COMMUNITY CHANGE PROCESSES AND PROGRESS IN ADDRESSING RACIAL INEQUITIES

October 2007

By Maggie Potapchuk, MP Associates

In consultation with
The Aspen Institute Roundtable for Community Change

Published in the United States.

MP Associates, Inc.
704 Brookwood Rd.
Baltimore, MD 21229
mpotapchuk@comcast.net
www.mpassociates.us

Aspen Institute Roundtable for Community Change
281 Park Ave. South
New York, NY 10010
(212) 677-5510
publications@aspeninstitute.org
www.aspenroundtable.org

Version 1.0

FOREWORD

T his is the story of four communities that took up the challenge of focusing on racial/ethnic diversity and promoting racial justice. Their courage and commitment are extraordinary, and we are proud to recognize their efforts and accomplishments through this publication. Too many champions of equity and justice go unrecognized in our country, and plaudits for those who work on racial justice are even rarer. The stories of these communities—the leaders, organizations, and community members who together embarked on an ambitious change process focused on race—stand as beacons for all of us.

The communities described in this report could hardly be more different in their demographic, historical, geographic, economic, and political circumstances. From the suburbs of New York City (Long Island), to a Southern metropolis (Charlotte), to a town in the Northern plains (St. Cloud), to a Pacific Coast melting pot (Seattle), the race-related challenges of each are unique. Nonetheless, examining the experiences of all four simultaneously yields cross-cutting lessons about how to launch, lead, support, and maintain a community-wide racial equity initiative. Maggie Potapchuk has done a brilliant job of analyzing their work and distilling lessons in a way that will guide other communities along this path.

In a survey published in 2006,* we found that there are dozens of communities across the country beginning to address race-related issues. Too often, these efforts are taken up in an isolated, *ad hoc* way without the benefit of lessons from those who came before them and know what is needed to do this work well. This report is intended as a partial remedy to that problem.

Over the long term, the racial equity field needs much more systematic and consistent support. A core finding is that, while leadership is crucial for initiating racial justice work, organizational capacity is what sustains it and makes it effective over the long haul. This report identifies the kinds of capacities that are needed and demonstrates that, when they exist, significant progress can be made. To date, there has been no systematic investment in such capacity building at the community or national level.

Momentum is building around this work. Every community in the United States will need to take up issues of racial justice sooner or later, and as this report shows there is a body of experience emerging to guide them. The next steps are clear: to support leadership initiatives and organizations like the ones described in this report, and to find ways to build the emerging "field" of practice and learning around racially equitable community change.

We are grateful to Maggie Potapchuk of MP Associates for the hard work, intellectual leadership, and moral commitment that she brought to this project. She was the person who made everything happen and she deserves all the credit. We also thank Susan Batten of the Annie E. Casey Foundation, who provided funding for this work. Finally, we thank the four sites for sharing the gifts of their wisdom and experience, and we wish them every success in the future.

Anne C. Kubisch and Karen Fulbright-Anderson, **Co-Directors**
Aspen Institute Roundtable on Community Change

CONTENTS

Many communities experience race-based inequities, tensions, and hate crimes, but their responses vary widely. Some, paralyzed by uncertainty or resistance to change, do nothing. Some respond to an immediate crisis without addressing systemic issues. Others launch efforts to improve outcomes for disadvantaged populations and communities but fail to make racial equity an explicit part of their work. A review of community-building and related efforts, undertaken in 2000, revealed the following reasons for under-attention to racial inequity: [1]

- Race and racism are uncomfortable topics to put on the agenda for the social welfare field, despite deep commitment to justice and equity, is no exception.

- Because antipoverty work often focuses on individuals and communities of color, race is assumed to be well-integrated into strategies and programs. This seems to reduce pressure to address race deliberately and explicitly.

- Community-building approaches are built on principles of cooperative problem solving, collaboration, and common enterprise. Addressing issues of race and racism implies a need to challenge power and privilege, which might undermine collaboration.

- Many leadership institutions in the social and economic development field (e.g., foundations, banks, corporations, research institutes) are products of historical racialized inequities in this country, so they don't have an ability to lead racial equity work naturally.

Fortunately, some communities are trying to address racial inequities and dismantle structural racism, through Community Change Initiatives to address Racial inequities (which we call "CCIRs"). If we hope to make such explicit efforts more commonplace, we must map, document, and analyze their processes, capacities, resources, and strategies; distill lessons from their experiences; and disseminate their innovative policies and practices. In short, we need to develop a field of practice and learning around racially equitable community change.

The first step in doing so was a study called *Lessons Learned: How Communities are Addressing Racial Inequities,* completed in 2006 by MP Associates in consultation with the Aspen Institute Roundtable on Community Change and the National League of Cities, with funding from the Annie E. Casey Foundation. (See box on next page for a few key findings.[2])

That research marked the first attempt to document the growing trend of these initiatives. CCIRs are important because their holistic, integrated approach offers the best chance to overcome structural racism. The effects of structural racism will not be resolved by addressing a single issue, such as educational improvement, service delivery, or economic development, but by changing the way these and other issues interact to create gaps in achievement, opportunity, and support between people of color and whites. *Lessons Learned* also highlighted the need to support and scale up their efforts more systematically and with a deeper understanding of the essential principles and practices that produce powerful CCIRs.

---

[1] Stone and Butler, *Core Issues in Comprehensive Community Building Initiatives: Exploring Power and Race,* 2000.

[2] To review complete findings, see *"Lessons Learned: How Communities are Addressing Racial Inequities."* Accessible at www.mpassociates.us.

Our second research report, *Community Change Processes and Progress* builds on that study by profiling CCIRs in four sites:

- **Seattle (WA)** became an immigration gateway between 1990 and 2000, as its foreign-born population increased by 40%. Mayor Greg Nickels, who heard concerns about inequitable access to city services expressed during his first campaign, created an initiative to (a) increase city employees' knowledge, skills, and commitment to a government free of institutionalized racism and (b) align business practices with goals for racial equity and social justice. A multilayered organizational infrastructure was created to address five core concerns: economic equity, workforce equity, immigration/refugee issues, capacity building, and public engagement.

- **Saint Cloud (MN),** a historically white, urban hub surrounded by farm communities, saw an influx of residents of color during the 1980s due to demographic shifts in migration. It subsequently experienced one of the state's highest rates of hate crimes. The CCIR initially focused on racial harmony, with the goal of building relationships across race and increasing awareness of different racial identity groups. The initiative now involves regranting to community organizations to tackle (a) closing the gaps in educational attainment, housing access, and health care access and (b) dismantling racism to strengthen the community.

Select findings of *Lessons Learned: How Communities are Addressing Racial Inequities*

In this research, 58 CCIRs were identified and surveyed to learn about their strategies, level of community involvement, and outcomes. The study sample (42 respondents) represented 31 states, nearly every U.S. region, and diverse population sizes and demographics.

The most common events to precede formation of a CCIR are: demographic shifts; a hate crime, legal case, or racial incident; and a convening of leaders and/or residents.

Two important institutional supports usually exist prior to development of a CCIR: (1) local leaders (elected, institutional, and grassroots) who serve as messengers and supporters of the effort, and (2) local organizations or groups that address race in some capacity (e.g., via programs, research, discussions) or convene diverse stakeholders.

