

Building a Race Equity Culture in Classical Music Organizations 2-4-20

Kayla: Good day and welcome to the League of American Orchestras, Building a Race Equity Culture in Classical Music Organizations. All participants are in a listen-only mode and we invite you to submit any questions in the Q&A box on your screen. It is now my pleasure to turn the call over to David Styers. Please go ahead.

David Styers: Thank you so much, Kayla. Hello, and welcome everyone to the second pilot digital learning session for the League of American Orchestras for 2020. My name is David Styers. I'm the new director of learning and leadership programs here at the League, and we are thrilled that you're joining us today. As you've seen when you signed on, we're doing a poll to get a sense of the diversity of people who are with us today. From the registration list, we've seen that we have quite a variety of orchestras and arts organizations, both from their geography around the country and also in their budget size as well.

We'll give you another minute or two to finish filling out that first poll, and we'll get a sense of who's on the call today. Also, again, everyone who's attending today will receive a recording of this webinar, and we'll also be giving you survey to fill out by email. We really would appreciate you taking the time to complete that survey so that we can get your feedback for our future digital learning programs as we're moving forward. Kayla, if you want to maybe close the poll and show our current distribution?

Kayla: Absolutely. That poll is now closed. We currently have 70% of attendees as administrators, 22.8% of our attendees are board members. We do not have any composers, 3.51% are conductors, 7.02% are musicians, and then we also have some presenters at 3.51%. We do not have any volunteers and we do have 14% that have said they are in the other category.

David: Great. Thank you so much, Kayla. Again, we are so excited to have a diversity of individuals from the field. Not surprising. Maybe we have majority of orchestra staff members but thrilled to have so many artistic leaders as well. Now we have the great pleasure to turn our webinar over to our presenter. Kayla, you can advance to the next slide. Again, the League is thrilled to be offering these webinars and it's very exciting for us to have Kay Suarez with us today. You can advance to the next slide, Kayla?

Kay is the executive director of the Equity in the Center, a new initiative launched through ProInspire that addresses a gap in philanthropic and nonprofit organizations' current diversity, equity, and inclusion practice. Kay has over two decades of management and consulting experience. Her focus on diversity, equity and inclusion was developed through support of emerging leaders in education reform, early childhood education policy, and social enterprise. Some of you may have seen Kay speak in Nashville at our conference last June. I recently had the pleasure to hear her speak last month at the Chamber of Music America Conference.

Because of her great expertise, not only in equity, diversity, and inclusion, but also experience with orchestra and the art field, we're so thrilled to have Kay joining us today. I will turn it over to you, Kay, and thank you all for being with us here and enjoy the seminar.

Kay Suarez: Thank you so much, David. I appreciate the gracious intro, and it's a real pleasure to be here this afternoon. Before we get started, we're going to actually do another poll to get a sense of where the group is in terms of their diversity, inclusion, and equity work. It would be helpful just for me to get a sense of who's in the room, but I often do this when I'm doing this in person.

If you could respond to the poll that's on the screen now and let us know where you are or where your organization is in its equity work, or your organization may call it diversity work. Are you just starting? Have you been added for a while? You've had some trainings on bias and structural racism and are shifting policies or do you have a more robust initiative, for example, that's supported by an external consultant and has a defined timeline of more than a year?

It looks like most people are in the beginning budget, which is totally normal for the conversations that I lead and for nonprofit organizations in general. Most organizations are just beginning to think about equity as I'm going to define it for the purpose of this workshop. We'll talk about definitions shortly. Most organizations talk about diversity, which is different than inclusion and different than equity, which we'll get to in a minute. It's helpful for me just to know where folks are in their work. It looks like a little more than half, about 60% of you are at the beginning stage, less than a quarter has been added at for a while and less than 20 had been focused on this for some time. Kayla, I think we can go ahead and close the poll. That was really helpful. Thank you for sharing. We can move on to the next slide.

As David mentioned, I'm not going to reread the description of who we are. We're a field-building initiative that focuses on supporting leaders and organizations in the social sector, nonprofit and philanthropic organizations and centering race equity in their organizational culture.

I came to this work primarily from management consulting. That's where I spent most of my career, but in my last role at a firm, I started focusing on leadership development for leaders of color and supporting organizations and thinking about how to shift their culture. That really was a turning point for me from moving from strategic planning to focusing exclusively on equity and what's particularly meaningful. I think I probably shared this at the CMA session. David mentioned last month and possibly last June in Nashville. Classical music is my personal passion and a great thing about being here today and being in classical music spaces is that I get to bring my personal passion and my professional practice together. I'm really grateful for the opportunity to speak to you all today.

Equity in the Center leads conversations like the one we're having today virtually and in person. We also host convenings where we bring together organizations' leaders and some of the leading trainers and practitioners in race equity so that organizations and leaders can connect with others at a similar point in their equity work and get support as well as a better understanding of the tools and resources and people, the human capital that's available to help organizations as they navigate this work.

Next slide, please. By the end of today-- We always like to touch base on results. You'll be introduced to a way to work building a race equity culture research and have a sense of how leaders can leverage the publication itself and the materials that are in it in their daily work with organizations. We'll highlight the key findings and talk a bit about the management and operational levers. There are seven of them that organizations can use to shift culture toward race equity.

I will point out here that the race equity cycle is an organizational framework and it's really designed to support organizations in explicitly talking about race with regard to organizational culture and how it connects to equity. I mentioned that because I know some of you are in organizations and some of you are not. It's still useful for folks who are outside of the organizations as a way of understanding this work broadly.

Also, if you're an individual, for example, a board member, it gives you a framework for understanding where the organization you serve or an organization you might be looking at to make a donation to or in other context to partner with, it can give you a sense of the indicators of this work so as you're engaging with organizations, you should see some of the characteristics that we're going to talk about today and how they talk about their work and how they engage with you and that would give you a sense of where the organization is in their equity journey and on the race equity cycle as we define it.

I'm going to encourage you as Kayla did to drop your questions into the chat box as you have them. What I'll do is pause periodically to review what's in the chat box as well as to pause and ask folks to drop additional questions in. I just ask that you bear with me as I try to balance presenting and reviewing what's in the chat box. I'll try to respond to questions as I go as much as I can.

Next slide, please. It's always helpful at the beginning of conversations about equity or diversity or inclusion, but equity is our focus today to pause and ground ourselves in definitions. One of the most challenging aspects of what most people refer to as the DEI work is that organizations and individuals don't pause and define what they mean by diversity, inclusion, and equity. As a result, organizations and teams can be part of initiatives that sometimes last years but no one involved in the initiative or no one's sitting around the table is actually talking about the same thing.

