it's the best answer that reflects your own involvement in the *Race to Lead* surveys both in 2016 and 2019.

Alright, so we can see that a lot of people who are on the webinar today did not know about the survey. So, we're really glad to have much wider reach again. I think 5,000 respondents is a very big sample and we also know that the sector is much bigger than that. So we're really excited to have more people knowing about the survey. And, hopefully, if we end up surveying again in another few years, all of you will participate and help spread the word, and we can continue to take the pulse of how nonprofit workers and employees are experiencing issues of race equity inside of nonprofit organizations in the sector more broadly. I'm going to turn it over to my co-director, Frances Kunreuther, to start talking about the three key findings and presenting some of the key data from the *Race to Lead Revisited* report. Frances, over to you.

Frances Kunreuther: Thanks, Sean. Hello, everyone. We're so happy you're with us and that you have interest in the work that we've done on *Race to Lead*. Let me just start by saying the respondents in *Race to Lead Revisited* are very similar to the ones in our original *Race to Lead* report that came out three years ago. They work for pay in the nonprofit sector, they're from all 50 states, and you can see this heat map here. The darker colors represent more respondents and the lighter colors are fewer respondents, but we had respondents from all 50 states. We want to remind you that this is a snapshot in time. The survey was out for about six weeks over the summer in 2019. The people who took that survey may or may not have taken the first survey. We don't know because it's anonymous, but even with a thousand more people taking the survey, they're remarkably similar in their demographics.

I want to show you a few examples of that. So, on the next slide, you can see the answers about race and ethnicity. In 2016, 42% of the sample were people of color. In 2019, the *Race to Lead Revisited*

survey was 41% people of color. And if you look at that breakdown by race, it's almost exactly the same. As we said in our first report, it pretty much mirrors the Bureau of Labor statistics on who works in the nonprofit sector, except that they don't have a multiracial group there. If you look at the gender and sexuality responses, there are 3% more people who identify as women in 2019 than in 2016 and 3% fewer people who identify as men. And then there are 3% who, in both samples, identify as gender nonconforming, gender non-binary, or genderqueer. The exact same number reported that they were LGBTQ+ in 2016 and 2019 at 21%.

We had a new question this time in the survey, which is if people have a disability. 10% of the respondents identified as having a disability. And you can see that the most common disability was mental health disorders, at 38%. And, finally, in terms of the demographics the biggest change is the generational change. And this really reflects changes that are happening in the workforce that we can see in other research. There's a 9% point increase in millennials and there's a few, just a very few, Gen Z here. We didn't have any Gen Z in the 2016 survey so they're coming into the workforce now. And then there's corresponding reductions in both Generation X and in Baby Boomers, who are now less than a fifth of the respondents of the 2019 sample. So, that gives you some idea of the demographics.

I want to present the three key findings of the survey. And again, if you want to know more about the survey, you can go to racetolead.org or buildingmovement.org, and you can download the full report. So there are three findings that we talk about in *Race to Lead Revisited*. The first is that there's been little change from what we found in our original *Race to Lead* report. The second finding is we clearly identified, what we call, a *white advantage* for white people who are working in the nonprofit sector. And then the third finding, which is from a set of new questions on diversity, equity, and inclusion, is that there's a lot of DEI in the sector, but there's still questions about if it's changing the actual workplace.

I'm going to go through that first finding: it's the same story. People of color have similar qualifications as white respondents and people of color are more likely to aspire to be nonprofit leaders. All respondents in both datasets noted that people of color face racialized barriers to advancement. I'm going to dig into a couple of these findings in more detail. First of all, on aspirations, we asked people who were not executive directors or CEOs, whether they aspire to become a nonprofit leader. And in 2016, in the first survey, people of color were 10% more likely to say they probably were interested in becoming a nonprofit leader. And that gap between people of color and whites grew to 15% in the *Race to Lead Revisited* survey.

In the next slide, we go to another question that was asked in the first and second survey, and that is whether people's race/ethnicity had an impact on their career advancement. In 2016, 35% of people of color said their race had negatively impacted their career advancement. And that percentage grew to almost 50% in this most recent survey, a 14% increase. So, that's saying that almost half of the people who responded to the survey who are people of color said their race or ethnicity had a negative impact on their career. There's an even bigger difference in the percentage of white respondents who agree that race had a positive impact on their career increasing from 50% in 2016 to 67% in 2019.

Here's a write-in response from one of the respondents who talks about how it's challenging constantly being the only Latina in all-white and mostly male circles. That challenge is how she's strategic about whether to stand up for her community or to hold back, or else be left out of decision-making circles and labeled as the "angry Latina." On the next slide, we show that we once again asked about challenges respondent's face on the job, and you can see there's a slight decrease from 2016 to 2019, in the percentage of people reporting challenges in their workloads, inadequate salaries, and opportunities for advancement. But it's important to note that except for the demanding workload, which everybody has in the nonprofit sector and we all feel, people of color are more likely to report challenges than whites

and the gap between people of color and whites has remained the same over the past three years or even increased.

If you look at that last line in the graph, you can see the people of color in the most recent survey are more likely to report that they are challenged by the lack of role models than they did in the first survey. So that's a growing challenge, the only place that's growing, but this challenge has decreased for white respondents. Another example of that is in another write-in response about why mentorship is so important. This person said, "I had phenomenal support, mentorship, and sponsorship by women of color, mostly black women like myself, who provided the emotional support which was critical to enduring and persisting through microaggressions. Otherwise I might have left the sector."

A final example of how the answers are similar from the first and second surveys is the statements about why there's so few leaders of color in the nonprofit sector. Overall respondents were more likely to agree to these statements in 2019 than they were in 2016. And here's some things you might want to note on this kind of complicated graph. People of color agreed to these statements more often than white respondents, but the gap, again, remains the same or even grows. So look at that one, the second from the top, where people of color agreed 11% points more in 2019 to the statement about organizations that rule out people of color based on the perceived "cultural fit" in the organization, which is a stand-in for implicit bias. The white respondents agreed to this statement more often as well, the gap between the two groups, with 18% points in 2016, grew to 25% points in 2019.

I also wanted to also point out that we clarify the statement on skills and training that most people of color need more skills and training for leadership positions. That's the second to the last in the figure. That led to a dramatic increase in agreement because it was stated a little differently, especially by people of color, but also by white respondents, though the gap between them also remains.