The most frequently reported outcomes of CCIR efforts are: increased community awareness (90%), different/increased conversations about race (81%), a growing group with knowledge or skills (81%), and new alliances across racial/ethnic lines (71%).

- Elected officials in **Charlotte (NC)** convened community members after a series of incidents magnified racial divisions. Their efforts led to a leadership development initiative for nonprofit board members and other sector leaders to build commitment and capacity for racial/ethnic inclusion and equity. In 2000, Charlotte scored near the bottom of a 40-city survey on levels of interracial trust, which led to large-scale community engagement that includes using scenario planning. The process has involved organizations in creating projects that could increase the level of access, equity, and inclusion in the larger community.

- **Long Island (NY)** is geographically small, but its population is larger than 18 states and it encompasses 1,000 government units, including 125 school districts. It is one of most segregated suburbs in the nation, with 95% of African-American residents concentrated in 5% of the Census tracts. This site's CCIR educated residents about institutional racism and engaged them in a partnership for change. Using research on fair housing, it showed what happens when the system doesn't work and underscored the impact on people of color. The research led both of Long Island's county governments to improve fair housing laws, including enforcement procedures.

These sites were selected from the original study group because of their use of unique and/or sophisticated strategies; their explicit focus on addressing racial inequities; their ability to show outcomes; and their collective diversity in terms of region, institutional entity, community demographics, and community size. Each site received a small stipend and limited technical assistance for participating in the case study, which included interviews with senior CCIR staff and leaders and a review of key documents.

The remainder of this overview presents major cross-site outcomes and themes. It is followed by a chapter for each of the case studies. For each site, we summarize local context, including the impetus for the initiative; major demographic and racial disparities; the initiative's mission, strategies, staffing, and budget; two major issues being addressed; site-specific outcomes; and lessons learned. A separate chapter summarizes core capacities across the sites. The report concludes with some final thoughts about the sites and the future of this work. The Appendix contains basic information on the sites in a format that allows easy comparisons.

SITE SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES

General similarities: Each initiative has well-thought-out strategies, uses data, engages leaders, is diverse in its approach, and is making progress toward substantial outcomes.

Location: Two sites are in major metropolitan areas, the third is a densely populated suburban area, and the fourth is a growing city surrounded by farm communities.

Leadership: Two initiatives' lead institutions are non-profits, one is led by government, and the fourth has a steering committee of community leaders. Each community has leaders and residents with the courage to act, despite the risks involved, and a vision for change, despite the complexity of the task before them.

Catalyst: In three sites, government played a catalytic or leadership role. In three sites, a community foundation also played a catalytic and/or leadership role.

Context: Each site represents a different region of United States, and the local history of racism varies considerably.

Demographics: The majority racial identity group in all four sites is white. In two sites the second-largest racial identity group is African American, and in the other sites it is Asian/Pacific Islander. The proportion of people of color in each community ranges from 12% to 40%.

Starting point: Two sites began their initiatives by convening action teams. The third focused on internal capacity building and the fourth on increasing racial awareness by sector.

Longevity: The longevity of the initiatives ranges from three to 10 years. Two initiatives built on the efforts of prior initiatives in their community/organization.

Staffing: Initiative staffing levels range from one to four full-time staff. Two communities also have part-time staff and consultants, ranging from 10 to 256 (250 staff serve on departmental change teams).

Budget: The largest CCIR budget is $684,000, and the average is $420,400. One site has an operational budget of $64,000 plus $200,000 available for regranting purposes. (Charlotte's Community Building Initiative is a 501c3 and serves as the process manager for Crossroads Charlotte, a separate project that is large in scope and intent and has a separate budget and staffing.)

WHAT HAVE THE INITIATIVES ACCOMPLISHED? OUTCOMES AT A GLANCE

At an **individual level,** people who participated in the initiatives' trainings, convenings, community forums, and group discussions report changes in their perspectives and behavior. These outcomes are less likely to be public recognized, since CCIRs are working toward long-term institutional level outcomes, but understanding the tipping point of individual outcomes could lead to better and sustained institutional-level outcomes.

For example, participants:

- Understand the concepts of racism, inclusion, and equity;

- Feel more confident speaking up about racial issues

- Interrupt other people's prejudicial statements or ask different questions because equity values have become a higher priority for them;

- View their world through an equity lens;

- Share information with family, friends, and colleagues;

- Participate in more programs to increase their knowledge and skills; and

- Are more involved in organizations committed to working on equity.

These personal transformations are small on a community-change scale, but they represent an important building block for more substantial change.

Although each initiative engaged a significant group of residents and employees, participation does not equal consistent action to address racial inequities. For people with a new understanding of structural racism, time is especially needed to integrate this information into their daily lives as they return to an unchanged environment where they aren't expected to act with the new racial equity lens. There is an ongoing need for training to include institutional and peer support, which could lead to increased changes in behavior and attitudes.

At an **institutional level,** representatives of organizations and governmental units who participated in the initiatives report that their institutions have:

- Changed policies;

- Integrated inclusion and equity into their daily work practices instead of letting such issues be the responsibility of a specific department or a staff person;

- Assessed and revised internal practices;

- Worked to make staff and governing boards more diverse;

- Invested in engaging more residents of different races to participate in programs;

- Become more willing to stand up in public and state their support for equity or against inequity;

- Created opportunities for staff to build knowledge and skills in inclusion and equity; and

- Collaborated with other organizations, paying special attention to power dynamics.

Moreover, these initiatives are able to avoid being marginalized by forces that don't believe in equity. In fact, local interest in each of these initiatives is growing. In **Seattle,** for instance, each city department

now has a Change Team. Recruiting people to the team was difficult for some departments at first, but now so many people want to be involved that some departments have waiting lists. **Long Island** developed a learning and mobilization network, Partnership for Racial Equity, to help residents increase their knowledge and participate in policy-change campaigns. The partnership has more than 400 members and continues to grow.

Crossroads Charlotte came up with a three-step process for engaging organizations: sign up to participate, undergo internal development, and then create initiatives to support "a positive scenario for Charlotte in 10 years." At each transition point, the number of organizations that continued to the next step has been nearly twice the anticipated number. And more than 1,300 people attended community events held to launch **St. Cloud's** Create CommUNITY initiative. The group hoped to raise $50,000 and ended up doubling its goal.

Nonetheless, there is much we still don't know about working on structural racism in a community change process. Some questions that remain are: How are we defining outcomes? What outcomes are we defining as relevant? What outcomes are we defining as successful? And who is doing the defining?

CROSS-CUTTING THEMES

Our follow-up study of four sites suggests the following themes and observations about leading change, engaging and unifying participants, framing and communicating ideas, overcoming resistance, and achieving and measuring results in community change initiatives that address racial inequity.

FRAMING AND COMMUNICATING IDEAS

Racial issues have to be discussed openly, frankly, and honestly. In fact, language that may seem inflammatory can spark constructive action. The study sites demonstrated that, contrary to popular belief, community initiatives and leaders can use words like "racism," "discrimination," and "white privilege" without causing people to avoid, discount, or reject substantive discussion. The terms remain challenging to use, but they are not the conversation-killers that some people fear. The sites we studied not only used them productively, they also explained the underlying concepts effectively through training, consistent messaging, written materials, and presentations.