Building a Race Equity Culture in Classical Music Organizations 2-4-20

We always start with definitions so that for the purpose of this conversation, when I talk about equity, you know exactly what I mean. Race equity in society broadly would be achieved if we disaggregated all social outcomes indicators. Everything, all of our community and social organizations strive for around education and income, housing, criminal justice, health,

all of those outcomes, if we were to disaggregate them by race, there would be no disparity. Meaning that if I were a mother, I would be just as likely to die in childbirth regardless of my background. Women of all backgrounds would have the same rate of challenges in childbirth regardless of their background. Right now, race is the biggest driver of disparities across social indicators. That's why we center race and discussion of equity. Centering race doesn't mean that you don't talk about and explicitly integrate work on other identities but the reason we center race is because it's the biggest driver of disparities and outcomes. If we don't explicitly center it, people would prefer not to talk about it. It falls off at the table.

That's what I mean when I talk about race, equity, and society broadly. We're going to be talking about race equity inside of organizations. The way we define that is if you were to disaggregate all staff outcomes by race. Compensation, promotion, performance, staff engagement, the distribution of individuals by their background from the board to the most junior administrative position.

If you were to disaggregate all of that data by race, there would be no difference. Right now, there is quite a racial leadership gap as my colleagues at Building Movement Project call it in the social sector. We do encourage organizations as much as they can to disaggregate their data internally to identify where those disparities are.

Race equity lens or equity lens, it's a very trendy statement to us. People will often say, we're applying an equity lens or race equity lens to our work. The way that we define that is, at any point in your work, when you're making a hire, when you are raising a fund, when you're making decisions about grant dollars, when you're deciding with whom to partner, where to present, whether or not to launch a fellowship, you would pause and consider the potential disparate income of your decision or partnership or investment by race.

What makes it a little bit challenging for some folks to get their arms around is that it is a conditional. As we make decisions, what we've got to think about is who's not at the table or part of this decision-making process that might result in inadvertent disparities at the back end of our process. Many organizations will use a tool called a Racial Equity Impact Assessment, and we have examples of them on our website. **[unintelligible 00:13:35]** has one which many of my colleagues use. Organizations will build that tool into their internal processes to support staff in understanding where they need to pause and internal process to consider potential disparities so that they can manage away from them.

Lastly, race equity culture is what we're going to be talking about today. That's the term that we coined through our research. Essentially, we define it as an organization that is focused on mitigating risk-based disparities inside of the organization among their staff, with their partners, and their programming, as well as externally. In broader society, advocating among their peers for the adoption of policies that would mitigate disparities. I see there's a question which has been answered. All right, next slide.

It's always helpful to ground ourselves in data. I think a great thing about today is that the League published a wonderful study some years ago on racial and ethnic and gender diversity in the orchestra field, and I'm going to get to that in a minute. I want to start with the data that's on this slide because this is the data that illustrates the racial leadership gap I mentioned earlier.

The racial leader gap is a term that was coined by Building Movement Project. You can find a lot of the data I'm going to talk about here at a website called racetolead.org. The racial leadership gap, if you look at the graphic on the left-hand side of the slide, is the difference between the representation of people of color and the general working population and where they show up at the highest levels of social sector organizations, so as CEOs, as board chairs and board members. The gap is the difference between the bar on the right side and those to its left.

In many organizations, it's quite normal for folks of color to be concentrated in the mid to lower management positions and for organizations to "struggle" to find diverse board members. This is the gap that I'm talking about when I say racial leadership gap. The graphics on the middle and to the right of this slide speak to the reason that people often give for the gap's existence.

Sometimes leaders or organizations will say, "We've got folks of color on staff, but they're not interested in the top job." One thing that was interesting about Building Movement Project's research is that in the survey that underlies the research, they ask the question, "Do you want the top job at the organization where you work?" If you were a person of color, you were more likely to say yes. That's why this data point is important because it responds to a particular point of pushback that's often to justify the gap.

On the right side, this is a set of data that some people find surprising because the absence of people of color at the highest levels of the social sector, in the C Suite, in the board, or on the board reinforces the belief that people of color are not qualified for those positions. Often when we talk about the racial leadership gap or organizations difficulty in finding "diverse applicants for different roles", in this case, we're talking about musicians and arts administrators, that they can't find them. That we try but we can't find them.

In nonprofit organizations, and there were nonprofits as well as some for-profit organizations in Building Movement Project dataset, that was found to not be true. There is no statistical difference in the educational background the level of experience and qualifications of folks of color in the social sector and their white colleagues. In some cases, folks of color were actually over credentialed. If you desegregate the data, black women are the most educated subset of the data set. That's something that's been talked about outside of the social sector.

This data point is important because it speaks to a very commonly and deeply held belief that folks of color are not in positions of power or senior positions because they're not qualified for them, they don't have the education, the experience, people aren't able to find them when that's not the case. There are folks of color out there who have the background necessary for many of these positions but they're not getting them. That's why we share this data point.

I didn't put the data from the League study in a slide because I'm sure you all have read it, but it's important to highlight, and I'm sure everyone on the webinar is aware that there is a quite a difference between the representation of people of color and nonprofit organizations generally and then within the orchestral field specifically.

Gender diversity, there have been some significant strides made in that in recent decades. The use of screen was a big part of that. If you go back to the 70s, there's been a three or four-fold increase in the representation of non-white musicians and conductors as well as if you look at orchestras far less so with board members. It's still hovering at less than 20% in most cases. At the board level, 7.8% of orchestral board members are non-white with orchestra staff. You have 14.8% of folks of color with conductors and music directors at that 21%. Then there is some difference between representation in small orchestras versus large orchestras. Essentially, it's in the mid-teens. Representation of 13% folks of color at large orchestras and almost 15% at smaller ones. I just use that as a point of comparison to what orchestras look like versus what the social sector more broadly looks like.

I'm taking a moment to look at the questions. If someone had a question about people of color-- In this data set, people of color includes everyone who did not identify as white. Southeast Asians, Asians, Pacific Islanders, all those folks are included.

Okay, all right. Next slide, please. This is the race equity cycle. The way we arrived at this is over the period of about a year back in 2017. We met with 160 people who were inside of organizations that were actively working on inclusion and equity. We talked with them about what actually happens when you try to do this work inside of an organization.

When we began this work, the circle or cog, as a colleague of mine calls it, was actually a straight line that went from diversity to inclusion to equity. Over the course of about six months, it became the race equity cycle that you see now. It's important that it's a circle because this work is not linear. Organizations can enter or leave the race equity cycle at any point depending upon the context in their organization. A change in leadership, like a radical shift in funding, some sort of a crisis in the community. It's not a linear process. It was important that we reflected as a circle.

The other thing that we moved away from in our original thinking was the use of the term diversity, inclusion, and equity. I'm going to define them shortly. The use of the word diversity and the acronym DEI is often used as a check the box way to address diversity and the lack of ethnic diversity inside of organizations. Our research found that using that term actually doesn't connect to any progress on the issue because people will talk about diversity and doing DEI more so than taking the actions inside of organizations that generate progress on equity. We thought it was important to reframe diversity, inclusion, and equity as awake, woke, and work.