We're going to go to another poll question: how does the race/ethnicity of the people in the top leadership roles in your organization, the staff, and board, currently match the communities that are being served or that you work with. Does it mostly match, somewhat match, somewhat mismatch, or mostly mismatch. Here are the results: mostly mismatch and somewhat mismatches are the winners. Well, somewhat mismatch and somewhat matches are both the second here. I'll pass it on to Sean to talk about what we call the *white advantage*.

Sean Thomas-Breitfeld: Thanks so much. So, as Frances mentioned, the second key finding was about the white advantage. The fact that, from our perspective, there is a white advantage in the nonprofit sector. We based that assertion on these three key things that we find in the data, looking at the racial makeup of who's in positions of power in nonprofit organization. How survey respondents reported on their own experience in nonprofit workplaces, particularly based on the demographics of who was in those positions of power. And then also that there were some income and financial disparities that were reflected in the data that also speak to this finding around there being a white advantage. So, on the next slide, we have this write-in response about the experience of being one of the only people of color, so the isolation, the frustration. I think what's particularly interesting about what this survey respondent was writing was that the lack of leadership of people of color was having real impacts on the organization itself, as well as this person's own experience and their own opportunity for personal and professional development inside of the nonprofit.

So, moving on to this next piece of data, we're looking at these four different levels in what could be considered organizational hierarchy. So, board of directors is at the far left. Then staff in top leadership roles, staff not in top leadership roles, and then the community served. And so what you're seeing here is that the orange bar reflects the percent of respondents who indicated that fewer than 25% of people at any of these categories were people of color. So over half of survey respondents reported that their

organization's boards and their leadership team were less than 25% people of color, meaning more than 75% are white people in those key power positions. In contrast, if you look at the constituents and community served on the right side of this figure, you can see that the blue and the gray bars together make up roughly two thirds of the sample.

So, again, roughly two thirds of the survey respondents reported that who their organizations are serving are at least 50% of the constituency base is people of color. And so, again, this is another way of visualizing that mismatch issue that we think really does exist in the nonprofit sector and we're also seeing in what respondents were reporting about their own organization. Now, focusing again on the board and the leadership. So, what this figure is showing is the combination of those two factors. So, again, there were four options on the scale, less than 25% POC, 25 to half POC, half to 75% POC, 75% or more POC. At the top, you've got staff in top leadership positions and then on the side is the board of directors. It creates a four by four grid. There was a question that came in to the Q&A asking why we set a 75% threshold for White-Run organizations. And I hope that this helps to visualize that. I think it's really striking that out of 16 combinations, 45% of the respondents reported working for organizations where both the board of directors and their organization's leadership team were less than 25% POC. And so the two figures side by side, the one on the left is just basically showing you the data and the percentages. And the one on the right is showing you as a proportion of the grid of 16, the 45% is the biggest share of what the options could have been. And then you see the spread of all the other combinations that were possible.

So again, 45% of survey respondents reported that they worked for organizations where both the board and their organization's leadership team were more than 75% white. And then only 14% reported working for organizations where half of the board and their leadership team, at least, were a people of color. And then there was this 41% that were in the middle, in terms of some of these other combinations that were possible. I'm going to move us on to the next slide because the organization's type really ended up having a real impact on how people were experiencing their organization.

We asked three workplace experience questions. One, would you be happy working in the organization three years from now? Do you feel you have a voice in the organization? And does the organization offer fair and equitable opportunities for advancement and promotion? So in the next slide, we're really just going to focus on that. Would you be happy working at the organization three years from now? And I think it's really worth noting that among respondents working for White-run organizations, where both the board and leadership team are more than 75% white, the happiness data is lower than the other organization types. And this is where you see the biggest gap between people of color and white respondents.

If you think of this on a scale from one to 10, an average response of 5.4 is not a very good grade, right? That would basically be a 54% compared to a 7.1 for white respondents working in those kinds of organization. The gap's a little smaller when you look at respondents working for other types of organizations with other combinations. And then the gap completely disappears when you look at people of color and white respondents who reported working for organizations that were POC-led.

For the next slide, we see whether people feel they have a voice in their organization. And again, you see the same pattern repeating itself. Very large gap, with people of color being much less likely to say that they feel that they have a voice in their organization compared to a white respondent's working in White-run organization. The gap gets smaller for those working in all other kinds. And then the gap is very small and in fact, people of color rated their organizations more positively on this measure of whether you feel you have a voice in your organization.

And then the last one, again, the same pattern happens. I think here is where it's also particularly striking, because it's about whether the organization offers fair and equitable opportunities for

advancement and promotion. Both people of color and white respondents rated their organizations much lower on this measure, when they worked for White-run organizations compared to the other two organization types. And again, the gap between people of color and white respondents was smaller among respondents working for POC-led organizations.

The next slide, which is a write-in response, expresses the challenge of not being taken seriously, particularly in majority white organizations. And then also the frustration of being used as a token. And this is where we start talking about some of the financial implications. So again, looking at the respondents by this organization type we see that respondents reported that their organizations tended to have lower budgets if they worked for POC-led organizations. The larger share of respondents working for POC-led organizations report that the organizations had budgets under a million dollars.

Although we didn't see big differences in terms of the salaries that respondents reported, it was striking that white respondents were more likely to report that they had received a cost of living raise in their organization. And this is across all organization types. But they were also more likely to report having received a promotion or a position with more responsibility and higher pay, and also more likely to report that they had received a performance-based raise.

So those are some of the findings related to the white advantage. We have another poll: Which of the following DEI activities / strategies, do you think would be most impactful for your organization? Let's see what the results are: the biggest vote getter was, and pretty significantly, address ways that racial inequity and systemic bias impact issues the organization works on. Almost half of folks who are on the webinars selected that answer option. All right. I'm going to turn it over to Frances, to get us talking about key findings three: DEI initiatives and obstacles. Go ahead, Frances.