Strategies should be based on a firm understanding of (a) structural racism and (b) systemic change. The concepts, dynamics, and core elements of both topics are central to any strategy for closing the gaps caused by racial inequities. Strategies that communities used to help people talk more comfortably and understand more about what these terms conveyed include: training; being consistent in messages to the media, presentations, and written materials; discussing why terms may cause discomfort; and creating different ways to explain the concepts.

LEADING CHANGE

Multiracial leadership is necessary to move toward long-term results. In many cases, the involvement of key leaders from a variety of racial identity groups gave an initiative prominence and credibility. The leaders served as carriers of the message to their colleagues, educators on inclusion and equity issues within specific sectors, catalysts for policy and practice reform, experts on strategic planning, brokers of influence and access to resources, and leaders of program implementation.

Leaders need a shared concept of systemic racism. Unless everyone understands the root issues in the same way, it is very difficult to select strategies and assess progress.

ENGAGING AND UNIFYING PARTICIPANTS

Racial inequities intrinsically are divisive, but it takes cohesion and unity to address them. CCIRs have to encourage people to work together, addressing the difficult issues and buying into a shared solution, rather than blaming each other.

Education and training are essential. Each initiative informed residents about racism and equity issues and gave them a chance to build relationships across racial and ethnic lines. The goal of education was to build a critical mass of residents to support, implement, and sustain the work.

OVERCOMING RESISTANCE

All four study sites constantly faced questions like, "Why do we need to change how we are doing things?" and (implicitly), "Why do we [whites] have to make this special effort for people of color?" The initiatives dealt with this resistance by:

- **Infusing the work into incremental, unavoidable activities.** For example, because Seattle's initiative is based in city government some resisters thought they could simply drag their feet until the next mayor came along with another set of initiatives. Initiative supporters responded by integrating the work into everyday practices, such as required training sessions. By "meeting people where they were," the initiative created opportunities to take small steps forward.

- **Keeping standards and integrity high.** In Long Island, some local elected officials expressed support for the initiative in person but tried to undermine the lead organization's credibility or embarrass staff in public. Initiative staff refused to back down, but they also declined to get drawn into inflammatory rhetoric. They made sure their work was clearly above reproach and always backed up their message with data.

- **Cultivating the middle without ignoring the extremes.** The challenge in Charlotte was to deal both with the people who think race isn't or shouldn't be an issue and with those who believe it's such a big issue that nobody can "fix" it. Staff persisted in sending their message, since they never knew when a person would connect with it. In some cases, a positive response was only based on self-interest, but sometimes it showed a deeper connection with the reality of racial disparities.

- **Giving people a personal interest in participation.** In St. Cloud, elected officials and community leaders visited leaders of nonparticipating institutions to emphasize the urgency of addressing racial inequities, learn why they weren't participating, explain why it was in the person's own interest to participate, and outline a valuable role for the person.

ACHIEVING AND MEASURING RESULTS

A multi-pronged strategy moves sites toward long-term outcomes. Racial equity is a complex issue that requires a many-faceted response. The variety of tactics used by most sites in our sample include: public policy advocacy, report cards to track progress, community convening and engagement, technical assistance, policy assessment, skill-building workshops, and focus groups. Site-specific strategies include Charlotte's use of scenario planning to engage organizations in community change, Seattle's multilayered capacity building and community organizing, Long Island's fact-finding process to expose racial inequities in housing, and St. Cloud's regranting program to involve organizations in closing the gaps.

Data are an essential tool for change. Data help to engage residents and policy makers in CCIRs by exposing racial and ethnic inequities within the community. The process of collecting, analyzing, and disseminating data—on housing, health care, education, and other social justice issues—helps to make strategies and interventions more focused and results-oriented.

Data development requires an investment of time and expertise. Often, data on racial disparities at the community level aren't readily available or widely known. CCIRs overcome this hurdle by collecting their own data, through focus groups or surveys, and by organizing community events where they share the information and stimulate broad ownership of the community-change effort.

Despite the wealth of information surfaced by the case studies, this report also accentuates how much we *don't* know. The CCIRs featured in this report are young, and we are still learning what changes are possible given their communities' history, infrastructure, resources, intensity and duration of strategies, and so on. A more comprehensive study, a larger sample of initiatives, and more time would undoubtedly produce more detailed patterns of experience and a clearer sense of how (and by whom) target outcomes are being defined—the story behind the accomplishments. It may have been the effort to get a key organization to the table that finally tipped the scales toward change, for instance, or the administrator who became a staunch supporter after participating in an eye-opening workshop, or the question a resident posed at a community event. Those everyday shifts and cultural changes may seem minor, but they are milestones in the course of a CCIR.

And so we still need to build our knowledge of what doesn't work; understand how local contexts and histories affect strategies; and further explore processes for creating long-term, racially equitable outcomes—especially when we realize that people of color *still* fare worse than whites on most socioeconomic indicators. Dramatic events, like the racially unjust incidents in Jena (LA), as well as quieter trends, such as chronic racial disparities and the growing migration of people of color to suburbs and metropolitan areas,[3] all emphasize the need to build capacity in communities to address racial inequities through comprehensive change.

These case study sites have achieved some notable early outcomes. Many of us believe that they, along with their colleagues at the four Project Change[4] sites and the other 50-plus CCIRs across the country,

---

3 "Hispanic, Asian, and Black populations continue to migrate to, and expand their presence in, new destinations. They are increasingly living in suburbs, in rapidly growing job centers in the South and West, and in more affordable areas adjacent to higher-priced coastal metro areas. The wider dispersal of minority populations signifies the broadening relevance of policies aimed at more diverse, including immigrant, communities." Frey, William H. *Diversity Spreads Outs: Metropolitan Shifts in Hispanic, Asian and Black Populations since 2000.* Washington D.C.: Brookings Institute, 2006, p. 1.

4 The Levi Strauss Foundation created Project Change in 1990, a community/foundation partnership that had as one of its four stated goals to "dismantle institutional policies and practices that promote racial discrimination." As far as they knew, theirs was the first community/corporate foundation partnership to name reducing institutional racism as one of its goals. The four communities chosen were: Albuquerque, NM; El Paso, TX; Knoxville, TN; and Valdosta, GA. Leiderman, Sally A., and Dupree, Davido. *Project Change Evaluation Research Brief.* Unpublished document, Conshohocken, PA: Center for Assessment and Policy Development, 2000.

are pioneers. They deserve more attention and investment to learn how to sustain the work and make strides in addressing structural racism. The growing prevalence of community change initiatives on racial inequity is a vital, promising source of knowledge that has potential to transform practices. The knowledge gained from these sites will strengthen the racial justice movement and provide vital support to communities.

Seattle is well-known to some people because it is the birthplace of grunge music and anti-globalization protests. Others know the city for its major corporations — Starbucks, Nordstrom's, Boeing Aircraft, Seattle Best Coffee, Microsoft, and Amazon. Or they know of Seattle's status as America's most literate city (2005)[5] and third most-wired city,[6] and its reputation for having the nation's highest proportion of college graduates. But the city also has its set of problems, too, and several incidents have tested the community in the last decade.