As diversity or as we call it awake stage inside of an organization. The work is very transactional and awake is where most organizations are. Some organizations are even what some of my colleagues call pre-awake. They're not reflective of the cycle. The organization hasn't really taken any action on this issue.

Diversity or awake means that the work inside of an organization is transactional. The organization is exclusively focused on trying to hire people of color and then counting the folks of color once they come on the team. What an organization's work would look like at this point is fellowships to attract folks of color, recruitment partnerships with affinity universities or professional associations to push opportunities out to folks of color. What the organization wouldn't be thinking about is the lived experience or the work experience of those individuals once they become part of the organization.

The work of diversity "at this stage of the work" is exclusively in human resources and discussed as a talent challenge versus a challenge related to structural racism and inequity and society more broadly.

I'm going to take a look at the question and see if there's anything. One important thing to note here is what DEI or equity is not. Diversity is not serving diverse populations. At the awake stage, an organization will frequently have partnerships with organizations or community-based organizations to push their job postings to more diverse applicants or they will talk about their organization's work on diversity or DEI in terms of the diversity of the communities that they serve.

For example, if your organization has an initiative like say music outreach program partnership with schools in your city that takes musicians from the symphony into the schools or brings the students into the concert hall, that is not equity work, that "diversity work" that's focused on serving people of color in what's a very charitable context versus focusing on the inclusion of people of color as equal members of society broadly and equal staff and employees inside of an organization.

The work is very nascent. There's a lot of talk about hiring folks of color, the number of people that have been hired, the number of them that have been retained. Most of the conversation is about finding or trying to find, unsuccessfully sourcing more diverse applicants, but no thought is given to what their experience is like inside of the organization or why folks of color have a higher rate of turnover inside of nonprofit organizations than their white colleagues do.

A great example of the difference between focusing on recruiting people of color versus retaining them is the use of fellowships. The League also has a great study on fellowships, which aligns with studies that have been done in other social sector organizations around fellowship and how successfully they drive an increase in diversity in organizations and in sectors. The belief is that the fellowships are not successful in retaining diverse candidates in a sector after their year or two years of participation in the fellowship.

There's a lot of great data in the League's report about why that is that speak to the difference between being focused on bringing a diverse person into an organization but then not giving any thought to what their experience is like. Some of the quotes that resonate from the reporter, from musicians who talk about sitting next to someone who was really explicit and clear about the fact that they didn't want them there and they don't think that they're qualified to play among the group.

That really is the difference between being focused on just pulling diverse folks into your organization versus transforming an organization's culture to be inclusive of all people, versus assuming that they'll assimilate to white dominant culture, versus transforming the organization's culture. I'm going to pause a minute and take a look at the questions. Okay. I don't think I have any I need to address right now.

Next, I'll move on to talking about the woke stage, which is what most people talk about as inclusion. Inclusion is the transition from what I was talking about earlier. So, from the focused-on recruiting folks of color to being focused on retaining them in the organization and building an organizational culture that is inclusive of the lived experiences of people of color, as equal to those of their white colleagues.

That's why I mentioned assimilation because in terms of assimilation in society and inside of an organization, the standard is white dominant or "normal American culture". There isn't a process within and in the organization to explicitly name that the lived experience of folks of color in their life generally outside of work and then inside of the organization and the practice of their craft is different than that of their white colleagues.

At the woke stage, you would see an organization being focused explicitly on retention, on understanding the lived experience of people inside of the organization and putting initiatives in place to ensure that people of color don't just work at their organization, that they feel like equal members of the team. They feel as if they belong there and their lived experience is valued inside of the organization.

Some of the characteristics that you'll see is organizations start having affinity groups for folks of color, as well as for white folks, to talk about race and racism. You'll see trainings on historical racism, structural racism. Organizations will start talking about the four levels at which oppression exists in society and connecting that to the work of building an inclusive and equitable culture inside of the organization. I'll just name the four levels quickly. We can come back to this later if someone has questions, but all isms, whether it's sexism, homophobia exists at four levels.

There's the personal or the internalized set of beliefs. On race, that would mean your personal beliefs about race and what it means in society. The next level is interpersonal. What that means is how your personal beliefs drive your behavior and interactions with other people. That's where micro-aggressions occur. People will make statements like they had to me about like, "You must be the first person in your family to go to college," things of that nature. Assuming a stereotype applies to a person based on their race or their phenotype.

The next level is institutional. That's most of what we're going to talk about as we move through the presentation. It's how our beliefs, our individual and collective beliefs about race are infused into institutional policy and process. One of the most common examples of how that shows up is the use of college degrees as a screen for the ability to get a very junior position. Another example is the use of unpaid internships as a requirement for getting your first job in a sector, which means that you had to be able to work for free to get your first job with a salary. Similar to the use of a college degree as a screen, it structurally excludes people who don't have financial access to those things. The biggest disparity there are around grades.

The last level, the fourth level is structural. What structural means is just how all of those levels, the personal, the interpersonal, the institutional, work together to form structural barriers for certain people, in this case, people who are not white,

to be excluded from society, and in this case, from opportunities, either in classical music or symphonies or in organizations, generally.

At this stage of the work, what organizations begin to talk about is that it is not the responsibility of people of color to educate their white colleagues. The example that I'll give here is often, and I've been in this position as a 'diversity hire', when an organization at the awake stage, for example, is focused on recruiting folks of color, when a person of color comes into a predominantly white organization, there is an implicit belief that that person is 'diversified'. They are supposed to answer questions and speak on behalf of a certain community, which puts a really big burden on them, and it's often difficult to manage.

At the woke stage where an organization is focused on inclusion, what the team organization would name is that it's not the responsibility of people of color to educate their white colleagues about their lived experience, or to help the organization do better on diversity, or in this case, inclusion or equity. That's where a learning journey generally starts, where an organization will start providing training on things like implicit bias, how it connects to structural racism and things of that nature. I'm going to pause and answer a question in the chat box.

I'll read the question because there was an earlier comment saying that everyone can't see them. The question is, is your framework focusing solely on race? If you're refraining from DEI, what about the individuals who make up other populations? Our framework explicitly focuses on race. As I go through this presentation in equity, in the center's work, we don't focus on supporting organizations in doing deep work on identities other than race. What we do, do is acknowledge the intersectionality of doing race equity work.

I mentioned earlier that we center race because it's the biggest driver of disparities in society. We keep it at the center of the conversation because, otherwise, people will not talk about it because it makes them uncomfortable. Centering race in a conversation about equity doesn't mean that we don't acknowledge all of these other identities, so the LGBTQ experience, the experience of folks with disabilities, gender, of course, but they're addressed in an intersectional manner. Centering race doesn't mean that you don't talk about those identities.

