INTERNAL SCAN FINDINGS 2020

# Staff Racial Equity and Inclusion Competency Survey Findings

On **June 9, 2020** we administered our **fourth annual** Racial Equity and Inclusion competency survey to all staff to reflect on their individual competency as related to understanding and advancing racial equity. The survey was originally designed by Hafizah Omar, with feedback and input from Nadia Owusu and Ratna Gill. The questions from this survey were adapted from ***GARE’s Employee Survey for Local Governments, D5 initiative’s Field Survey,*** and additional best practices from the field. This will be the third year that we have collected demographic data. The past two years we added questions that speak to our racial equity competency framework and questions on risk-taking.

With 34 respondents, we had 100% participation in the survey, however at least two respondents chose to skip all of the questions.

The survey results were analyzed by the CORE (Colleagues Operationalizing Racial Equity) team: **Joanna Carrasco, Hafizah Omar, Chipo Sachirarwe, Alyssa Smaldino and Ellen Ward.** We had the following overarching takeaways:

* In comparison from past years, we saw that staff were more willing and have more language to name tensions that they’re holding as well as dissonances they are seeing within the organization. Many of the dissonances named are a direct result of how adding elements of pro-Black culture without actively dismantling white supremacy culture is insufficient to grow an organizational culture that is pro-Black.
* Staff have grown in their analysis reflected by more nuanced language in what they are asking of leadership, specifically the Resources and Results (R&R) team of eight senior leaders. There is a lot of alignment in what staff are naming and asking of leadership, particularly as it relates to power.
* Last year, staff reported deepened understanding of interpersonal, institutional and structural racism. This year, we saw even deeper analysis and interrogation on what it might take to address the different levels of racism and how much they are interconnected. At the same time, staff felt the tools they have for addressing racism within the organization are insufficient.

**Additional Context: COVID-19 Pandemic and Uprising for Black Lives**

In light of the COVID-19 pandemic and the uprising after George Floyd’s murder, there were some changes in organizational policies based on staff input and feedback. In addition to that, the CORE team decided to pause our curriculum offerings in the summer and focus on healing spaces and CORE team members talked to Black colleagues to understand what they might need in this current moment and beyond. CORE acknowledges that in our organizational racial equity journey and history, there have been times that Black colleagues’ needs have not been prioritized and therefore conversations around addressing anti-Blackness might have led to more harm. We also know that the support needed is beyond this moment, and that it is an ongoing process and practice to shift our culture. We wanted to share a summary from different conversations we’ve had and feedback we got from staff:

* Invest in conflict resolution for all staff, and create pathways for staff to be able to address conflict with each other
* Work with HR/Talent to align staff around organizational culture and understand what it will take to shift culture towards a pro-Black organizational culture
* Be transparent on R&R internal power sharing and where R&R is as a leadership body towards moving Living Cities to becoming a pro-Black organization
* Be transparent on career trajectory for staff, particularly Black staff to grow in their ideal roles, and possibly into senior leadership.
* Share the plan for the new compensation study with a racial equity lens.

Much of this is also reflected in the survey results, as well as the summary of REI audits from project teams and the CORE team year-end scorecard. We want to acknowledge the patterns and repeated requests from staff, and demand for bold steps from leadership.

# Staff REI Competency Building and Practice

Staff continues to be engaged in racial equity trainings either through Living Cities or professional development

It has been three years since all Living Cities staff were required to attend anti-racism training, and since then we have maintained the requirement to attend a two-day training within six months of employment. In addition, staff continue to actively seek opportunities to build and deepen their competency training. These external trainings range from competency building to trainings that center healing, creativity and conflict transformation.

A list of the trainings that staff have recommended is provided at the end of the document.

There is also an increase in staff who have taken time to read, attend workshops, watch films and educate themselves about how people of color experience this country and how they might advance racial equity in their current position.

2018 also saw the launch of Living Cities’ competency framework which included [the Racial Equity Competency Framework.](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1BzN8-TeWbPv3KD-knAylPTKvA9jWQgoj/view?usp=sharing) This competency framework has helped the CORE team to understand how trainings and opportunities offered at Living Cities can support in building these competencies.