Frances Kunreuther: As I mentioned earlier, the third key finding in the report looks at responses to a new set of questions on diversity, equity, and inclusion. 74% of the respondents reported their organizations had in the past or were currently engaging in a DEI initiative. This shows the most common activities were training, clarifying DEI is central to the organization's mission, and addressing how racial bias impacts the work. And again, we break these all down by people of color and white respondents. The survey didn't evaluate DEI initiatives, but we did learn a few important things from the data. For example, though most respondents, especially white people, felt training had a positive impact, this figure shows that those respondents in organizations that trained on multiple topics were far more likely to be very positive than those who trained on three or less topics. That's that little blue visual in the center about trainings. They are more likely to be very positive if they're trained on four or more topics.

Here is a quote that echoes some of what we heard in the focus groups: that training can lead to transformation. Unfortunately, we also heard, especially in people of color focus groups, that many organizations send staff to trainings as the full extent of their DEI initiative. People of color in the focus groups often refer to this as "checking off the DEI box," that is, sending staff to a training on race as the only work the organization engages in related to race equity.

In the next slide, this figure shows through the lens of the white advantage that Sean just talked about, whether respondents' organizations have policies to ensure leadership is committed to DEI, and/or takes a public stand on root causes of issues facing the people they work with and serve. It shows that people of color in White-run organizations rate their groups far lower on all three statements, than both the white respondents in White-run organizations and lower than people of color in the other two types of organizations. And all respondents across race gave higher ratings in POC-led groups and the gap between people of color and white respondents starts to close or even disappear.

On the next slide, the figure compares data between 2016 and 2019. And shows there was increased agreement by all respondents in the *Race to Lead Revisited* dataset to statements about race in the nonprofit sector. Let me just point to two things. First, the biggest increase was seen in the statement, "Nonprofits trying to address race equity in their organizations often create tensions they're not equipped to resolve." That's that second to last line, and you can see this big increase there.

Second, we want to point out the high levels of agreement, especially from respondents of color, to a new statement, "We know how to improve diversity, equity and inclusion in the nonprofit sector, but decision makers don't have the will to make changes." 72% of people of color agree with this statement, compared to less than half of the white respondents. And here's a write-in that talks about some of these issues. She says, "We know the way forward, we can readily identify the barriers, but we focus on changing people's minds." And she says, "I think we must shift the focus to changing people's behaviors."

On the next slide, and this is the final one in this presentation that Sean and I are doing, the figure shows the level of agreement to statements about how to increase people of color leadership in the nonprofit sectors. So this was a new set of statements. On the left are answers by all respondents, and on the right are just executive directors and CEOs. It's notable that the biggest gap between people of color and white respondents is the statement that funding should be increased to POC-led organizations, and this is especially true for the CEOs. That's striking to us because we know from the findings, from the white advantage, but also from other data, that people of color-led groups have smaller budgets than White-run organizations. So why wouldn't that be a top solution for everyone? So with that, we're going to take a breath and answer some of the questions that you've been asking in the Q&A. So Sean, can I turn it over to you?

Sean Thomas-Breitfeld: Sure. We did get a few questions related to the demographics of the sample. A few people are asking about the proportion of the respondents who were identified as people of color. I just want to clarify that the survey asks people to self-identify as either a person of color or not. And so, that's how we got the 41% versus 59%. Again, 41% of the sample self-identified as a person of color. Of those 41%, 14% of the sample self-identified as Black. Just under 1% self-identified as Arab American. Roughly 7% identified as Asian American. 10% self-identified as Latinx or Hispanic. Roughly 1% self-identified as Native American or Indigenous. And then 8% identify as multiracial, meaning they selected more than one racial/ethnic group.

There was also a question about how we accounted for multiracial people who were half white. If they first self-identified as a person of color, then they're in that multi-racial POC category. If they first identified as not being a person of color, then they're not factored into the 41%. So that was the one question related to the demographic. There was also a question about the economic disparities, related particularly to class, and how that has impact in terms of who's in organizations and the claims that organization makes about representing the community. Frances, do you want to answer or respond to that question?

Frances Kunreuther: We did ask people about their class growing up and their current class. Now, we didn't look at that in terms of the communities they serve, but we did take note. And all this data, just to remind you, is in the full report, we're only selecting certain things to say on this webinar since the report is quite long. But, we found that people of color were more likely to have grown up as, the language from the economic data is lower class, or working class. And they were more likely to have changed class position by working in the nonprofit sector. So, not only were they less likely to be upper class or middle class, actually their class position was raised by working in the nonprofit sector. That was

much more likely to happen for people of color in this sample, than for white people. And you can get more detail on those findings in the report.

Sean Thomas-Breitfeld: There are some other questions that are coming in that are answered in the report. Obviously we couldn't answer or cover everything in the presentation. There are also some questions coming in about the impact of the potential economic downturn on funding decisions, which hopefully we'll be able to talk through in the panel discussion. Particularly, Edgar, you might think of that one.

Frances Kunreuther: One thing I just wanted to mention in regard to questions like, "What does the size of the organization matter? Does a budget of the organization matter?" When we reported things, we really had controlled for things like size and a budget, et cetera. So those aren't what's being reflected in the answers that we show. We're really looking at the data where we saw that the difference.

Sean Thomas-Breitfeld: And just for the sake of time, I think a lot of the questions that are coming in will get answers to through the conversation with the panel. I'm going to have to shift to the panel conversation, to make sure that we can maximize our time with Margaret, Edgar, and Kay. I'm going to invite each of the panelists to share a very quick intro: name, organization, any other key thing that you think is important for people to know about you. And then what data point most resonates with your own lived experience? Margaret, can I start with you?

Margaret Mitchell: Thank you, Sean and Frances, for having me. I'm really excited about this conversation. My name is Margaret Mitchell. I'm President and CEO for YWCA at Greater Cleveland. I've been in my post for about nine years. The data point that most resonated with me was really the key finding that whiteness is an advantage in the nonprofit sector. And all of those data points in there I just really resonated with, and was thrilled to participate in the 2019 survey. So, thank you.

Edgar Villanueva: Hi, everyone. My name is Edgar Villanueva. I'm an enrolled member of the Lumbee Tribe of North Carolina. I work at the Schott Foundation for Public Education. I had a really hard time identifying with one single data point, because I could see myself all throughout this research and this report. It was really holding up the mirror of my lived experience. I think the conversation earlier around tokenism really speaks to me. Being Native, I've always been the only Native American in my organization, except for a short period of time where I led a Native focused nonprofit organization. I think that's probably the part of the data that I resonated with the most so far.