To be frank, if you're working with someone who is supporting you in a discussion or an initiative on issues that are specific to race, and they're not including very explicit conversations about how all those identities intersect with race, then they are not doing the work, as my most of my colleagues would define it, well. Centering race doesn't mean you exclude the discussion of and the significance of all other identities. When an organization is at the woke stage, for example, an organization that is working on inclusion with, for example, begin

initiating affinity groups around those other identities as well and address things at the same time as part of an overall initiative to address race equity.

I'm going to pause for a minute. I'm just trying to work through the questions. There's a question about, for organizations doing diversity-based education work, how can they build or supplement it to advance race equity. My recommendation would be to stop talking about diversity work. Because diversity is about literal variation and difference, and it is important to consider literal variation and difference around race, around disparities, because it is such a huge driver of disparities, but to reframe the work and the conversation about 'diversity' to equity, which is the outcome we're working toward.

As we go through the presentation, we'll talk about what the work looks like when you're focused on equity instead of diversity. The last phase of the race equity cycle, but I use last with a caveat, it's the last I'm going to describe but this is a circle and the work is not linear, is the work stage. That's what most people would define or talk about traditionally as equity.

Equity is above all else measurable. If you can't measure equity in your work, then it's probably not equity. What I mean by that is some of the examples I gave earlier. Around maternal mortality, infant mortality, the rate of criminal justice incarceration, the number-- The percentage of students graduating from high school, the percentage of students being admitted to college. There would be no disparities on any of those outcomes if equity were achieved.

When you talk about equity, you shouldn't be talking about we have X number of people of color working on our team or we have X number of people of color on our board or we serve a community that is predominantly black and brown, those are transactional indicators of diversity, but they are not equity indicators. Equity indicators would talk about closing a gap over time to drive equity broadly. At the work stage, organizations are explicitly focused on mitigating risk-based inequities inside of their organization and outside of their organization.

They're often taking a leadership role by forming task forces or coalitions, for lack of a better word, to push their colleagues to adopt similar equity policies inside of their organization and in their communities more broadly. An example of the type of coalition I'm talking about is like an organization like Enrich Chicago that brings together the arts community in Chicago explicitly around mitigating race-based inequities.

The elevator speech that I have around what an organization looks like at the work stage is that their internal organizational culture matches the language they use to talk about their mission externally. Most organizations have a diversity statement, and the work begins and ends with crafting that statement. An organization that is advanced in the work stage. In the work stage, what you

have is alignment between what people say about their values around inclusion and equity and the way they actually live those values inside of the organization.

An example I often give is because of the current political climate and various crises that have happened in the past few years, organizations are frequently called upon, though perhaps less though, in the classical music space, but very much so in the broader social sector space to make statements about things that are happening. What's happening at the border, et cetera.

What some of our partners say is that people inside of the organization will be part of an organization or have a conversation with us about how they feel when their CEO releases a statement in support of DREAMers or Black Lives Matter. When they're a member of that community and one, they were never consulted on what was in that statement and, as a member of that community, they feel "marginalized" inside of the organization. At the woke stage, what you have is an alignment between the organization's stage values and how they operate internally. I will pause there and take a look at the chat and encourage those of you if you haven't already to drop questions.

Kayla, who is helping us with administrating the webinar, Kayla, I'm going to ask for your help and ensuring that I am actually addressing all of the questions because it's a little bit hard to toggle between them in the screen.

Kayla: Absolutely, just let me know if there's questions you would like for me to read for you and I'd be happy to.

Kay: Okay, thanks. I've looked at the question from Ruhollah alias Reyes, and I'm going to go to the next question. If you could just help me make sure I don't miss anyone as I go down because I'm not actually able to see all of them, and I may have missed people ahead of them. It would be helpful for me if you could actually, I don't know if you can do this, if you could drop their questions into the presenter chat, it will make them easier for me to see. Apologies.

Kayla: Absolutely.

Kay: Deal with the technology. Thank you. Colby Gordon shared a question. Do you have thoughts on affinity groups versus DRGs or ERGs? Employee resource groups, that's another name for them. I think you're asking do I have data to this point tends to show in studying or over the past five to 10 years they've made an investment, but affinity groups don't necessarily-- Sorry, I dropped. I'm not able to totally see the rest of the question. I'm sorry. I think what the rest of your question probably says is that they don't work.

Over the past 5 or 10 years, they've made this investment, but the affinity groups don't necessarily yield any outcome. I apologize, but your question was actually cut off, so I can't see the rest. I would say that that's not surprising to me and

most organizations don't manage employee resource groups well. One thing that I'll say about race-based affinity groups is that it is important that they be offered for people of all backgrounds. Actually, that goes for across identities. Affinity groups and ERGs are not just for the people who hold the non-dominant identity.

Affinity spaces are designed and intended to be spaces where folks who share an identity can come together and talk about their experience of having that identity and in the case of the workplace, how it intersects with their experience, doing their work and interacting with colleagues. In that space, particularly around race, is important for white people and non-white people and for people of color of different backgrounds. Frequently, those of us who are of color are lumped together into one bucket when there are manifold cultures and ethnicities inside it and very variegated experiences driven by proximity to whiteness in terms of how races are stereotyped in more broad society. It's important to give people of different backgrounds faces to talk about that and outside of just the people of color bucket.

The short answer to why ERGs or affinity groups don't necessarily yield outcomes and I don't know what outcomes you might be thinking of, if it's a more diverse workforce or higher staff engagement numbers, is because people will use all organizations, use affinity groups, and ERGs as a box-checking exercise. We're doing work on inclusion or work on diversity because we've given certain people, members of certain communities or members of certain identity space to talk about their experience.

What they don't do then is use affinity groups or employee resource groups as part of an intentional process to transform their internal culture which would go far beyond the use of simply hosting affinity groups. It would include the cross-functional auditing of internal policy and processes to center equity. It would include an explicit learning agenda for people at every level of the organization from the board to the administrative staff outlining an arc of learning that aligns to the organization and goals around mitigating an equity inside of the organization and outside of it. I say the short answer as to why they don't work is because they are not used effectively as part of an equity initiative to transform culture to center equity.

I'm going to go and take another look at some of the questions that I have. Someone asked if based on my experience organizations also include volunteers and training. Yes. If an organization and there are lots of organizations that leverage volunteers, not just in the performing arts, but in the social sector, generally as staff people or as primary points of contact with patrons, for example, or volunteers, for example, who might be going into schools and getting music lessons, yes.

If you are working with a consultant as part of a well-designed equity initiative, when you think through what your stakeholders are and arts organizations have

fairly complex stakeholder relationships, all of those stakeholders, volunteers included, would be included in the learning agenda and be given opportunities to, for example, talk about and learn about implicit bias, talk about historical instructional racism, talk about how bias connects to institutional racism. We will get to some examples of organizations that have done well in this work.