There is acknowledgement of CORE team growth in providing internal curriculum, and also a couple comments that highlight the need for external trainers or facilitators for CORE curriculum offerings.

From the survey, we found that the CORE activities that staff have found most impactful are:

1. Employee Resource Groups (ERGs) (same as last year)
2. Timeout Tuesday facilitated conversations
3. CORE curriculum workshops
4. REI audit

Highlighted comments:

“My ERG has been a great space to challenge my thinking and analysis by understanding how others in a shared identity are applying REI in their work”

\*\*

“Completing the REI Project Audit was a really challenging but helpful conversation in my teams. However, now completing our end of year reports, I’m wishing that I’d pushed my teams to use that document and more formally go back to REI audit throughout the year, not just at the end.”

\*\*

Staff continue to be active in advancing racial equity in their project teams



96.88% (increase from 91.43% last year) of staff reported taking concrete actions to increase equity in their team processes and infrastructure and 96.87% of staff reported being actively involved in advancing racial equity in their projects and teams.

It’s time to revisit the Racial Equity Assessment Tool and the principles behind it

For the past four years, we have asked the question around usage of the Racial Equity Assessment (REIA) Tool, and while there has been increased use, there are still some questions around the tool and its purpose. The CORE team will take this into account as we are building our curriculum to include a refresher of the tool and highlight some examples from teams who use it regularly and those who have adapted the tool for their own teams.

Staff also named other tools that they use, which include: Weaving a World without Violence, Power mapping and field of play, REI diagnostic tool, and meditation. A full list of racial equity tools that staff have used is at the end of the document.

Highlighted comments:

“On my teams we’ve used check-in questions to center humanity and used norms to keep us centered on REI. And we’ve used norms in the ongoing work of the team, like naming when a decision is being made or deferred.”

\*\*

 *“I’ve intentionally sought to use team budgets resources on external partnerships with POC-owned firms due to team REI pauses”*

\*\*

 “I don’t like the REIA tool but I do like the ones that each team has modified for their work. It’s easy to “check the box” with REIA tool”

There is an upward trend in staff competency in understanding in interpersonal, institutional and structural racism: close to 100% on all categories (both strongly agree and agree). Staff also reflected on what tools they would need to address structural, institutional and individual racism in the comments section:

**Institutional racism**:

One comment highlighted that the process of examining institutional racism might be felt differently by co-workers of color. Several respondents also brought up the limits of analysis without connecting it to accountability, and the importance of leadership’s role in actually addressing institutional racism. Staff named that while they are able to identify how institutional racism shows up at Living Cities through policies and practices that disadvantage people of color, they may not have the tools to address them without leadership. There is also confusion on what the formal structures are in place to address institutional racism.

Highlighted comments:

“The tool I have to address institutional racism is “naming it” by raising concern to colleagues who have more positional power than I, submitting anonymous feedback to R&R or through this annual survey… I felt I took a risk by naming something, and then I am not connected to the follow-up conversations/decisions where it is addressed, because they take place behind closed doors”

*\*\**

*“After being at Living Cities for many years, I think it’s time for us to center ending institutional racism at Living Cities. We spend a lot of time focused on the individual and how we impact/are impacted by racism. But there have been many, many things raised repeatedly about how LC can become a pro-Black organization. Why aren’t we making those changes? What is preventing people in power from implementing the things we know we need to do?”*

*\*\**

“Have appreciated trainings on identifying and interrupting microaggressions, changes over time to the way competencies are valued and annual reviews are done, focus on shifting our board, new procurement policy, evolving ways of centering humanity and recognizing different ways of knowing and engaging”

**Interpersonal racism:** Last year, staff expressed a desire for more tools and space to practice (role play was brought up in one comment, and a request for a guide in another). In response to this the CORE team included in our FY20 curriculum workshops resources on interrupting violence and accountability. From this year’s survey, several respondents named that the interrupting violence training had been helpful. However, there still needs to be a structure in place when one-on-one conversations fail, when calling in senior leaders without fear of consequences and more support on moving through conflict at the organizational level.