Seattle's foreign-born population increased by 40% between 1990 and 2000, with the greatest growth among Mexican, East-African, and Vietnamese immigrants. Concurrently, the city experienced the worst economic downturn in 20 years. Boeing moved its headquarters to Chicago and laid off 16,800 employees in 2001, and the Department of Justice fined Microsoft anticompetitive business practices. By 2002, Seattle and the rest of the Pacific Northwest had the highest unemployment rate in the country.[7]

Seattle is often viewed as a "polite" city when it comes to race, but in early 2000 a string of major incidents began, mostly violent, and many people understood them to be race-related. They included dismantlement of the state's affirmative action law, two police shootings, and the assault of a former mayor at a unity gathering in the African-American community. Community leaders felt pressure to respond, and residents were vocal. Each event was a visible indicator of the racial dynamics that exist in the community.

The strength of a community can sometimes be measured by its response to crisis. A civilian-led review of police action prompted the police department to install a camera in every cruiser. The Church Council of Greater Seattle launched a year-long campaign drawing attention to White privilege, and the Seattle School District formed a task force to close the achievement gap. David Brewster, founder of the *Seattle Weekly,* describes the community's response by saying, "It's just like Gatsby in that respect. It's in the constant process of reinventing itself."[8]

While on the campaign trail, would-be mayor Greg Nickels listened to the complaints of racial divisions and the perception that race played a role in access to city services. He pledged to improve race relations if elected, and when he took office in 2002 Nickels launched the Race and Social Justice Initiative (RSJI). The initiative, which focuses on city government departments, aims to increase employees' knowledge, skills, and commitment to creating an organization free of institutionalized racism[9] and to transform business practices to align with race and social justice goals.

RSJI is noteworthy for its commitment to capacity building and its strong infrastructure, which includes a well-trained core team, a subcabinet of senior officials, departmental change teams, the mayor's

[5] Marklein, Mary Beth, "Seattle reaches a literacy peak." *USA Today*, November 28, 2005.
[6] Frommer, Dan, "Atlanta is most wired city in the U.S." *Forbes Magazine*, September 8, 2006.
[7] Murphy, Kim, "The Decline and Fall of Seattle; The Emerald City is in Distress, with dot-coms and Boeing Leading the Way." *Los Angeles Times*, August 4, 2002.
[8] *Ibid.*
[9] *2006, City of Seattle, Race and Social Justice Initiative* pamphlet, Updated April, 2006.

accountability agreement with every department's director, and the Office of Civil Rights' guidance of the process. This case study focuses on two strands of work conducted by RSJI: capacity building and economic equity.

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF SEATTLE

Total Population[10]	536,946
White	68.9%
Black or African American	8.2%
American Indian and Alaska Native	1.2%
Asian	14.4%
Native Hawaiian, other Pacific Islander	0.3%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	6.3%
Some other race	3.2%
Two or more races	3.9%

SELECTED DATA ON RACIAL DISPARITIES

INCOME African-American, Native-American, and Hispanic households have median incomes that are one-third less than the overall median. In 2000, Native Americans had the highest poverty rate in Seattle (29%), followed by African Americans (23%).
HOUSING ACCESS Homeownership has not increased significantly during the last 10 years for any racial or ethnic group. Minority homeownership lags behind White households.
HEALTH CARE ACCESS Latinos had the highest health insurance non-coverage rate (36%) of any group, followed by African Americans (21.5%). One in six African Americans reported experiencing discrimination in medical care settings, compared with one in 20 for respondents overall.
JUDICIAL DISPARITIES 24% of Washington State's youth belong to minority populations, but 45% of youth who enter the juvenile justice system are people of color.[11] African Americans, although less likely than Whites to sell drugs in Seattle, are up to four times more likely to be arrested for selling cocaine, 20 times more likely to be arrested for selling heroin, and 30 times more likely to be arrested for selling methamphetamines than Whites.[12]

---

[10] 2005 American Community Survey, http://www.census.gov/acs/www/, accessed 6/12/07.
[11] Seattle RSJI Core Team, *Disparities: A Snapshot of Seattle* in 2006, unpublished document.
[12] Drug Policy Alliance, "Seattle study shows staggering disparity in African American drug arrests," December 2, 2003. http://www.lindesmith.org/news/12_02_03seattle.cfm, accessed 7/12/07.

BASIC FACTS ABOUT THE INITIATIVE

Name of Initiative	**Race and Social Justice Initiative (RSJI)**
Start date	2004[13]
Administrative Home	City government
Mission	To end institutionalized racism in city government; and to create a community that is enriched by its diverse cultures, with full participation of all residents.
Strategies and Interventions	• Assess the impact of race on organizational culture, policies, practices, and procedures • Transform business practices by aligning personnel and contracting activities with race and social justice goals • Conduct outreach and provide public engagement opportunities • Provide different levels of training and build staff's capacity and skills to address institutionalized racism • Collaborate with stakeholders to address Central Concern Issues • Provide technical assistance to department change teams and executive leadership groups
Major Issue Areas	Workforce equity, economic equity, immigrant and refugee access, public engagement, capacity building
Definition of Racism	Racial prejudice plus the misuse of institutional power
Long-Term Target Outcomes	• Hiring/promotion of employees who represent Seattle's cultural and ethnic diversity • Significant increase in the amount of business city government does with minority-owned businesses • Diversity within the city's boards, commissions, and neighborhood groups • Diversity reflected in city policy decisions • Race and social justice used as a standard for good business practice and government action
Staffing	2 full-time, 4 part-time, and 250+ staff in city departments working on change teams
Board Size	15 Sub-Cabinet members, 30+ Core Team members
Budget	Approximately $200,000 of dedicated funding
Major Donors	N/A

---

[13] Earlier work in different city departments was instrumental for setting the stage for RSJI. For more information, see p. 14 of this report.

HISTORY

Seattle was named for Chief Sealth, leader of the Duwamish and Suquamish tribes that lived on the Puget Sound coast. White founders of the city erected a monument near the chief's grave, with the engraving "The Firm Friend of the Whites, and for Him the City of Seattle Was Named by Its Founders."[14]   In 1855, the Point Elliott Treaty was signed, making the U.S. government the new owners of the Native American land in western Washington.[15]

The state's first Black resident was George Washington Bush, a farmer who settled near Olympia in 1845. Bush had left the Oregon territory because White settlers were excluding Blacks, but in 1850 he lost his farm because the federal Donation Land Act gave property rights in Washington State only to White and "half-breed" male settlers. Another legislative act returned Bush's farm to him but the legislature refused to give him citizenship and voting rights.[16]

Racial restrictions were included on property deeds and enforced until 1948. They made it illegal to sell or rent property to African Americans, Asian Americans, and sometimes Jews. Some retail and eating establishments refused to serve Blacks, Chinese, Japanese, and Filipino Americans. In 1964, Seattle voters rejected a referendum to end racial discrimination in home sales and rentals by nearly two to one. Four years later, after federal legislation banned housing discrimination, the city council passed a fair housing ordinance.

Seattle's Civic Unity Committee played a key role in encouraging business to welcome all customers, documenting complaints, and leading protests. Stores removed their "Whites only" signs in the early 1950s, but Seattle police enforced unwritten "sundown" rules north of the ship canal and in the Queen Anne, Magnolia, and West Seattle neighborhoods until the mid-1960s. This meant that after work, African Americans could not be in White neighborhoods.[17]   The last neighborhoods to desegregate were North and West Seattle and Queen Anne, in 1980.