One question, a really good one, is if equity is measurable, what are the measurements we would be using in the orchestra world. Tracking the percentage of people of color who are in symphony positions or playing in orchestras is not in and of itself a bad metric. I'm not saying that metrics around the number of diverse folks on your staff, they're not good ones to have, but what would be part of a, it would be one of a part of or a set of rather robust metrics that give you a broader sense of what equity looks like in an organization. For example, inside of an orchestra or orchestra organization, because if you disaggregate the data, you would be looking at these things for people who are members of the orchestra versus people who are members of the orchestra organization.

You would look at staff engagement. How engaged are individuals? How happy are they with the organization? Do they intend to stay there? You would also look at compensation. You would look at-- It's very common now to talk about pay equity around gender, which you essentially would look at as pay equity by race. Disaggregating by race, are there disparities and compensation? There are a number of equity audit tools that are available, I can share some of the follow-up and consultants can help you come up with a set of metrics that makes sense for tracking equity in your particular context. Essentially, what you would want to do is look at a robust set of staff indicators if you're looking at the organization that tell you where your culture is on equity. You would have indicators, very output-oriented indicators, for example, the number of policies you have audited and redesigned to center equity from HR to onboarding, to management, to board engagement. That's a relatively short answer, but I can share some resources and follow-up. Next slide, please.

What we're going to do now is walk through the senior leader's level. The senior leader's lever is one of seven that's part of the race equity cycle. What we did as part of the research is, we framed the overall Awake to Work to Work. We just talked about where the organization is in its work and then the levers represent sets of management and operational best practices that we identified through the research. There are clusters of tactics, actions, and characteristics that organizations demonstrated at different levels of the race equity cycle. What we're going to do is talk about the senior leader's lever and some characteristics at the Awake Work and Work stages. Then I'll share some brief case studies of organizations at each of those stages. I apologize, I'm not able to get through all of the questions, but I promise I'll come back at the end and make sure that I've heard as many of them as I can. Next slide, please.

One more time. Next one. All right. Thank you. At the senior leader's level, what we're going to do is talk about personal beliefs and behavior. At the personal and interpersonal level, we were talking about earlier in terms of the four levels at which we think about oppression away from this case. Policies and processes. The internal workings of the organization. This is where institutional racism shows up in terms of the four levels that we talked about layer and data this ties to the metrics that someone on the webinar asked about earlier. What are some of the outcomes that we'd be thinking about and how are we managing data as we think about equity? What you'll see as we go from awake to Work to Work is a deepening of each of the practices that you see on the slide.

From Awake to Work to Work, the work is moving from being transactional to transformative. Here at the Awake stage, senior leaders would believe that diverse representation is important. You can go back to the previous slide, please. Thanks. I believe diverse representation is important but don't feel comfortable discussing race which is very normal in American society. For policies and processes, the responsibility for creating and enforcing DIE policies would as I mentioned earlier, live in HR. We often talk about DDI initiatives as living and dying in HR among my colleagues.

For example, if you're in an organization and you start talking about diversity, if I were a senior leader and someone asked me what we're doing on diversity, I would give you pretty much exclusively HR examples, talent examples and then refer you to my HR colleague who could talk to you more about it because the work is not perceived to have any significance beyond recruitment.

Then in data, in terms of how the organization and senior leaders manage data at this stage, they have started to gather data about race-based disparities and the population that they serve, so they're local community, but they wouldn't have turned the mirror on themselves necessarily, to look at the disparities that exist in their own organization around race. Next slide, please.

At the Work stage, this is where you see leaders prioritizing an environment where different experiences and backgrounds are valued and seen as assets and the organization. This is the transition between having a focus on folks assimilating to a white dominant culture and an organization and being able to, I won't say bring their full selves to work, but not feel that they have to do what is called cover aspects of their identity that don't align to the dominant standard.

Deloitte has written a paper on covering which is something that we all do as people to hide certain aspects of our personalities or our lives that we think will be damaging to our reputation, in this case in a work context. I might think that people won't accept me because of some element of my ethnic background or my personal preferences. What people do is cover those aspects of their identities in the workplace. A senior leader at this stage would be helping to create an environment where people are with regard to their race and their ethnic

background, encouraged to share their lived experience outside of work and inside of work, and not to cover and assimilate, because that part of their identity is seen as valuable to the work of the organization and its ability to achieve its mission.

Policies and processes, leaders would evaluate hiring and advancement requirements that often ignore systemic inequities and reinforce a white dominant culture similar to what I talked about before with the requirement for an unpaid ensure internship experience or a college degree. I will pause here and say some of you may not have talked about or read about how white dominant culture is framed. In societies, I'll just share one resource on this. It's a paper by a woman called Tema T-E-M-A Okun O-K-U-N, and what she talks about is what white dominant culture looks like inside of organizations, how it shows up, and it's often with things like worship of the written word, fear of open conflict, but what we're talking about is really assimilation to the dominant culture standard of the work in this case.

At the world stage around data, we'd be starting to turn the mirror on to the organization internally and look at disparities in outcomes inside of the organization. Looking beyond the transactional, we have X number of people of color working here, looking at disparities in their pay and their promotion and their rates of retention, in their engagement. Moving beyond just thinking about data as highlighting data. Next slide, please.

Before I talk about the work stage here, I do want to answer a question that was asked. The person asked, it's not clear to me how the levers work across, for example, how does the senior leadership lever impact on the board of directors? The levers are not mutually exclusive. What I can do is go to a second lever, which I'll do more quickly and you'll see the alignment. Organizations do work across levers concurrently, what they generally do is prioritize work with the board, for example, or work with their C suite executives and senior leaders. The personal beliefs and behaviors policies and processes and data that I'm going to go through and that are outlined in more detail in the paper are not mutually exclusive across the levers. You address the work of equity cross-functionally, and the levers are essentially a cross-functional set of tools, or practices rather, and characteristics and actions that you can take to make progress on equity.

At the work stage, which is the most advanced stage, leaders will be modeling a responsibility to speak about race, dominant culture, how it shows up inside the organization and structural racism, in the community where you live and work as well as inside of the organization. In terms of policies and processes, leaders would demonstrate a willingness to review personal and organizational oppression, which is just essentially how isms show up inside of the organization, how the microaggressions play out, how do institutional policies and practices serve as barriers to entry, in this case, musicians.