**Highlighted comments:**

“…I think we need to start pushing ourselves to have the hard conversations about the system in which we operate and the disproportionate harm that some of our policies, culture and operations have on POC.”

*\*\**

*“I have the tools to address some instances of interpersonal racism with some staff, but do not feel equipped to do so with senior leaders without fear of consequences.*

*\*\**

“I don’t know who I would go to if one-on-one conversations didn’t work, especially if I was looking for support to work through an accountability process in a non-punitive framework.”

**Structural racism:** As in last year’s survey, the question of how we might address structural inequities that are present at Living Cities (i.e how our institutional policies and practices consider structural impacts on our staff of color) came up. There is also a stronger structural analysis based on the comments this year, as staff are connecting our programmatic work towards structural change and the internal changes that need to happen in our own institution.

**Highlighted comments:**

“To address structural racism, it means that we have to actively look at our strategies and have a clear understanding whether or not it is addressing structural racism”

*\*\**

*“The CORE curriculum that connected tools for organizing with anti-racist principles were really valuable in helping me build tools/competencies to address structural racism”*

*\*\**

“One example that comes to mind is the pay disparity at Living Cities – even though there are not disparities within salary bands, my understanding is that there are significant broadly, and those who hold roles that are structurally underpaid (administrative, for example) are mostly Black women at Living Cities.”

While our tolerance for racial equity conversations and taking risks has increased, the CORE team wanted to understand whether talking about race is still perceived as a risky thing to do at Living Cities, and if staff felt that taking that risk has made any difference.

100% of staff continue to believe that it is valuable to talk about race and its impact on our work and the majority of staff are comfortable talking about race when others talk about race. (compared to 30% strongly agree in 2017). 91% of staff have set aside their own discomfort and fear of saying the wrong thing when talking about race at work.

27.59% of respondents report that it has seldom made a difference when they have risked their reputation to talk about race. 17.24% of respondents felt that it doesn’t make a difference at all. Perception of risk (aggregating often, sometimes and seldom) has increased by 6.24 point and there is a 16-point increase in respondents answering “often” in terms of feeling risk.



This data, along with comments that staff have left below signals a sense of defeat from staff in trying to push for some internal changes. This might also be connected to a comment that mentioned increased risk following the layoffs last year.

***Highlighted Comments***

“In some cases, when I offer ideas, observations, the burden of proof feels heavy. I’m asked for definitions and proof that is readily available in the world.”

\*\*

It depends on who I’ve talked to about race at Living Cities. True and candid conversations among peers don’t make a difference.”

\*\*

After raising the same issues of institutional inequities for many years, I am getting to the point where I don’t think much, if anything will change.

***There is a call to leadership to take bold action on addressing things that have come up multiple times.***

# Institutional commitment to racial equity and our results

Last year (FY19), our survey results surfaced some fundamental questions about our work with regard to moving towards pro-Blackness and our tensions of working within capitalism, while at the same time, understanding how capitalism and racism are inextricably linked. While this is an ongoing conversation at Living Cities, the survey results and comments indicate that staff have an increased understanding of what a pro-Black organization could look like, and what Living Cities can work towards.

Staff continue to feel that Living Cities is committed to racial equity and are taking steps towards reducing inequities both at Living Cities and in general. However, staff feel that there are bolder, more radical steps we can take.

Generally, staff perceived leadership at Living Cities as committed to racial equity and the results remain largely the same as last year. However, there continue to be reservations about R&R collective competency around racial equity and limitations of the shared leadership model as well as a call for more intentional transparency on R&R processes.

***Highlighted comments:***

 “Some moments come to mind where leadership has expressed staff should not to continue to bring up concerns like after the layoffs, compensation race analysis results seemed very surface, and not a lot of safe space to reconcile harms”

\*\*

I say strongly agree but I think leadership could do better in terms of what those conversations are about. Are we going to talk about policing? Are we going to talk meaningfully about reparations? Is there room to interrogate our focus on entrepreneurship given the fact that not all POC want to be entrepreneurs? Are we going to talk about what we do when the mayors we work with are complicit in Black death? Are we going to talk about what our stance is on City budgets? Are we willing to discuss the ways banks are blocking Black people from COVID-19 recovery?