During the late 1990s and early 2000, several incidents put race in into the public forum:

- In 1998, Ward Connerly brought his organized effort to dismantle affirmative action to the state of Washington. Although the majority of Seattlites rejected it, statewide voters affirmed it. The legislation had a far-reaching impact on in education, hiring, and contracting with the city and state.

- In 2000, Kristopher Kim, a White male, was assaulted at a Mardi Gras celebration and later died. An African-American male, Jerrel Thomas, was convicted of murder. Debate ensued over whether this should be deemed a hate crime, because some people assumed that the assaults on Whites by African Americans during the celebration were racially motivated.

- David John Walker, who had a history of mental problems, fired a gun in a supermarket parking lot and ignored police commands to drop his weapon. After making a sudden move, he was shot by a police officer. Members of the African-American community were outraged when the Police Guild gave the officer an award for his handling of the incident.[18]

---

[14] Warren, James R., "10 Who Shaped Seattle: Chief Seattle -- peacemaker, 'firm friend of the whites'." *Seattle Post-Intelligencer,* September 18, 2001.

[15] Kueter, Vince, "Seattle Through the Years." *Seattle Times*, November 13, 2001. http://seattletimes.nwsource.com/, 2007.

[16] Goodnow, Cecelia, *Seattle Post-Intelligencer's Special Report on Black History,* "State owes much to George W. Bush -- a black pioneer," February 5, 2002. http://seattlepi.nwsource.com/lifestyle/56993_blackhistory05_2.shtml,   accessed 6/ 3/07.

[17] Summarized from Seattle Civil Rights and Labor History website, *Segregated Seattle*, Power Point presentation, http://depts.washington.edu/civilr/, accessed 5/13/07.

[18] Lynch, Jim, "Veneer of Racial Harmony Shows Cracks after Seattle Police Shooting." *The Oregonian*, July 1, 2001.

- Police stopped a group of Asian-American students near Safeco Field and issued a jaywalking citation. The students felt they were being harassed, and the judge threw out the ticket.[19]

- Former Mayor Paul Schell was struck in the face with a bullhorn during a unity gathering in the African-American community.

- An African-American man, Aaron Roberts, was shot by a White police officer after Roberts dragged another officer alongside his car.[20]

IMPETUS FOR THE INITIATIVE

Greg Nickels, candidate for Mayor in 2001, discussed with voters their concerns about public safety, health, education, and other issues. He learned that the community was deeply divided across racial lines. Residents were concerned about how a neighborhood's racial and ethnic composition determined the level of city services it received. The perception that the quality of government services varied based on race and ethnic group affected Nickels deeply. After winning the election, he prioritized work across all city departments to create an organization free of institutionalized racism.

RSJI was launched in 2004, and Seattle's Office of Civil Rights later took the lead in coordinating RSJI and selecting strategies to meet two overarching goals: (1) create a community where residents and employees experience cultural and ethnic diversity as an asset; and (2) eliminate institutional attitudes, practices, and policies that result in racial disproportionality.

THE RACE AND SOCIAL JUSTICE INITIATIVE (RSJI)

The focus of the Race and Social Justice Initiative is on the internal programs, practices, and policies of City of Seattle government. This was a strategic choice. Mayor Nickels believed that City government employees needed to be educated about issues of disproportionality in the community, and begin addressing them, before creating a community-wide initiative. He also didn't want RSJI to be perceived as a political tool to gain support from communities of color. But although RSJI's focus was on what happened within each department, residents also experienced the initiative's impact through changes in programs, policies, and practices.

RSJI focuses on five key areas:

1. Assessing the impact of race on organizational culture, policies, practices, and procedures;

2. Creating an organization free of institutionalized racism;

3. Transforming business practices by aligning personnel and contracting activities with race and social justice goals;

4. Reducing racial disproportionality in education, public safety, economic development, citizen engagement, public health, and environment, by increasing the relevance of city programs and services to a multicultural citizenry; and

5. Creating more inclusive public engagement.

---

[19] Information about the incidents involving the Hispanic male and Asian-American students was obtained from Jamieson, Robert L., "Seattle Not Alone as World Trips over Race." *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, September 1, 2001.
[20] Information about the Mayor Schell assault and Aaron Roberts murder was obtained Van Dyk, Ted, "Race, Public Safety and Transportation issues dog Seattle." *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, July 12, 2001.

All city departments are required to develop work plans to dismantle institutionalized racism and support multiculturalism, and each department's director is accountable to the mayor for RSJI activities. RSJI is in a process of reflection as it moves to "Phase II" and is looking at the effectiveness of its current activities, structures, and processes to see what to keep and what to refine or alter. RSJI's infrastructure for management and implementation includes:

- **The Subcabinet**—An executive-level body of department directors or deputy directors who review, discuss, and provide input into key RSJI issues, helping to inform recommendations made to the mayor and serving as a forum for sharing RSJI practices and opportunities.

- **Office of Civil Rights**—Manages implementation of the initiative by reviewing departments' RSJI plans, providing support to change teams, coordinating training, and staffing the Core Team. This office also has a coordinating team that serves as liaison to departments and delivers RSJI presentations at new employee and supervisor orientations.

- **Core Team**—A group of 30-plus employees who were nominated and selected for the role and received 10 days of RSJI training. The Core Team provides technical assistance and strategic planning citywide, leads trainings and workshops for city staff, and works on RSJI-specific issues.

- **Change Team**—Each department has a change team responsible for implementing the RSJI plan. Each change team has an executive sponsor (i.e., a senior official within the department who supports the work and helps with implementation).

- **Central Concerns Committees**—A lead department was identified to coordinate efforts across departments, share best practices, and develop consistent citywide tools and policies to address five central concerns distilled from the departmental plans during RSJI's early years:

(1) *Workforce Equity* - "Develop citywide strategies and practices to improve diversity of our workforce on all levels and across functions;

(2) *Economic Equity* - "Change purchasing and contracting practices to increase participation by people of color;

(3) *Public Engagement* - "Change the city's public engagement process to improve access and influence of communities of color;

(4) *Capacity Building* - "Increase departments' ability to implement and sustain RSJI; and

(5) *Immigration Services* - "Develop a citywide approach to improving services to immigrant communities."[21]

OVERARCHING STRATEGIES BEHIND RSJI'S SUCCESS

The mayor has an accountability agreement with every department directors and takes the lead in emphasizing the initiative's importance.

The Core Team uses a multi-layered community organizing model to mobilize people top-down, bottom-up, and across departments.

The Core Team's size (33 members) and time commitment (120 hours per person per year) provides substantial infrastructure to ensure momentum and integration within city government. The Core Team also serves as a model for inclusive, equitable teamwork.

Each departmental Change Team must implement an RSJI plan.

---

[21]*Change Team Bulletin*, Issue #2, April 6, 2005.

PRE-INITIATIVE SNAPSHOT

Even in progressive Seattle, which has a significant number of racial justice organizations,[22] the typical trajectory for changing demographics begins with a focus on diversity and multiculturalism. One of the primary steps in training a workforce on interpersonal relations is increasing cultural competency skills and reinforcing the value of diversity. Almost 10 years before RSJI began, departmental managers were required to attend diversity training. Some couldn't understand how diversity would change their workforce, but others—especially those who had direct contact with residents—were interested. When state anti-discrimination legislation, known as Initiative 200, passed in 1998,[23] some employees thought parity had been reached. Others saw pockets within departments where there were no employees of color.