In terms of data, the organization would be able to demonstrate through some longitudinal analysis, not just that they were, for example, serving more folks of color through their outreach program, but they had also increased the number of individuals of color working in their organization, the representation of individuals of color at all levels of their organization versus just at the junior level, and that the engagement level the compensation, as well as under other indicators around the experience of employees inside of an organization, an organizational culture that there had been a shift in there, in those over time. Often when you begin work on equity, the initial "outcomes are transactional". We did these trainings. This was the staff experience of the training. These are the skills that they gain. This is their feedback on their ability to actually practice the skills that they gained through training in their daily work. A certain number of policies and processes were evaluated and redesigned to center equity. It's a combination of staff engagement and cultural indicators. The experience of working at the organization and then a set of indicators around the steps that the organization is taking to transform its culture and center equity. Next slide, please. Sorry, I'm just taking a minute to look at the questions so I can try to address them as I go through example. Okay. Thanks for your patience. The example that I've given here are from just general organizations, not orchestra organizations that we work with because there weren't orchestra organizations that were part of our research. As I go through, I'll try to give examples from orchestra organizations. Someone else did ask a question about the need to include other stakeholders in this process. If you are co-presenting, people who are ticket takers, patrons, board members.

If you work with the consultant, organizations can't do this work without an external consultant. It doesn't mean that you can't do anything without the support of an external consultant, but to develop a cross-functional plan which integrates work across all of the levers, and intentional engagement with each of your stakeholder groups from the board to the senior staff, the middle-level staff, to junior staff, to volunteers, to people organizations with whom you co-present venues in which you hold events. The people who work in the box office, for example, all of those stakeholders would be reflected in an intentional plan to shift an organization's culture on equity. All of those stakeholders would to some extent be pulled into, for example, training to help shift their thinking on this.

I have never worked with organizations that have a more complex stakeholder network or stakeholder matrix than arts organizations, particularly arts presenters. What I encourage folks to think about if you're coming from an orchestra or a classical music organization is to start with your internal team. I find that often conversations among orchestral organizations default to how do we get more diverse musicians, or how do we get more diverse board members versus how do we change the culture of our organization.

If you change the culture of your organization overall, you would see a shift in the level of diversity among musicians, the level of diversity among the board. I

would encourage you to think about this as more robust than just hiring diverse individuals as or finding diverse individuals to be part of the orchestra, but think of this as a whole organization, a way of thinking about equity.

At the awake stage leadership or educational equity or LEE disaggregated program data to identify how many people of color participated in external leadership program, and this ties with a question someone asked, which is how do you pull? How do you manage youth engagement programs in such a way that you can build a pipeline for classical musicians over time? This is a very basic example, just keeping track of how many people of color come to your programs isn't a particularly robust example, but what's important about it is that they looked at the outcomes by race for their programs. In this case, they ran a candidate training seminar, people who are running for elected office.

I forget what the rate of success is, it's something like 7% overall. When they disaggregated the results of their participant's campaign by race, they found that white participants were elected at a rate of more than two to three times that of their participants of color. At a very early stage in their journey, they just looked at who was coming to our training.

As the work of all they thought about well did they ultimately achieve the outcome they were seeking in this case of the case elected office. Then what was the difference in the rate of election based on people's background? What they did as they shifted through the race equity cycle, through the world stage as they started to create programming that specifically addressed disparities and outcomes. What they decided to do ultimately was create a set of programs by community. There were trainings for folks from the Asian community, from folks from the Latin **[Ex 00:59:28]** community, from the African American community, tied to trying to get them elected for office.

Over time, over about a year and a half, they saw the rate of election of people of color actually exceed the national average. What started as a very basic indicator at the awake stage, led them to make shifts in their strategy so that ultimately, they can drive equity in the outcome which wasn't getting folks elected.

In orchestra context, if you're

thinking about executing partnerships with schools to identify people who have potential, relatively young say around middle school, what you would need to look at and I feel like there are orchestras who are beginning to do this with the Pathways Programs that have started in many cities, is ensuring that the students that are identified relatively early in their careers or at middle school have the support that they need to have the same outcome of children who traditionally have gone into pre-professional programs and where there are a lot of race disparities, that they had access to the same level of support, so that they can become part of the pipeline, in this case, orchestra position.

The next example I'll give from Lee is that as they were at the world stage, they set and communicated goals around DEI across programming. This is critical. They incorporated those goals into staff metrics. When I talk about equity as being solely the responsibility of HR, what happens as you move to the world stage is that an organization gives cross-functional accountability for shifting outcomes around equity to everyone who works in the organization. From the most senior level of the board to the senior-level executives on down to junior staff, their performance management plans, but include goals around equity. Generally, what you see is organizations have a learning goal. Staff members would participate in certain trainings or capacity building initiatives. Then you would expect on the back end to see a shift in whatever their particular set of metrics is, in their role. If they're the CEO and responsible for recruiting board members and engaging in partnership and driving the level of engagement, for example, among diverse board members, all of that will show up in their performance evaluation.

I am just pausing to take a look at the questions. Someone asked, what's the best course of action to take in order to motivate, push, or push forward a value proposition for them for board members, for example, or employees and leaders and organizations who take action on equity? This is a very common question in what I'll share and follow up is a link to a podcast conversation I had with a colleague on this. People, often in years, particularly at the board level, asking about the case for equity. How does this connect to mission? Does this have a financial upside? What's the return on investment?

There are a number of ways that you can think about it. There is the moral case, which is, it would just be the right thing to do but that's not how the conversation generally unfolds, particularly at the board level. My favorite data points to share with people who aren't convinced that this is something they should focus on is to give them examples from Mackenzie and Company which board members usually like. It comes from the for-profit sector. Mackenzie has now done two studies that demonstrate that diversity in terms of who

you staff in your organization around race, ethnicity, and gender, drive upside profitability. They've now published two studies on how they found that within their own work.

Another example that I share with usually board members and senior leaders around the case for equity, like the value proposition is a study by the Kellogg Foundation that came out in April of I think 2018 and it's called the business page for equity. What it does is quantify the cost of that an equity by social sector vertical, like education, housing. It doesn't quantify an equity for the performing arts or for classical music specifically, but that's a place to start, I would say, and I'll also share some resources in **[unintelligible 01:03:44]**. At the work stage at the senior leaders level, we initiated a coaching pilot for VPs as part of a year-long investment to shift management practice around equity.

This is often where diversity or inclusion initiatives fall short. There's a check the box approach to, Okay, well, let's hire more people of color. Like we have a partnership with a professional association from a certain community. We're doing X number of outreach programs in a community of color. That's how we're doing diversity or how we're beginning to do inclusion, for example, by pulling more of those folks into our organization and shifting our internal culture. What organizations don't think about is management practice. The reason that the race equity cycle has seven levers which represent cross-functional operations, is because equity inside of an organization in terms of the experience of inclusion of staff people really rests in their relationships with their managers and leaders.

Managers can really struggle with translating equity principles into their daily management practice like understanding how things like microaggressions, and implicit assumptions about people from certain communities show up in their interactions with folks of color, or in the institutional decisions, they make about who is worthy of investment or partnership. Coaching is a very effective strategy to doing that.

In terms of classical music organizations, I don't know many who have talked about it publicly, but I know a number of senior executives who have gotten coaching within the context of usually their leadership. Coaching relationship to think about how race and issues around microaggressions show up in their management practice. It's particularly effective because what folks don't often understand is that the word they use to talk to people and talk about people of color reflect in equity. Coaching is particularly effective. We recommend it quite a lot, particularly to senior leaders who are trying to figure out how to approach this work inside of their organizations and how to communicate with their teams about it. I'm going to pause for a minute and take a look at the questions.