\*\*

Is all of Living Cities leadership in an ERG or accountability partnership? Living Cities Leadership participates in conversations at all staffs but at times it seems like an obligation rather than a voluntary commitment

\*\*

Seem to personalize a lot of feedback and or top down decisions across too many spaces, devaluing/reauthorizing or staff or team leads, or avoid conflict rather than acknowledge and work through it

\*\*

I think I need a definition of "bold". In the beginning, I thought establishing a shared leadership was bold but now that we're a few years into that structure, what is the next frontier that leadership is looking for? If R&R can articulate what they consider bold steps to reduce institutional racism then I can better answer this question.

\*\*

“I wish we had more opportunities to understand what shared leadership and shared power looks like among R&R and the subcommittees.”

# Institutional REI policy and practice

Staff appreciated policy and practice changes due to COVID-19

There was good feedback from staff comments on the impact of the internal racial equity and culture building work in light of COVID-19 and the uprisings. At the same time, there are still some structural issues that staff brought up in terms of inequitable application of policies, advancement and workload, which made some of the COVID-19 policies still inequitably applied.

**Highlighted comments:**

I think the decision to have summer Fridays has helped staff deal with the multiple anxieties and the sense of loss created by a "chain" of crises that disproportionally impacted BIPOC. However, I think not everyone at LC has the opportunity to block half of their Fridays off. Folks at F&A and CNM (who are mostly people of color) manage/hold external deadlines that have remained unchained and prevent them from taking advantage of the summer Fridays policy.

\*\*

In light of COVID and the uprisings across the country, I can definitely see the impact of the culture building that we have done as an organization- informed by our individual competency building- and what a huge difference that makes in terms of how we've responded. Our policies around having a day for grieving, summer hours on Fridays, reducing call times, getting home offices set up, etc. - and the fact that they were guided by staff feedback and input demonstrate that we're committed to centering each others' humanity.

As in the past four years, an inconsistent and sometimes inequitable application of policies and practices remains a challenge, as well as questions about advancement at Living Cities.

Across the four years of our survey results, the inequitable application of telecommuting, professional development and PTO has been brought up several times. This year one comment mentioned colleagues struggling with the current family leave policy. Several comments noted that there have been many instances of inequitable application of telework policy (i.e who is allowed to benefit from the policy) and professional development policies and in light of COVID-19 when everybody is working from home (with minimal problems), it shows that this should not have been the case.

Staff comments on Q32 (Living Cities creates an environment where everyone has equal

opportunities to advance.) indicate that there is still a demand for clarity on pathways to advancement for staff at Living Cities.

This year, staff also brought up how Living Cities performance management system could contribute to inequitable outcomes. Staff are looking for a performance management system that centers humanity and allows for non-punitive accountability, as well as a system that does not depend on a manager’s discretion to advocate for someone.

From staff comments, these are themes that surfaced regarding pathways for advancement and compensation system at Living Cities:

* Market/race-neutral approach to compensation system contributes to inequitable outcomes of staff of color. Race-neutral benefits might also be a missed opportunity to advance equity internally for Black staff specifically or practice reparations.
* White supremacy culture still lives and breathes in our understanding of power, hierarchies and can show up as paternalism
* Managers have disparate power to advocate for staff promotion, raises and higher-level work assignments
* Role descriptions feel arbitrary and unclear if they correspond with salary bands.
* Staff of color asked to take additional roles without compensation.