Kerrien Suarez: Good afternoon. Thanks to Sean and Frances for inviting me. It's a pleasure to be here. Like Edgar, I struggled to answer this question. I'm Executive Director of Equity in the Center. And the pervasive white advantage is deeply validating for me as a professional, who, until the past five years, operated in predominantly white organizations most of the time. In my role, currently at Equity in the Center, what really resonated with me deeply was the challenge organizations are having living into their awareness of the need to shift culture inside of organizations. So the updated data showed that there's a greater awareness of the need for organizations to shift, to focus on equity internally, but the conditions have not actually changed. So, behavior and actions haven't changed. And that's really where I live in our work with Equity in the Center.

Sean Thomas-Breitfeld: Thanks so much. All right. So, we're going to start off the panel by posing questions to each of you. Margaret, having led large nonprofits that provide critical services in

communities, what challenges have you had to face and overcome as a woman of color in the nonprofit sector?

Margaret Mitchell: It's an adventure being an African American woman in the nonprofit sector, leading a nonprofit. I have three instances. The beginning of this year, City Lab and the University of Pittsburgh produced a report that showed the best and the worst cities for Black women to live in. And Cleveland, the city that I live in, was ranked the worst overall city for Black women. There were a number of indicators in the report. It is an interesting report to look at. And Cleveland, Pittsburgh, Milwaukee, Detroit sort of traded being at the bottom in several of the indicators, but overall Cleveland was the worst.

And I took a call from a reporter from our daily newspaper. She called me and she asked me what am I going to do? And what was I doing? What programs was I doing to address this? I was really dumbfounded and I had a conversation with her around why she called me, and who else she was talking to for the story. And she was a little unsure of why I was questioning her. But then I walked her through, "Have you called the chamber? Have you called the Tourism Bureau? Have you called the city? Have you called the County? This is a crisis. Why are you calling me to ask about programs, because programs are not going to fix this."

Another instance: I have been working in this space for a while. We run a preschool, a unique preschool, that is trauma informed. We're working with families that are homeless at the time they enrolled in our preschool. And we understand and utilize the adverse childhood experience report and score the ACE score. And at our organization, we believe that racism is an adverse childhood experience. And we've had that position for quite a while. Years ago, like two years ago, I can't tell you all the pushback that I would get, because racism was not identified as one of the classic items that the investigators had identified in terms of adverse childhood experiences. It was always, just always, a struggle.

And then lastly, I would say that being a black woman and showing up in spaces where I'm not necessarily always "the only," but often one of the few, and certainly it is expected of me to be able to carry the banner. I'm always fascinated by white men who say to me, "Oh, I really pushed for you to be in this meeting so you would say X, Y, Z." Like this year, people are telling me this. Foundation presidents and CEOs of XYZ. And when I say to them, "Well, I'm waiting for you. I'm waiting for you to carry the banner and lead the conversation around racial equity and social justice."

Sean Thomas-Breitfeld: Thanks so much. You talked a little bit about the factoring in adverse childhood experience into your program, your work with children and families. Can you talk just a little bit more about how your own commitment to racial equity impacts the organization, the work you all do in Cleveland, and where that factors in?

Margaret Mitchell: Well, our mission at the YWCA is eliminating racism and empowering women. And we have not always lived up to that mission. About four years ago, I knew that I could not speak in the community without having my organization authentically be an anti-racist organization. That you could walk into my organization and talk to any staff member and they would be able to support or lead a conversation around anti-racism.

As we ventured down this road, four years ago, to put racial equity front and center into absolutely everything that we do, everything we talk about, the way we live and breathe. I mean, the resistance was wacky. And at times I really felt like I was pushing a boulder up the hill, but we stuck with it. And I can't tell you what it is like to be in the space where we are now, where we have so many champions within our organization. We're really able to identify ourselves authentically as an organization,

barreling towards being anti-racist and can articulate that, support others, talk about our challenges, our realities, and our wins. And it's humbling to be at this point. We are able to encourage and also demand that others join us, because we've done the work to be here.

Sean Thomas-Breitfeld: Thank you so much for your leadership. I'm going to turn to Edgar. The question I wanted to start with for you is, from your vantage point in the world of philanthropy, what is it going to take for foundations and the philanthropic sector to increase funding for organizations led by people of color?

Edgar Villanueva: Thank you, Sean. I do want to just underscore that there is a direct correlation between who decides where money goes in foundations and where the money actually ends up. And we know that within the philanthropic sector, we have a significant diversity challenge. Three fourths of foundation staff are white, only 8% of foundation CEOs are people of color. Only 3% of philanthropic institutions are led by Black executives. And I can only think of three Native American CEOs in the sector. So, when we see this major diversity issue within the philanthropic sector, we're going to see that play out in where money actually goes. We see and know that only 7.5% to maybe about 8.5% of philanthropic dollars overall go to communities of color. We have a philanthropic injustice there as far as I'm concerned.

What will it take? You know, I want to believe that folks working in philanthropy are good people and we are going to self-correct. To begin collecting data and understand the demographics of who we're supporting, what the leadership of those organizations look like, and make conscious decisions to dramatically increase and shift that so that we are investing in people of color and in POC-led organizations. I don't know that we'll get there fast enough on our own goodwill. So, I'm very interested in the idea of some external pressure to really push us as public institutions. Although we behave as private institutions, we are still a part of the nonprofit sector and should be accountable to the public. I believe in many ways that other nonprofits are.

I have been a part of conversations about legislation that would potentially require foundations to diversify their boards. Some people think that's a radical idea, but this happens in many other sectors. Organizations that receive federal funding like FQHC, Federally Qualified Health Centers, are required to have boards that are 51% reflective of the communities that they serve. I don't see why it would be such a stretch for there to be a requirement on foundations, organizations that do not have to pay taxes, to have a requirement on board leadership, that would be a mirror reflect the communities that we are working to serve.

So, that's an external pressure. I'm here for the self-correct, but I'm also very interested in getting there faster because we know these dollars will never get to our communities unless there's more diversity and folks like us making decisions about money.