Someone asked a question about would it be possible to begin this work at a granular level, like starting with customer service? I'm thinking perhaps that might be customer service in terms of relationships at the box office or at the venue with patrons. I would say I wouldn't frame beginning the work there. I would go back to what I said earlier of framing the work as focused on the organization overall.

If you're doing or launching a cross-functional initiative that focuses on equity, the people who are in those frontline customer service roles either at the house, during performances, or in the box office, dealing with ticket sales, they would be pulled into the workshops and the training that a consultant would support the organization and doing with all of its staff. I would advise against thinking of the beginning this work with customer service to the extent that customer service is external facing.

When we talk about organizational culture, it is the people inside of the organization. It's how people talk to and work with one another every day, that is

organizational culture. It's an institutional policy and process. I would say to start there. Start with the board, the senior leaders, the managers of the organization and begin to focus on shifting culture. What folks often don't understand is that if organizations had a race equity culture or an equity culture, if you're thinking about an intersectionality but in this case, we're talking specifically about race, initiatives like outreach, and in the philanthropic sector grantee engagement, wouldn't be necessary because the organization in terms of the people who work inside of it, the culture they created together, and the way they value people of all communities, like all humans equally, would show up in their organizational culture in practice.

It wouldn't be such a heavy lift to find a diverse board member or to manage interactions with patrons during performances, which often are the source of some pretty direct comments around race and other issues. Next slide, please.

We have a question about assessments. What I can do in follow up is share with David a long list of materials that we share with partners after we complete a webinar. You will see some links to potential assessments. I'll just share since I'm talking about it now. We do have a website. It's equityinthecenter.org and we have a blog so if you go to the website, you'll find a link to the blog. We have a two-part series called *So You Want to Hire an Equity Consultant*. Embedded in those two blog posts are a number of tools for assessments, not just for boards, but for organizations overall. Kayla and David, I've tried to work my way through as many of the questions as I could. If you feel like I've missed any, please let me know.

Otherwise, I will transition to the Board of Directors' level. Does that work? Let me know if there are any questions that I haven't covered.

Kayla: I believe you said most of them.

Kay: Okay, thank you. We always get lots of questions about a board of directors. Boards can be challenging because they are least proximate to issues of inequity, so you frequently get questions about why this is something that we need to focus on. Particularly if we, for example, have outreach programs, or pipeline programs, or we're part of a fellowship program that pulls diversity issues into the orchestra for a certain period of time. It is important as you think about the cross-functional elements of the levers that work with the board progress as much as possible in alignment with the work in the conversations that you have on race and equity with the staff. Often, the staff is beyond the board in terms of their journey on equity on to the extent to which they may have thought or talked about it inside of team meetings or just in their lives generally. As you think about engaging a board, you want to be conscious of where they are and bring them along as much as possible, but you do want to keep them in alignment with the other staff at the organization to the extent that the board is not surprised by the

depth or the explicit nature of staff conversations about race and equity. I'll share that before I dive in.

In terms of personal beliefs and behaviors and as I mentioned before it, you'll see how this is connected to the senior leaders' lever. We're essentially looking at the same sets of personal beliefs and behaviors and policies and data, but how they manifest with a different stakeholder group. Boards of directors not comfortable discussing issues of race at the board level, but what they will be comfortable talking about is generally the need for more diverse board members. Though usually, the party line is that they can't be so comfortable talking about it in terms of we should get more diverse folks on the board. We should be in group engaged with diverse communities from an outreach or an education perspective, but not turning the mirror on themselves and looking at how they function as a group and speaking explicitly about their experiences with race. At the data side, they've got a limited understanding of race-based disparities in the populations that they serve. They may know that their outreach programs that serve a certain part of town or pulling kids from a certain school or send orchestra members to certain neighborhoods or certain schools.

I know I've worked with some partners that have performances in outreach neighborhoods. They may be at a high level familiar with some of that work, but don't really understand how race is driving disparities in the city where you're based or specifically in terms of the programs that you deliver. Next slide please.

At the woke stage and I apologize; I'm just pausing to try and keep track of the question. At the woke lever here you would have or at the woke stage rather you have board members who are part of creating and sustaining practices that foster an inclusive environment within the board and encourages and values differing viewpoints in decision-making processes. This is where we train the mirror from. This is about our external engagement with communities too. This is about how we as board members work together and about how our broader team the senior staff and everyone else the shared norms, vision, values and policies that we have around inclusion and equity.

In terms of policies and procedures, you'd evaluate board member requirements that it ignores systemic racial inequities and reinforce dominant culture such as minimum donation amounts and conventionally prestigious backgrounds. What I will say here is that having board members write large checks is a very standard and, in some cases, depending upon your financial stability, critical element of board participation. This recommendation is not meant to belittle that or to play down the significance of individual donors. We're board members in particular play in an organization's annual budget, but what we're trying to do is encourage organizations to consider that the lack of diversity on the one hand and inclusion and equity on the other is tied to the fact that people who are not wealthy are systematically excluded from the board table, from board seats. If you were to shift, excuse me, donation requirements or create, for example, board seats that

some of the partners I've worked with have that don't require a \$20,000 donation, the board of directors would start to look different in terms of the people that would be on it. In terms of driving inclusion among the board, the policies and procedures and how they work together would become more inclusive. As a board member who's been in predominantly whiteboards, there is often a disparity between the level of enthusiasm. You see what people welcoming into that space as a board member, and then the experience of being in the space, so the number of microaggressions, et cetera, that happen in board meetings and in conversation. That's why I mean when I talked about inclusion, it's not that you're trying to bring people, you're not just bringing people to the table, you're creating an environment where they feel that they are equal participants and equally valued.

At the data stage up will give the analyzing and disaggregating as I keep saying data so look at the root causes of disparities that impact the organization's programs and the populations that they serve. This ties to something we talked about earlier around creating pathways or pipeline programs for young musicians. When I talked about what you would do is identify your set of young musicians with potential and then identify the disparities in their community or school environment that are structurally preventing them from getting into the pipeline to pre-professional music program and ultimately into an orchestra. If you analyze your data in this way, so looking at the root causes, looking at the music training programs, the resources in certain communities, where are their gaps, what an organization would do and what a board with support an organization and doing is creating a system of support that fill those gaps so that students who traditionally have been excluded from the pipeline can become part of it and supported in, getting on a path that would ultimately lead them to a 10-year orchestra position. Next slide, please.