Four city departments were working to address racial justice issues before RSJI was launched. These departments provided a strong foundation of skilled, committed individuals and experience in implementing interventions and training. For instance, the Human Services Department's Undoing Institutional Racism Employees group had existed for almost a decade, and many staff participated in the People's Institute for Survival and Beyond's *Undoing Racism* training. Some liked the philosophy, while others felt it was too confrontational. The Seattle Office of Civil Rights (SOCR) coordinated *City Talks!,* a program which laid the groundwork for discussion of racism among employees. The Purchasing and Contracting Services Division was developing a "Contracting Equity Framework" to address discrimination and inequity in its practices. (The fourth department was the Office of Economic Development.) RSJI planners discussed how best to build on the platform of these departments' experience while also acknowledging some challenges inherent in their methods.

STRATEGIES

Although SOCR was responsible for overall coordination and management of all facets of RSJI it was not in a position to control a 10,000-person workforce, even with the mayor leading the effort. The department therefore decided to create an organizing model and a structured capacity-building process, and the four other groups described earlier (Subcommittee, Core Team, Change Team, and Central Concerns Committee) were essential for helping SOCR move everyone along. Key implementation issues were:

- How best to share common definitions with employees;

- How to build employees' awareness of racial disparities and examine how city policies and programs may cause racial disparities;

---

[22] The People's Institute Northwest compiled a document which described the work of 29 organizations, committees, and government departments working on race relations and racial justice.

[23] Initiative 200 legislation passed in 1998 states that "The state shall not discriminate against, or grant preferential treatment to, any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, color ethnicity, or national origin in the operation of public employment, public education, or public contracting." www.secstate.wa.gov/elections/1998/i200_text.aspx.

- How to build employees' skill in creating inclusive and equitable policies, practices, and programs (e.g., What type of training program is required? How many hours are needed? What is our capacity to provide training? What outcomes are reasonable to expect?); and

- How to engage departments that may not immediately embrace RSJI.

The **Core Team** is composed of 33 employees drawn from all departments and all employee levels. Members apply to participate and must be approved by his or her department director and reviewed by a team from SOCR. Members must attend 90 hours of training over four months and commit 120 hours per year for two years to the Core Team, in addition to the training time. The first Core Team

---

GUIDING PRINCIPLES, OPERATING PRINCIPLES, AND NORMS DEVELOPED BY THE CORE TEAM

Guiding Principles
- We are all teachers and learners. Each of us has something to teach and something to learn.
- We commit to mutual respect and caring and will listen carefully to each other, help each other deal with conflict, and together build our team.
- We will continue to explore our common analysis of racism and apply it to our Team's decision-making process.
- We acknowledge that we have taken on a difficult assignment, and we aim to accomplish our work while modeling our commitment to anti-racism and institutional transformation.

Operating Principles
- All members' interests will be respected and considered, and the group will work collaboratively to reach agreement on decisions.
- The Core Team will discuss issues, make suggestions, and coordinate actions and responses across committees.
- Email communication will be used for logistics and coordination, to share agendas and to distribute materials in advance of meetings. Substantive issues are best discussed in meetings rather than through email dialogues.
- The Core Team will respect the collective bargaining process.
- To ensure anti-racist operations and accountability, the Core Team will caucus at each meeting. People of color will discuss how internalized racial oppression has affected decisions and processes within the meeting. White people will discuss how internalized racial superiority has affected decisions and processes within the meeting. After caucusing, the groups may share reactions and revisit decisions.
- Leadership will be shared and rotated among Core Team members.

Norms
- Model new, anti-racist institutional behaviors.
- Promote shared leadership at meetings by using co-facilitators.
- Model shared power by rotating planning for and facilitation of meetings.
- Hold caucuses at each meeting to review how internalized racial superiority and internalized racial oppression
- Hold caucuses at each meeting – review how internalized racial superiority and internalized racial oppression affected processes and decision making
- Be transparent – share agendas, notes and decisions with Core Team members; share contact information and team member responsibilities.
- Be transparent. Share agendas, notes, and decisions with Core Team members; share contact information and team member responsibilities.

—From City of Seattle Race and Social Justice Initiative, *Core Team Strategic Plan* 2006-2007.

---

completes its service in Fall 2007, and a second Core Team (with some participants continuing from the first team) has begun training.

For the Core Team's 90-hour training process, SOCR chose Crossroads Ministry, based in Chicago. Crossroads, founded in 1986, works to combat the root causes of institutional racism. Its work focuses on training teams "within institutions, helping them to analyze racism and to develop and implement strategies to dismantle racism within their structures … they equip teams with strategic skills to lead their institutions toward long-term and permanent transformation."[24]

The Core Team has **committees on Leadership, Communications, Training and Curriculum, Stakeholders, Gaia** (i.e., the team's health and well-being), **and Accountability**. These committees are responsible for:

- Developing skills, tools and resources to advance RSJI;
- Building relationships with key stakeholders to increase understanding of and support for RSJI;
- Delivering anti-racism training to key stakeholders (and others, as timing and capacity permits);
- Providing technical assistance to advance the work on RSJI central concerns; and
- Ensuring accountability to people of color within the Core Team, to the institution, to the community, and to the anti-racist analysis.

The first Core Team helped create RSJI's organizing model and capacity-building structure while also learning and experimenting with how to become an inclusive work team. Team members created norms and practices that sent strong messages about the initiative's integrity. (The initiative has not yet tracked the extent to which these principles and norms were integrated into departments.)

One of the Core Team's main tools is the **race caucus**[25]—meetings by racial identity group that are convened at every meeting as a way to hold people accountable and strengthen the team. Although racial caucusing can be a helpful tool in anti-racist work, it was new for many Core Team members and it spurred much growth. Key components to ensure the usefulness of caucusing within the Core Team include a clearly understood focus for discussions, skilled facilitation, and a mechanism for "report-backs" so members of each caucus can share information and lessons with the other participants.

TRAINING

Four **training programs** are available to City of Seattle employees (see box on next page). RSJI Core Team members often have experience with a particular social justice organization's anti-racism philosophy (e.g., People's Institute for Survival and Beyond, National Coalition Building Institute, Western States Center, Re-evaluation Counseling's United to End Racism), and they bring that knowledge to RSJI and its training program.

Because training is mandatory, and because there are many competing perspectives on institutional racism, RSJI participants do not always embrace the content. Rather than changing the focus or terminology, however, RSJI simply expanded efforts to engage participants. (Many anti-racism trainers say that if some participants don't push back you aren't doing your job.)

---

[24] Crossroads Ministry, accessed May 12, 2007, http://www.crossroadsministry.org/Introduction.sxml.
[25] SOCR uses the Western States Center's definition of caucus: "All people of color and white people are affected by racism and have to work together to end racism. However, how we are affected by racism and the work we have to do is different. Caucuses are times when people of color and white people within an organization meet separately in order to do our different work. Many organizations have gender caucuses or other types of caucuses as well." www.westernstatescenter.org.