Sean Thomas-Breitfeld: Thanks so much, Edgar. And the follow-up question. There's a lot of data that didn't get reported in the *Race to Lead Revisited* report. And so, one of the data points that stood out to us was that over a third of people of color who were in that ED/CEO role, compared to less than a quarter of white EDs, reported that they never or rarely get funding that is comparable to peer organizations doing similar work. Given that they're getting smaller grants to basically do the same kind of work as peer organizations, what might be some strategies for those people who are leading, but on the grant-seeker side, to hold the grant makers accountable and challenge them to be more equitable in their giving and really confront the philanthropic redlining?

Edgar Villanueva: Yeah, we know in the nonprofit sector one of the major barriers to diversity is that we are saturated with white dominant culture. And within philanthropy, white supremacy culture, or white dominant culture for me, is even more pervasive because of the origins of our sector being steeped in wealth and privilege. I think that before I get to what nonprofit folks can do, I really think that burden must be on funders because of the power dynamic. I actually feel terrible that nonprofit leaders have to take on this extra work to educate, to inspire, to encourage philanthropic leaders to come around to this. I think that the onus should be on philanthropy to do the right thing.

The underlying issue here is that we need, beyond diversity, we need a fundamental shift in a worldview about whose money it is and an analysis around power that is not connected to white supremacy culture. And for philanthropy to understand that philanthropic capital should not be treated as private wealth. Instead, this wealth inside our foundations belongs to communities and we should reallocate or redistribute that wealth in a way that reflects the diversity of communities.

I'm really inspired by nonprofit leaders who are stepping out and pushing back on this system. I know that it's very hard to bite the hand that might feed you. But I think that we have to get to a point where we have to ask questions about, as nonprofit leaders, which foundations do we want to be in relationship with and how do we organize as an entire sector to really push back on and hold philanthropies accountable? There are various organizations that I feel like are beginning to do that work. I've seen responses from direct action on foundations, which I think is the boldest, most radical. And I love it when a nonprofit is that bold to do that work, to really think about bringing philanthropy into the fold and into a relationship that's beyond transactional to one of trust. And it takes both sides to get there, you know? It's really challenging.

I will say to nonprofit leaders who may be afraid to have these conversations, to not be afraid. That this is the time where pretty much everyone I've found in the foundation world is beginning to have conversations about race. We talk about white supremacy now in the sector more than we ever have. So, be bold to ask funders, what are they doing about equity? What is their policy on diversity? And I would almost bet that every funder is thinking about this and we sometimes are afraid to bring up this conversation. I call it donor fragility. We're like, "Oh, don't ask the funder. We don't want to rock the boat or make them uncomfortable." This is the time for everyone to be uncomfortable and to have conversations about race and power. If not now, then when?

Sean Thomas-Breitfeld: Thanks so much. Edgar, that was a great segue to a question I wanted to pose to Kerrien about the current moment that we're in. And there were a few questions that came in to the Q&A about this as well. So, how are you seeing the current moment impact the sector? And how can we, as a nonprofit sector, make sure that the changes that may just be starting in organizations are actually sustained, particularly when media attention may shift to something else, or when the election overtakes conversations about race equity. How do we make sure that the nonprofit sector stays focused on these issues?

Kerrien Suarez: Sure. Thank you. This moment is unique. I think it's one from which leaders and organizations can't turn away because of the imagery of George Floyd's murder and then the protests that resulted. So, organizations that I've been working with and hearing from and leaders that I've been hearing from, overwhelmingly understand that this moment is different and they have to do something. Whereas in the past, many of them, including many whom I've spoken to a year ago on this same topic, felt that it was okay to wait. You know, "When I got more budget or something shifted, I would come back to it." I think what I see now in white leaders, as well as leaders of color, is an understanding that the moment is now and that this issue is urgent. And unfortunately it took a police officer kneeling on

George Floyd's neck for 8 minutes and 46 seconds to demonstrate the lesser value of black life in our society and in particular inside of our organizations.

So, when I've been speaking to leaders we've had, more so than in the past, really explicit conversations about what Black Lives Matter means inside of their organization. Because the reality is, just as in broader society, black lives are not valued as equal to white lives. Inside of organizations, black lives and the lives of people of color are not valued as equal to white life. White ideas, white philosophies, white leadership, white bodies are elevated above all others. And I feel in the conversations I've been having in the past month or so, there is an explicit understanding that action, not just words about diversity and inclusion, action on anti-racism specifically needs to be taken.

To persist through this shift in the media's focus: I think we who are leaders in the sector and staff and leaders of organizations have to beat on the drum for action, which ties back to *Race to Lead's* finding that organizations are now significantly more aware, but the conditions haven't changed. And the conditions haven't changed because organizations have not transformed their culture to center equity. They continued to predominantly live in a space of diversity where they're focused on the literal variation of the racial background of their staff versus focusing on driving inclusion and a culture where multiple lived identities, specifically around race, but around LGBTQIA and gender and other identities are valued equally. So that they can drive inclusion and then narrow the race-based disparities inside of organizations. So, I think focusing on the action, not training, but transformation and the anti-racist action inside of organizations will make progress toward equity.

Sean Thomas-Breitfeld: Thanks so much. And you know, this is also a question that I would want to encourage everyone to weigh in on. Kerrien, the critique of training is well considered. I'm curious, what is training good for? Since it does seem to be the go-to strategy for organizations that are starting. And maybe just a little bit more of what ways training tends to fall short, and what to do in addition or instead?

Kerrien Suarez: Sure. Training is critical because training helps individuals to learn. What's overwhelmingly lacking in our society is education on structural racism and institutional racism, as well as just the basic history of our country. So, it's not that training isn't important. We don't know, as Americans, how to live in a society that centers equity. So those are skills that we have to learn. Training is important and it's imperative that the thread from the skills that are cultivated in training be pulled into the daily management practice of an organization. Because where training falls down is where the organization fails to make a clear case for why the training is related to individuals, institutional functional roles. And how they're supposed to apply the skills that they learned in training in their daily work and policy and process to support people in applying principles of equity in their daily practice of management. It's the pulling of the thread that is generally not present. So I go to a training on implicit bias. I check the box. I now know that I have implicit bias. Great. I still keep treating my colleagues of color as if they are lesser humans, because I don't have any understanding of how that implicit bias shows up in my daily interactions with them. In whom I call on in a meeting, who I give a stretch project to, who I think is a fit, as we were talking about earlier.