Sorry, I'm just pausing to try to get through the question. Thanks for the good feedback. I hope this is helpful. It's always a little bit hard when you can't hear people. Last slide will cover it here in terms of the cycle for Board of Directors, as personal beliefs and behaviors that the state use, you would see board members taking leadership on this issue. Often as organizations move to this work, a board committee on equity will be established. What you see here is members of the board being proactive in driving change on equity, not just in their stakeholder group, but across the organization, and really actively articulating the need to eliminate bias and disparate treatment.

The way I've seen this showed up, show up in board meetings of orchestras and performing arts organizations as well as social or social sector organizations generally, is as new opportunities arise or as you go through the business of a board meeting, for example, board members begin to apply what I talked about earlier as a race equity lens. An example from a board meeting I was in recently is, I think the ED introduced with a new educational outreach program.

One of the board members asked, "Well have you thought about potential inequity that this program could drive?" I don't know where they ultimately landed when they use the race equity impact analysis of that particular decision, but that's what you're looking for. You're looking for board members, just like you're looking for your senior leaders and your staff members to begin to consider as they go about the work of governance and all the other things board members are called upon to do to apply a race equity lens or an equity lens intersectional context to the work of being a board member and to support the organization and threading that lens from the board all the way down to the most administrative staff person and volunteers.

For policies and processes, board members would show a willingness to review personal and organizational oppression and have the tools to analyze their contribution to structural racism. What I will pause here and say is that we are all contributors to structural racism. Whether you're white, whether you're a person of color, just like in the system of patriarchy, women carry the water for the patriarchy and contribute to the perpetuation of the patriarchy. Structural racism is not just about white people and the behavior of white people, it is about culture that we share in this country. We're talking about America specifically, but colonialism is global.

When we talk about revealing personal and organizational oppression, we're not talking about white people per se, we're talking about white dominant culture and structural racism, and these are things that all of us share and all of us play a role in. One thing that you look for you begin to see not just with board members at the work stage, and you can sometimes see this at the world stage as well, but with senior leaders is that you begin to name as a leader, your privilege and your role and upholding a system that excludes other people. I know for me personally and doing this work, I came to it because I had to think long and hard about my own privilege and how many things, I took for granted. That's some of the behavior that you will start to see here not to the board members, but with senior leaders and staff.

Data here since the board is ultimately responsible for evaluating the performance of the ED, one thing that we flagged is that holding the CEO accountable for all measures related to performance on equity and ensuring that the financial resources to support the work are in place. This ties to something I said earlier that equity outcome and indicators would be threaded from the CEOs performance management plan, all the way down to the most junior staffer, and for organizations that are advanced in terms of how they manage the performance of their board, in the performance goals for the board and some boards do you have them. Next slide, please.

I'm going to pause for a minute here and answer a question that comes up a lot. A mile chamber music in orchestral organizations and that's the issue of media, which aggregate question is, are rooted in a history of segregation and exclusion.

Yes. One of the many complexities of doing this work in an orchestra context is the existence of unions, and the limiting nature of contracts and what you can ask musicians to do. I'll share just my general response to this question and where I've seen some colleagues have success. I am going to keep going back to thinking about equity and the work that you do on equity at being about more than just your musician.

The lack of diversity in orchestras is stark and it's shameful. It's something that we should all be working on, but when you think about equity, it's important to think about musicians as members of an orchestra organization overall. You have greater latitude with your other staff in terms of getting them to come to training. What you would need to do in terms of thinking about how to engage members of an orchestra, it's similar to how we encourage many people to think about engaging members of the board who are not proximate to the day to day work of the organization or to issues of inequity. Being really intentional about reaching out to musicians who care about this work, and in orchestras and organizations, generally, that generally is going to fall to the musician of color, who might be a member of your orchestra.

Also, folks who are not of color who believe for whatever reason personally in this work, and initiate a campaign similar to what we've seen, be successful with boards of reaching out to people personally and trying to pull them into some of the trainings that you can hold or the conversations that you can hold with the broader organization and ensure that all those other people are there and come up with a very explicit and intentional strategy to engage musicians that leverages relationships because changing a contract is something that is going to take years.

Like I've worked with people who are like, well, we can do this training or have this a week to work session, no musicians will come. They won't come because they don't have to, because it's not in their contract, but what you can do is reach out to musicians intentionally and try to pull them in leverage relationships to try to cultivate champion so that over time, you can make the case to musicians, and hopefully, over time, shift the language in the contract so that it would align with some of your equity work, meaning that they would have to participate.

Short answer is, I would say focus on the organization overall, develop an intentional strategy to develop relationships with musicians who care about equity and use them to influence their peers. Changing a contract will take years, but I have seen some colleagues be successful and getting musicians who don't have to come to conversations about equity and then to go back to their musician colleague and talk about it with them.

We only have about three minutes left. I'm just going to give a couple of quick examples from the slide. This is an organization that focuses on pulling folks from underrepresented communities into initially it was tech position. I think the way

that they think about their work and equity or the actions that they took online, the classical music is that it's a core model, going back to the issue of pipeline. One thing that they did and I'm going to jump ahead from awake and go a little bit deeper is they started pulling alumni from the program. The corollary in the orchestra world would be individuals who have gone through some outreach program that landed them in the pre-professional pipeline and hoping that hopefully ultimately at a conservatory, pulling those individuals into the board to begin to shift the culture of the board and drive conversations that will cultivate equity within the group of board of directors within the group of members as well as the organization overall. My clock says 2:28, so I'm going to stop and ask David if you wanted to give some final words while I take a look at the few remaining questions that we have.

James: This is James from the league, David stepped away--

Kay: All right. Hi?

James: -- but thankful to say, thank you so much, Kay for this wonderful webinar. Hopefully, you join us for our other digital learning offerings which are coming up, so please keep an eye out for those communications in the coming weeks.

Kay: I will say in response to a couple of the questions that I'll share and follow up some materials that can be used to shift the thinking or make the case to senior leaders.

A couple of folks asked questions about how do you get employees and staff who are not on board along, so I'll share some resources. The other question that was asked is, can this work be used as a reason to ask them to leave the organization. This is important because it comes up a lot, board members who don't support the work will often ask whether or not they will be allowed though being a board member as a volunteer to stay and staff. People will sometimes ask the same questions.

Over the course of doing equity work, whether its race equity or intersectional equity, members of your team will leave, members of your board will sometimes leave. That happens when you're fairly advanced in the work and it is a normal part of the work. Some people don't believe in this. If your organization about your equity values that don't align to there's some of them choose to leave.

As you integrate equity outcomes and indicators into your performance management plan, organizations can ask people to leave, if they don't share those equity values, demonstrate those equity values in a measurable way, and if they're not working on increasing their competency to practice management with equity values and practice. I will leave it there, I think it's 2:31.

Kayla: Great and James and team do you have any closing remarks?

James: We don't. Thank you so much to Kay and thank you all for joining us.

Kay: Thank you for having me. I hope it was helpful.

Kayla: That concludes today's webinar. Thank you for your participation and have a great day.