It is important to note that within the RSJI training program, attention was paid to helping Whites understand racism and privilege and knowing the challenges and barriers to sustained individual growth. RSJI was transparent about this piece of anti-racist work. For example, presentations included the following points:

- "What makes racism difficult for Whites to see?"
- "We are taught to see ourselves as individuals rather than as members of a socialized group."
- "We are taught that we are objective and that our frame of reference is neutral and representative of everyone's reality."
- "We live segregated lives and have very little authentic connection with people of Color."
- "We are taught not to feel a sense of loss about the absences of people of Color in our lives."[26]

Each department established a **Change Team to develop and implement the department's RSJI action plan**. Some of these teams are more active and engaged than others. However, most Change Team members have participated in *Race: Power of an Illusion* training, and some departments developed and implemented supplemental training. For example, the Change Teams participated in a training session with Dr. Joy DeGruy Leary, author of *Post-Traumatic Slave Syndrome*.[27] Six months later, the police chief decided to have all of his direct-report and command staff attend a training by Leary.

Like the Core Team, Change Teams have used the **racial caucusing tool**. In fact, members of the Core Team provided technical assistance on how to use caucusing effectively for some of the Change Teams. One department's Change Team found caucusing quite helpful for addressing divisive issues

---

RSJI'S TRAINING PROGRAM[i]

RSJI Introduction (1 hour)
Introduces key concepts and content. Typically used for employee and team meetings.

"Race: The Power of an Illusion"
(3 parts, 7 hours)
PBS documentary examines people's beliefs about race, privilege, policy, and justice to show how the history of race has shaped perceptions and practices. After participants view the video, facilitators lead exercises to deepen participants' understanding, personalize the learning, and apply the learning to the Seattle context.

RSJI Basic Anti-Racism Training
(8 hours)
Provides an overview of institutional racism, power theory, and impact on individuals, society, and government structures. Offered to members of change teams. Also included in the leadership/management training series.

Leadership/Management RSJI Training Series (20 hours)
Includes the three components listed above supplemented by a half-day, hands-on management skill-building session to apply theory to daily management activities.

Program was added to RSJI after SOCR staff noticed that Change Teams had frontline staff but no middle-management employees. Seattle Public Utilities, which noticed the same gap in its own work, and with SOCR piloted the training curriculum with 50 managers.
—Race and Social Justice Initiative Training handout

---

proactively instead of stumbling through them. Part of the challenge when caucusing is that many conversations about race in the United States occur informally among people of the same race, but when these same conversations are framed as an anti-racist tool they become more provocative. This can be especially true for some Whites who may not understand the importance of discussing racial issues among themselves instead of in a multiracial group. Also, there is an unfamiliarity by some Whites about having a responsibility to educate themselves and assist each other rather than relying on people of color to teach them the concepts of racism and White privilege.

---

[26] *City of Seattle Race & Social Justice Initiative Anti-Racism Training*, PowerPoint handout, Undated.
[27] To learn more about Dr. Joy DeGruy Leary's research and work, go to www.joyleary.com

ATTRIBUTES OF EFFECTIVE CHANGE TEAMS

Racial Justice Change Teams are most effective when individual team members are engaged, the group works effectively as a team, and the larger organization provides clear and consistent support.

Team members:
- Believe in their organization's ability to improve outcomes
- Are committed to challenging their own racial preconceptions
- Recognize that institutional change is a long-term process and focus on strategic next steps
- Are trained in and embrace a racial justice analysis that aims to dismantle institutional racism and produce institutional change
- Take on and are accountable for Change Team actions
- Continually seek to deepen their understanding and use what they learn in their work

The Change Team:
- Plays a role in capacity building for the rest of the organization (including building relationships to further racial justice goals)
- Keeps track of power relationships within the team and adopts shared leadership strategies, such as mixed-race leadership teams
- Develops and implements an action plan as part of the organization's strategic plan
- Assigns tasks to all Change Team members so everyone is accountable for an aspect of the action plan
- Periodically assesses progress
- Develops strategies to help team members lead this difficult work
- Establishes multicultural team norms[1] that interrupt the relationships and behavior that re-enforce inequitable institutional outcomes; strives to lead by example

Departmental leaders:
- Endorse a clear Change Team charter with specific roles and responsibilities, an explicit decision-making model, plans for management transitions and leadership succession
- Allocate time and resources to the Change Team's work

— Developed by SOCR and Change Team leaders

FOCUS AREA TWO:
ECONOMIC EQUITY

PRE-INITIATIVE SNAPSHOT

Racial and gender preferences in state-sponsored affirmative action programs, originally established to rectify discrimination, ended in 1998 with passage of Initiative 200. The bill was sponsored by Rep. Scott Smith (R), who felt the system was unfair when his wife scored 200 points lower than he did on the police department's entrance exams and got a job offer—but he didn't. The law passed even after widespread publicity about three major discrimination incidents: a lawsuit against Boeing by Black employees who weren't promoted, accusations of mistreatment against a restaurant by a group of

Blacks, and a work shutdown during construction of the Mariners' stadium by tradesmen of color who said White workers intimidated them with slurs and swastikas.[28]

I-200 eliminated the city's ability to set mandatory goals for racial diversity in contracting and employment. Seattle passed two ordinances in response.[29] The first established resources for a small contracting program to attract more women and minority businesses. The second made it illegal to discriminate against companies and businesses that contract with the city. Nonetheless, the number of women and minority business enterprises (WMBEs) that contract with the city plummeted from about 30% to between 4% and 5%. African-American contractors experienced the greatest decline, and they responded with public protests, press conferences, and business closures. There is still a discrimination suit against the city at the Department of Justice, based on current and past administrations.

Not surprisingly, when departments submitted their RSJI plans the issue of WMBE contracting surfaced in every one. To ensure that RSJI developed a citywide response, leaders made economic equity one of the initiative's five central concerns. RSJI wasn't the only group tackling the issue, however. Three years before the initiative began, a Mayor's Contracting Task Force was convened to address the drop in WMBE participation and minority apprenticeship workforce issues. The task force met several times to explore barriers to minority participation on public works. The Urban League subsequently established a Contractors Development and Competitiveness Center to provide technical assistance and capacity building to WMBEs.

STRATEGIES

The Department of Executive Administration coordinates a **citywide action plan for economic equity,** which encompasses assistance to WMBE firms and efforts to ensure equal benefits and employment. Strategies include:

- Tracking, monitoring, and providing monthly reports on WMBE utilization to all departments; DEA not only tracks certified WMBEs but also self-identified ones

- Maintaining and centralizing an online Vendor and Contractor Registration (VCR), the city's Small Construction Project, and the city's consultant rosters

- Implementing an Internet-based application for businesses that want to do business with the city

- Administering and monitoring the city's apprenticeship programs to ensure that 15% of total contract labor hours on applicable public works contracts go to apprentices enrolled in the program

- Hosting annual vendor fairs and co-sponsoring an annual regional contracting forum

- Contracting with the Urban League's Contractors Development and Competitiveness Center

- Providing funds and support to the Turner School of Construction, which educates owners of disadvantaged firms about the critical elements of running a business

- Providing technical assistance to city departments

Centralized oversight helps ensure accountability. Each department must submit an outreach plan for DEA review and approval, and contracts are not awarded until the prime contractor has made a good-faith effort to reach WMBEs. For example, when Seattle Public Utilities fell short of small-purchase items, the department began to feature the needed items on its website and identified

---

[28] Haynes, V. Dion, "Race Initiative stirs emotions in Northwest, Washington State weighs ending Affirmative Action." *Chicago Tribune*, August 24, 1998.
[29] National League of Cities, 1999 Futures Report.

historically underutilized businesses (HUBs) and WMBE vendors who could provide them. Through this process, the department's purchasers increased the number of blanket contracts going to HUB/WMBEs.