So, building the capacity of individuals and of organizations to apply the skills learned in training to operationalize race equity is critical, and that's the piece that's missing. And it's why if you Google implicit bias training, it overwhelmingly is found to not be effective because, yes, you went to the training, but were you able to successfully apply anything that you've learned to mitigate race-based disparities? Generally the answer is, no.

Sean Thomas-Breitfeld: Thanks so much. I'd invite Margaret and Edgar to weigh in as well, if you have any thoughts about training and/or additional strategies that organizations should be incorporating into their toolbox?

Edgar Villanueva: I'll jump in. I feel like often the conversations about diversity, equity, and inclusion are either when an organization is in trouble. Sometimes there's good intentions, folks want to be in alignment with their mission and do better. But the challenge with training and a lot of the efforts around diversity, is that they are an add-on or an aside. They are not woven into just how we do business every day. And also for folks, especially white relatives who are watching, sometimes conversations about race equity or diversity, the only time that those conversations happen might be in a 30 minute workshop or the one hour training or, if you're lucky, a whole day, right?

What I've been saying to folks, if the only time that you talk about race or equity or inclusion is at work or at work in small segments, that's not enough time. Because we have to get beyond the training, we have to get beyond the frameworks and actually have some personal transformation. You should be talking about race with your family, you should be talking about race with your faith, in your faith community. Everywhere. We have to really lean into this. There can't be a checklist. It's not a linear process. So, this is work that has to happen at the individual level, has to happen in your community and your family level, and then also at work. When we're doing that work at a personal level, I think we'll begin to show up at work and it will manifest itself in the way that we're leading and managing staff. But we can't just professionalize equity and have this be a part of our day job, it has to be a part of what we do and who we are, every moment of our lives.

Margaret Mitchell: Yeah. I would just piggyback on that and say that I agree. I think that training does have its time and its place, but in my opinion, it really falls short. Because, as Edgar said, it is far too often a checked box and, as Kerrien said, that thread is not pulled through. And so, when I say we make racial equity front and center, I'm really talking about on a regular, consistent basis, you know? Just curating and driving and understanding and exposing and talking about how racial equity is impacting us. If you're looking at something new or different, the 4th of July is coming up. There's an amazing piece that Frederick Douglass wrote in maybe 1852 about the insanity of the 4th of July. And we know that we truly didn't have one man, one vote in this country until the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

But until you really put that in front of people and they have an opportunity to digest it and read his words and understand that this has been happening for hundreds and hundreds of years. So it is the ongoing. As a leader, if you had an issue and you're the CEO, or you have an issue around finances, you dive in and you learn what you need to learn to build your financial muscle.

We truly believe that racial equity is a leadership asset. If you are willing to lead an organization in 2020 and beyond, you must have racial equity as an acumen that you own, possess, and are able to transfer, ignite, empower others to gain that equity as well. We look across so many other organizations, important to understand the United Farm Worker movement in the United States. It's important for us, diving in and understanding who Wilma Mankiller is.

This is so important to be able to look at people of color, understand movements and challenges and success, and not just be myopic, but understand the humanity. And, as Gail Christopher says to us, the hierarchy, right? How we're always sort of needing to have a human hierarchy and we must understand all this in order to dismantle it.

Sean Thomas-Breitfeld: Thanks so much. So, we're getting a ton of questions in. One question that I think really relates to some of what you were just raising, Margaret, around equity being a sort of core

competency for nonprofit leaders. Any tips or thoughts, particularly for leaders of color, in the sector who are leading organizations that are based on systems, structures, and policies that are based in white supremacy?

Kerrien Suarez: I was just talking about this earlier today, and it's important to note that white supremacy is upheld by people of color in the same way that the patriarchy is held up, we contribute to it, by women. So, people of color have to interrogate their own personal narrative around privilege and their role in upholding white supremacy. I always try to lead with this: it is the responsibility of the people preferenced by a system to dismantle it. So, there's not the responsibility of people of color to dismantle white supremacy and we play a role in upholding it.

So, one thing I often challenge folks of color to do, as well as white folks, to do is look at Tema Okun's article on the characteristics of white supremacy culture. And I asked them to find themselves, because if you are an individual of color who has made it to the C-suite, you are in there. If you are at the middle level of the organization, you're in there. If you're a junior staff person, you'll find yourself in that list because white supremacy culture, as Edgar was saying, is our standard operating setting in America.

And if you have been coached on aspects of professionalism, it has to show up in the workplace, you live and breathe white dominant and white supremacy culture in your work every day. And it's critical for me as a person of color, to name my economic and educational privilege. And name that I have upheld practices within institutions that are rooted in racism, and that I have done harm to other people of color in my role as a professional.

We all have to interrogate the choices that we're making within organizations, because we may be thinking that, "Well, this is the best way to do it. This is the excellent way. This is how a leader shows up. This is what a new young professional looks like, if I'm going to put them in some sort of a stretch role." And many of those characteristics, most of them in a professional setting, align to characteristics of white supremacy culture. And so we have to interrogate ourselves as complicit in the structure, even as we work to dismantle it and also push our white allies to take a very active role in dismantling a system that was designed to preference them.

Margaret Mitchell: Wow. Love that. Yes. Just to add onto that, I would say that it's important to have to build a really strong appetite around this work and it doesn't come overnight. Edgar's book is excellent. I just recommend that to everybody. It is absolutely amazing. As you build your appetite, just think about continuing to learn about your space and the diaspora and just begin to understand.

I was in South Carolina earlier this year, really wanted to see where most of the slaves came in. My first trip to West Africa was in 1997. I've done the Civil Rights Trail. I just really enjoy learning and I'm in awe all the time of what I learn, and you have to be a learner in order to share this. And I think once you sort of go down the road of being an anti-racist organization, people will start calling you on your stuff and pointing out where you are falling short. And that is the fuel you'll need to be able to make change. We've made changes to our job descriptions. We have racial equity in our performance planning. We have regular conversations within our organization. We're constantly providing opportunities to grow and learn. We held a big conference last year to commemorate the 400 years of 1619, the commercial end of chattel slavery in the United States. We were one of the early communities in Cleveland to say, "Hey, we think that racism is a public health crisis." We worked on that for over a year. And while we got passage just recently, it was a conversation we started a year ago, but people were rolling their eyes and saying we were absolutely crazy. Be bold and courageous as you've heard on this call and be willing. More people have tipped into this work, so there's a little bit of cover with that, but it is like anything. Racism continues to find its least resistance. It's highly adaptive. It'll become adaptive again and come

up in some other form. So we've got to keep shifting and changing and dismantling and being able to see it and recognize it for what it is.