# Our Vision

Staff Vision for Living Cities’ work in Racial Equity

23 people (or 67% of staffers) responded to the question, *in your own words, what do you think a focus on racial equity and inclusion should mean for our mission and how we work? What should we do more / less of? What would we need to change?*

* **Choose cities with large populations of Black people** to see how ecosystem players work to solve for anti-Blackness
* Continue to **push our board to use their power and take risks** for more equitable future.
* Bravely **testing new, imaginative, operational processe**s that increase transparency and collaboration
* Create space for people to share what they're learning in professional development and other outside-of-work spaces
* Reflect on purpose of meetings**, who is it serving, what decisions are being made**
* Reflect on **how hierarchical culture contribute to distrust.**
* Work **intentionally on antidotes of white supremacist culture**. leadership needs to reflect deeply on whether or not they want to have an organizational culture that defies white supremacy culture, because that will require power shift, and being invested in non-hierarchical ways of valuing people's labor.
* **Be bold and explicitly name Black.** What are some internal policies that can support Black colleagues to be more economically advantaged?
* Ongoing self-reflection at person, role, system level toward undoing racism. We should have more conversations about the systems and institutions that intersect with our work, about power, and about vision for the cities we work on. A barrier might be that leadership is not ready to really confront the harms caused by those systems and institutions and are more comfortable talking about reforms. **Is there space to push ourselves?**
* Do more **principled work that is adaptive.**
* Invest in **conflict, conflict resolution and restorative justice.**
* Continue **interrogating capitalism.** there is a tension between interrogating our own role in perpetuating racist practices and systems and deepening our research around/contributions to the capital systems. I think we should start having the conversations about LC's take on the current version of capitalism and the possibility of being perceived as an organization that pushes for reimagination on the public sector front but accepts harm reduction on the capital strategy.

In the spirit of re-imagination, staff also shared what an anti-racist institution could look like:

* Freedom to do work with people in places without being forced in models that aren’t suitable for what we imagine
* People are paid based on what they need to thrive, regardless of their role and how that role is typically compensated in the non-profit industrial complex/ capitalism
* People are doing roles and taking on activities that they love and want to grow in. Individual contributions **are recognized and valued without comparison**.
* Everyone is aligned on what's happening in the organization because we have an intranet that allows for transparency, collaboration, nimble adaptations
* We have a culture of accountable community where everyone holds a norm of naming conflict when it arises (48-hr rule!?), engaging in difficult conversation, and transforming the conflict into deeper relationship. deep love and commitment to one another that enables people to work through conflict and ask for forgiveness/extend grace in a way that acknowledges our shared fate/freedom
* Far more listening to community organizers and residents, working to understand vision and demands, and following their lead.
* Black-led – young Black organizers as board members with explicit power, without minimum donation requirements.
* Power is shifted more consistently and accountability for power held by a broader collective body.
* Less exhaustion and more care. Black colleagues’ needs prioritized, and perspectives heeded.
* Living Cities truly embodies shared leadership -- internally and in the way we engage with partners, cities, community.
* Our Board to go from understanding the fact that they serve antiracist org to engaging in a meaningful process of reimagining their institutions and the overall collaborative.

# Implications for our work

For CORE:

* Shape curriculum towards living in reimagination and towards Black futures, while continuing to work on history and how we all relate the systems of oppression. We want to make sure that we can support Black staff through sense of fatigue, especially in a moment where there is much less boundaries between work/home space.
* Support White and non-Black POC affinity spaces towards action in solidarity
* Support conversations with Project Leads to figure out how to balance different priorities as we think about working towards less productivity
* Support and foster a culture in which Operations, Finance & Accounting teams’ labor is seen and valued

All Staff

* Continue to participate in our REI internal activities (ERGs, coaching, staff discussions etc.) and work to apply lessons learned to our work
* Share examples with CORE and LSR team on how you are operationalizing racial equity in your teams
* Support each other
* Continue to give feedback to R&R, CORE, HR & Talent
* Hold ourselves and others accountable to our racial equity and inclusion value and norms
* Seek out and receive feedback from peers, project leads, and leadership
* Consider one’s own self orientation: How am I stepping up or back? How am I listening to others? How am I being an ally to people of color? 4

# Response from R&R

Overall, we continue to be grateful for the time and thoughtfulness each of you take in filling it out.  It’s incredibly helpful in understanding how to support our organizational racial equity journey as we continue to live into our aspirations to be a leading anti-racist organization.  It’s also encouraging to see staff continue to build their competencies and engage deeply in the CORE curriculum, seek out external trainings, use professional development resources to improve REI competencies, build accountability relationships, participate in ERGs, and continue to organize inside of and outside of Living Cities around anti-racist principles.  While we can acknowledge and celebrate the continued growth and commitment of our whole staff to undoing racism, we also acknowledge that we have many areas that we need to improve on and want to do so as an organization.