Edgar Villanueva: I'm just getting fired up just by listening to Kay and Margaret here. I think I might just add or say in a different way that diversity is so important. Representation matters, but we can't just have diversity efforts in a vacuum. That culture shift work is so important because what we see time and time again, is that we hire people of color into these white dominant spaces and they do not sustain, thrive, or last. So really good people of color will not stay in your organization if you're not creating a culture that is one that they can thrive in. The old saying is that people don't leave organizations because of mission or because of the organization. It's because of the boss really. So think about what we can do to engage in culture change.

I appreciate what you said, Margaret, because for white brothers and sisters who are listening to this, I know that often to make those changes, people get paralyzed by the fear of not knowing or being unsure or worried about making a mistake. We all can have more grace towards each other as we're figuring this thing out, this thing called life, together. And I often share my own personal journey in the work. I have not always been as enlightened as I am today. I had to unlearn a lot of things and I'm still unlearning a lot of things. Sometimes I make mistakes and think the wrong thing or make a wrong decision. So it is about just holding yourself accountable to some journey, to some experience every single day, to do better and to keep learning as you all said. And to create a culture within our organizations, to have the conversations, to take risks, or to not have a culture of perfection, which is one of those white dominant characteristics, so that you can grow and learn together and began to move in that right direction. To not only support people of color differently, but to have a culture that everyone can be successful in your organization.

Sean Thomas-Breitfeld: Thanks so much. There were some questions from white EDs in particular around what they should be doing. What is this moment calling on white leaders to do? So, thanks for bringing that in and would welcome any other thoughts that people have in terms of the particular strategies that white leaders should be considering. So, someone raised specifically succession planning. What other things should white leaders be thinking about in terms of how to make their organizations more equitable workplaces?

Kerrien Suarez: I have some thoughts. Coming on the heels of some conversations that I've had with white EDs in the past few weeks, what came to mind when you asked that question was, "Get out of the way." By get out of the way, I don't mean leave your position necessarily, but succession planning is important. "Get out of the way" in terms of creating space and freeing up resources for this work to actually be done. So if that means bringing in an external consultant, signing up for a training and then engaging your facilitator to help you pull the thread from how you take the skills and that training and operationalize it within your culture. Get out of the way and provide resources that will facilitate action, measurable action and changes in behavior, not just in yourself as a leader, but all of the people who are on your team.

One of the questions that you asked in advance, Sean, was what recommendations might I have about the places where people get stuck in this work? The initiation of conversations and the unearthing of challenges that they're not equipped to handle. The importance of coaching cannot be understated. So I do acknowledge that coaching is something that requires money and in these times, resources are a challenge. But all of the issues that you, Frances, Margaret, and Edgar have talked about in terms of the necessity of transforming internal culture ties to the four levels at which oppression operates. So: internalized, our internalized racism, our thoughts on race and what it means and what we think of

people. Interpersonal, how those beliefs inform the way you treat other people. That's where implicit bias and microaggressions show up. Institutional, how those beliefs, society's beliefs, and individual beliefs about race and racism are codified in institutional practice and daily management. And institutional, how all those things work together to keep people oppressed and marginalized.

The work that you do inside of an organization to transform it requires that you do intentional, consistent work at four levels. So, as a leader, that means you're going to have to open up the box of race and racism that you've kept closed because you're an American and that's what we're supposed to do. Start to unearth many of those issues. Have a coach support you in processing, that is helpful. It's also a very helpful resource to give to managers and more junior level staff who are facing the same issues. These are issues that people of color and white folks are not accustomed to mining and bringing into the public square in the workplace. The importance of providing external support and coaching to, as Margaret said, build the skill and the competency to hold space and persist through these difficult issues is very important. So, get out of the way and bring in some expertise and resources to help you as a leader and to help your team do this work.

Margaret Mitchell: I absolutely agree. The only thing that I might add is that I have gathered with a small group of other EDs to have these difficult conversations with each other, talk about what we're doing and what our go forward plan is, just challenge each other. That has also been helpful to be part of a small group with two other organizations. I think we've been together for three years. I think the first year we just talked in a loop and didn't go anywhere. Then in year two it moved forward and we've been able to do some really good work and I think all of the organizations have grown. So that's, I think, something that could be accessible for all organizations to do consistently getting together and working through these difficult conversations.

Sean Thomas-Breitfeld: Thanks so much. I want to invite Frances to rejoin because there was a question that was raised earlier about board members and the role of board members. So there's a question to us in terms of the research, since the survey did not survey board members. How do the findings get out to board members? But then I also want to ask the rest of the panel, what is the way to manage a board toward becoming more equitable, particularly in hiring of the next ED, but also in terms of making clear the mandate. So, Frances, do you want to start us off with your thoughts about the board and how to share information related to the survey and report as well as any other thoughts about the responsibility of board members?

Frances Kunreuther: First of all, we didn't include board members because BoardSource puts out a report that I think is coming up this fall, where they actually do a deep dive into what's happening with boards of directors. So, you should be looking to them and sign up for that on their website. They have a great data set. They've really dug into this issue. But we did want to include the fact in the survey that the composition and the diversity of the board is so important. That's really how we define one of the factors of the white advantage.

Sean always says when we're training and when we started training on *Race to Lead*, everybody would say, "I really want to do this, but my boss won't do it or my board won't do it." Until, finally, Sean said, "Well everybody has a boss. The board has a boss, the funder." I use that all the time because nonprofits have to push against the funder. That's their boss. If we really believe in race equity, we have to bring this to our boards. It's not like we're trying to convince the boards. It's like we have to partner with the boards to say, "This is how we address this," but not let it go, not wait until they're ready.

Also, I think you must, must, must change the composition of your boards. You can't have a board that's all white and say that that's okay. It may take time to change the composition of the board. We understand that can't happen overnight. On the other hand, you can't ask the staff to do all this race equity work when you're not asking the board to do the same thing. So that's just a quick response to that. But I'd love to hear from our panelists, who have been so fantastic, what you think about the boards.

Edgar Villanueva: I'll jump in. It's so critical that work is happening at the board level. We've got to have the work of equity happening at all the different levers of change in the organization. Often it does seem like a bottom up effort in the places where I've worked, where the people of color are pushing, but we've got to have through and through. Everything rises and falls on the leadership of an organization. What I will say, because I get a lot of calls from firms who are looking to hire their first ED of color. Because of this great work, people want to be more inclusive. I do think that if you are a board member and you're thinking about taking that step, that you've got to ask yourself how ready are you are to ensure that this new executive comes in and is prepared to lead. Like we were talking about earlier, to be comfortable. What extra supports might a new ED of color need in your organization if you've never had a POC leadership?

I've heard time and time again, stories where boards are not extending the type of supports or the network and relationships that an ED needs to be successful in the role. We see ourselves caught in this cycle of bringing in people of color and then the numbers go back down again. So, the board has to own this. It needs to start with the board where it's possible. Then the board needs to hold itself accountable. Create metrics and a dashboard around equity goals. Also all of the work that's happening at the staff level should be mirrored, I think among board leaders.

Margaret Mitchell: I absolutely agree. As we were doing our staff work, we did that same level of work with our board of directors. It's just absolutely a key and critical. I think our board has not always said that they've been grateful and excited about the work, but I think this year in 2020, they have all noted, mentioned, discussed, and flexed their racial equity muscle around the leadership that they are able to exert in their own organizations on other boards. It's absolutely critical for the boards of directors to move in this direction.

Kerrien Suarez: I absolutely agree with everything that's been said. Board members are least proximate generally, to issues of inequity. So the need to cultivate the equity muscle as some folks call it, or the capacity to do race equity work, is just as critical for that group as it is for everyone else in the organization. The connection between the fact that board members are generally at least approximate to inequity and what Edgar is saying about how leaders of color are not set up for success when they transition into C-suite roles is critically important because a lot of the judgements that boards make about who deserves and is worthy and is qualified to be an ED and who deserves and is worthy of additional support or access to networks is bound up in implicit bias.

The more work you can do with your board to explicitly name how the hierarchy of human value, which Margaret mentioned, and Gail Christopher has done a ton of work on that, puts them at the top and society says that they're the best and most qualified people to be in these positions and make decisions about who should be the CEO and what the strategy should be. So explicitly naming how white supremacy operates within a board and how that connects, as Edgar was saying, to the success of an ED of color, as well as to the organization's ability to raise funds when they have a leader of color.

Sean Thomas-Breitfeld: Thanks so much. Okay. So we're going to move into wrapping up and I just want to invite each of the panelists to give a concluding thoughts as far as what the people who are watching the webinar should be pushing for in terms of their own organization to do the transformation, to become more equitable workplaces. Kay, can we start with you in terms of the big tip to make some real change in organizations.

Kerrien Suarez: I'd say my main tip, and I'm a little I'm biased because Equity in the Center is an organization that supports folks in building their capacity on race equity, but engage expertise to persist through those moments of discomfort. In terms of having walked into discussions or, in the case of the past couple of months, found yourself in the midst of civil unrest for which you are completely and utterly unprepared. So engage expertise that facilitate discussions. Also name, as a leader, that you are unprepared for this moment, because we all are as Americans that have not been raised to center equity in our society and in our practice and secure the help that you need.

I did just want to read this tweet that I've been sharing in a lot of the conversations I've been having with folks in the past month or so. It's by a woman named Sonja Gupta: "Unlearning white supremacy isn't Instagrammable. It's deeply personal existential and difficult work. It often feels horrible. It will make you cry. You might become depressed. It can be very lonely and isolating. It will shatter your ego and your belief system. Do it anyway." So that's what I would leave the group with: unlearn white supremacy and avail yourself of whatever tools and resources you need to do so.

Edgar Villanueva: I'll just underscore what we were talking about earlier about doing the personal work. If you have not done your individual racial identity work and understanding where you came from, what your original instructions are and tapping into the teachings of your ancestors and understanding of how that overlays with US history. This is just important work for us all to do, to be decent human beings. So, do that personal work as well, lead the charge, and support the work at your organization. I think one question that I try to ask myself every day is, "What can I do to make sure that everyone feels powerful?" It's not necessarily giving up our own power, as Kay was speaking to in getting out of the way, but it is making sure that we are using our power to ensure that we can all be powerful together.

Margaret Mitchell: Be prepared for the backlash. It is coming. It's going to be fierce. You may experience it in different ways from different people. Not everybody's going to be excited about your move into this space, but you are doing it because of the souls of our children who are black, brown, red, yellow, purple, and polka dot. We must do this work and you must be prepared to stand in the storm and it is coming. But you must be able to understand and be thoroughly convinced of why you are doing this, why you are advancing this work. Don't turn back. Take a bold step, be courageous. Do your own work and be sure to understand. Be a good listener and be able to have someone in your life in your organization who can call you on your stuff and speak truth to you. Even as it pricks your heart, be able to weed through all of that and do the right thing. It's always the right time to do the right thing.

Sean Thomas-Breitfeld: Thank you so much. I'm going to bring back the slides and Frances is going to close out with a quick review of the recommendations from the *Race to Lead Revisited* report, and how you can stay in touch with them.

Frances Kunreuther: I just wanted to thank the amazing panelists. It's just inspirational. This is going to echo much of what they said. First: pay attention to the experience of people of color in the workplace. You can engage in race equity training, but you need to move from training to change in order to engage in race disparities. Look at your policies and look at your actions at work and make sure they

reflect your commitment to equity and then enforce them. Just fund more people of color-led organizations. That race equity for organizational leadership, especially reflecting the communities you work with and serve. When we talk about organizational leadership, we know we mean the board, as well as the staff leadership. And finally, be transparent in the organization about your DEI progress by including those people in the organization that work there. Don't just say, "I've done this work," and you think, you know what you're doing, especially leadership. Asks people how it's going and listen to their feedback. I just want to say, talking about change is not change. Change is actually making change.

If you want to get in touch with us, you can write us info@buildingmovement.org. You can sign up for our newsletter. If you want to promote the work of the *Race to Lead Revisited* report, you check it out at racetolead.org.