Here are some areas we discussed and priorities we have for the upcoming year:

**HR/Talent:**

1. ***Increase clarity on career growth paths/performance reviews:***  There continues to be a desire for more clarity on career paths within Living Cities and opportunities for growth.  Relatedly, we hear a desire to evaluate our performance review process and ensure it isn’t contributing to inequitable outcomes.  Finally, compensation continues to come up, both questions about the system and questions about the process to evaluate/improve it.
	1. **R&R Response:**  We acknowledge that there needs to be more transparency in all three of these areas.
		1. Our first commitment is **to improve transparency.**  Sharing historical promotion data and salary bands was a start, but we will continue to share more about the types of questions we’re wrestling through in making improvements to all three areas.  For example, we know our performance review process needs improvement.  And, **we recognize that we need to wrestle with some fundamental, philosophical questions about what we mean by performance and accountability**, how it is or isn’t connected to compensation, and what compensation is tied to if not to performance.  These are questions that R&R will be working through as a leadership team over the next year and ensuring that as we wrestle with these questions and make decisions about them, we are holding an REI lens so that our decisions reflect a strong racial equity analysis.
		2. As we think through different models, we will make **some interim adjustments to this upcoming annual review process while working through these deeper questions.**  We acknowledge that interim adjustments may or may not work but we’re committed to continuously improving and appreciate the ongoing feedback as we work to develop an organizational philosophy on performance that reflects our values and informs process we ultimately develop.
		3. Similarly, for compensation, **we are starting with asking questions about the following: (1) reducing the number of job families (which would enable a more complete disparity study since our current number of job families results in a small “n” that makes the study not as useful as it could be), (2) posting salary bands in new hire job descriptions, (3) how to compensate for emotional labor, (4) should Living Cities have a minimum wage**.  As we do this we want to get feedback from staff on the process and will share what we’re learning.
		4. Finally, on promotions and improving transparency on career paths, we will **prioritize training Performance Managers** so that they are able to provide better clarity and guidance on career paths and skills both at Living Cities and beyond.

**Shared Leadership**:

1. ***Increase transparency on shared leadership:*** There continues to be questions of how we are living into our shared leadership model and wrestling with our relationship to power and how it is held accountable.
	1. ***R&R Response:***  Over the last six months, the team has worked with J.K. Nelson to dig into what’s working/not working about our shared leadership model and how it needs to evolve in order for us to live more fully into our desire to hold power differently as a leadership team and improve accountability as a team, with staff, and ultimately with community.  We plan to capture/codify that process into an internal content strategy that we will share with staff.  The essence of those conversations have been wrestling with the “why” behind shared leadership and ensuring we are aligned on what we mean by shared leadership and why we believe it is the most effective leadership model for an anti-racist organization.  We are also wrestling with what accountability means in a shared leadership model and how we build accountability mechanisms into our process that allow us to reflect on key questions we want to be accountable to: how is the issue being defined? Who is defining it? Who is this work going to benefit if it succeeds?  How are the risks distributed among the stakeholders?
2. ***Continue to build competencies individually and collectively:*** While not as pronounced as last year, there remains some discrepancy in the perceived competencies of individual R&R members and questions around our individual and collective commitment to continue to build our competencies.
	1. ***R&R Response:***  We acknowledge that feedback and are committed individually, and collectively to build our competencies so that staff see a growing analysis of each R&R member and an increased shared analysis of R&R as a whole through decisions we’re making about the organization.  One of the ways we’re doing that collectively is by participating as a team in an upcoming two-part training on Building Pro-Black Organizations and Movements facilitated by Equity in the Center.  We will discuss our takeaways as a team and share our reflections with staff.  We will also ask CORE to provide feedback and support our REI competency building work.  We know that accountability requires a two-way conversation between CORE and R&R to ensure we are continuing to build our competencies.
3. ***Take bold action:*** While there’s a belief that R&R is committed to racial equity, there is encouragement from staff (in different ways) to take bolder steps/actions to move the organization.
	1. ***R&R Response:*** We hear you and we appreciate your pushing us to be bold.  How “being bold” is defined may differ but we are committed to pushing ourselves to take bolder steps.

Culture

1. ***Continue to improve culture:*** Culture has consistently been brought up in the survey and this year we saw specific feedback on how adding elements of pro-Black culture without dismantling white supremacy culture creates more tension and dissonance.
	1. ***R&R Response:***  One of the biggest elements of white supremacy culture that we believe keeps us from moving toward a pro-Black culture is our inability to engage in/and work through conflict.   This has come up in myriad ways within R&R and across the organization.  One of the most concerning data points in the survey this year was the increase in staff feeling like it’s often a risk to bring up race/racial equity at Living Cities.  While we want to dig into that number to understand what some of the factors are that contribute to the perceived risks for staff, we assume that one of the reasons is that we have not built the competencies to engage in and work through conflict so staff don’t feel safe in raising concerns.  To address this, we are committed to bringing in trainers/facilitators who can support all of us to lean into/work through conflict and hold tensions that are inevitable with people who hold different perspectives without disproportionately putting the cost/risk on junior staff.   We believe these competencies are necessary to help support some organizational conversations we’ve identified we need to talk through as an organization—conversations about the tensions we hold around capitalism, our organization point of view on policing, how we define our community, and what it means to be accountability to community.  As well as regular opportunities to talk about things that are happening in the communities we have and are continuing to work including Rochester, Louisville, and Minneapolis.  We want to create space to have these conversations as they are critical to our work.

# Appendix

Trainings mentioned by respondents:

* Resonance Network's Workshopping the Worldview
* Movement Generation's Course Correction: Just Transition in Era of Covid-19
* MosaicEye's Abundant Creativity
* Resonance Network's Conversations for White People
* Gumbo's Creative Writing for Healing
* BEOTIS's guided writing
* BIPOC Solidarity training by The BIPOC project
* Conflict Transformation
* Disability Justice training
* Black-Asian Feminist Solidarity
* PISAB Undoing Racism
* Decolonization in Practice
* Racial justice facilitation training
* Series of trainings on leading multi-cultural organizations
* Faith and justice training series
* OneTILT training for white managers, followed by 5-part peer learning group for aspiring white allies
* Understanding of intersectionality
* 3 day retreat on Soulful Justice & Racial Identity Development with Christena Cleveland
* Anti-racist kids
* Racial Equity & Liberation
* Healing Justice
* Storytelling core concepts
* Groundwater
* Racial equity poems that focus on history
* Racial Equity Institute phase 1
* Facilitative Leadership
* Dismantling white supremacy for women

Respondents also mentioned tools that they use in their day-to-day work:

**Impact assessment tools**

* REI decision making tools
* Procurement policy
* Racial Equity Impact Assessment
* Procurement scan
* REI diagnostic tool

**Frameworks**

* Anti-racist RBA
* Distributed leadership
* Emergent Strategy

**REI concepts/history tools**

* Equity Matters’ institutional racism tools
* 1619 Project
* Ibram X. Kendi’s work
* White Supremacy Culture antidotes by Tema Okun
* REI mapping tool

**Communications/facilitation tools**

* Weaving a World Without Violence cards
* Living Cities’ check-in guide
* Art, healing & storytelling practices
* Values setting
* Norms setting
* Naming when decisions are being made or referred
* Healing justice tools
* Building in equity pauses
* Meditation

**Organizing tools**

* Power mapping
* Field of play
* Representation on panels