The mayor emphasizes WMBE contracting goals in all accountability contracts. His leadership prompted a shift, particularly in large departments with the financial capacity to make construction contracts. The Seattle City Light department (separate from Seattle Public Utilities) struggled with its WMBE utilization. The department convened the staff responsible for contracting and construction to discuss the importance of reaching out to WMBE firms. Between 2005 and 2006, the proportion of WMBE contractors grew from 2.4% to 10.6%. This change was attributed to getting staff on board and giving them the tools to make changes with their procedures.

Monthly data tracking and monitoring, which DEA shares in status reports, enables department heads learn how they are doing and identify practices that may need to change. For instance, some departments have hired outreach coordinators. The purpose of data collection and sharing is informative, not punitive. DEA also suggested vendors who were available to provide a service. Staff members recognized the importance of developing special strategies to give African-American firms an equal opportunity to contract with City departments, since increases had occurred for minorities in general but only marginally for African Americans.

Departments find ways to introduce new vendors to purchasing agents, who otherwise tend to rely on the vendors they already know. One of the biggest hurdles was to help purchasing agents change their habits; they had formed relationships with certain vendors and did not find it necessary to identify other ones who could provide the same service, possibly at better rates and quality. Seattle Public Utilities began a process called Five on Five, in which five vendors are identified and matched with departmental needs. The vendors are brought in to meet with agency or divisional employers so they have a better chance of developing relationships.

OUTCOMES

Capacity building. Although individual capacity-building activities have been evaluated, it is difficult to measure this aspect of RSJI from an outcomes perspective. In 2007, the Office of Civil Rights planned to assess employees' understanding of RSJI. Seattle's public utilities and human services departments surveyed their employees in previous years, providing partial baseline data. The new survey will capture employees' understanding of the initiative and terminology and their self-assessed their ability to help implement the initiative.

SOCR, the RSJI Subcabinet, and the mayor's office designated the three-part PBS series *Race: The Power of an Illusion* the primary training component for all city employees. To date, the departments of Human Services, Arts and Cultural Affairs, Personnel, and SOCR have shown the series to all staff members. An estimated 1,000 city employees had viewed the series by the end of 2006.[30] including most of the 200 members of departmental Change Teams.

Economic equity. Some employees believe there has been a culture shift, with leaders now playing a strong role in changing internal practices. That outcome would validate one of RSJI's basic tenets, which is that leaders have to be committed to change before the rank and file can be held accountable.

---

[30] Many of the outcomes listed in this section, including this one, are from a memo to Mayor Nickels from Germaine Covington, former Director of SOCR, Subject: Race and Social Justice Initiative status report: Summary of 2006 accomplishments and 2007 departmental work plans, dated 4/3/07.

Data suggest that Seattle has made progress toward economic equity. The percentage of purchasing and contracting expenditures that went to WMBE firms grew between 2005 (5.5%) and 2006 (7.2%). For Public Works projects, the percentage rose from 11.25% in 2005 to 14.9% in 2006. African Americans were the only subgroup that did not benefit substantially from this increase.

Since the Contracting Development and Competitiveness Center (CDCC) opened, the number of contractors using the services grew from 20 to more than 50. Since May 2003, CDCC contractors have bid on 684 projects and won 216 contracts. Between January 2004 and December 2006, the CDCC helped several small businesses win contracts worth a total of $31,748,119. When CDCC held an event publicizing a program to increase the number of graduates of color in an apprenticeship program, more than 300 people—primarily individuals of color—showed up.

Programming. Departments have taken various approaches to infuse programs with a racial justice framework. For example:

- *The Office of Civil Rights***,** through a series of all-staff planning sessions, developed and implemented an action plan based on RSJI norms to broaden the array of assistance offered to potential charging parties and to charging parties whose cases are no-cause. They also adjusted hiring guidelines and procedures to reflect RSJI.

- *Fleets and Facilities* improved candidacy pools by advertising job opportunities more broadly and by partnering with the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, National Association of Asian American Professionals, and National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

- *The Hearing Examiner* created mediation trainings with a special focus; titles include, "When Race is an Issue" and "Hidden Biases in Decision Making."

- *The Housing Department* translated homeownership marketing materials into Spanish, Korean, and Vietnamese; ran ads on a Spanish radio station; and contracted with nonprofit organizations to publicize homebuyer education services in multiple languages. The department played a significant role in planning the Southeast Action Agenda; its goals include anti-gentrification efforts and preservation of affordable housing as the neighborhood is revitalized.

- *The Department of Neighborhoods* changed its RFP process and incorporated race and social justice work into the fabric of the Neighborhood Matching Fund. It is now a specific project type for Small and Simple Project awards of up to $15,000. In 2006-07, the Fund gave $759,015 to 69 programs. Staff also recruited community members of color who had never participated on citizens' advisory committees and historic review boards.

- *Parks and Recreation* created a program to make swimming available to Muslim women by establishing female-only bathing times, added food and fitness programs for Samoan and Native American seniors, and established a citizen-based Multicultural Advisory Board.

- *The Police Department* created an outreach program for the civil service exams, which generated almost 10% more applications from protected classes that took the exam.

- *Seattle Center* hosted the first "Discover Seattle Newcomers Fair" to disseminate information on city services for immigrants and refugees. The Arab community was looking for a place to meet after a religious event and decided to gather at Seattle Center because they consider it a welcoming place. This was a change in terms of use and perception of the facility.

- *Seattle Public Utilities* established an Environmental Justice and Service Equity division, with RSJI leadership responsibility included in its charter.

Policy changes. A citywide translation and interpretation policy, adopted in January 2007, led the city to enhance its Employee Language Bank and increase the number of blanket contractors (via an RFP process) available to provide translation and interpretation.

With prompting from a Core Team member, the *Personnel Department* changed its policy on health care benefits and negotiated with the insurance provider to charge employees who need diabetes medication only five dollars. The policy change will be especially helpful for African Americans, who on average are 1.8 times more likely than non-Hispanic Whites of a similar age to have diabetes.[31]

The *Department of Planning and Development* developed an out-of-class policy to improve internal notification and recruitment of employees and to rotate assignments to qualified staff every six months.

The *Human Services Department* developed a "Healthy Communities Policy," adopted by the City Council, that guides efforts and investments in public health to reduce health disparities based on race or immigrant/refugee status.

CONCLUSIONS

Seattle's innovative Race and Social Justice Initiative could be a model for mayors across the nation to take the lead in addressing institutional racism and for practitioners to integrate community-organizing principles into their systems and processes. Four city departments laid the groundwork by courageously taking steps to address institutional racism. Mayor Nickels could have asked these departments to serve as pilots for the rest of city government. Instead, he and his team deserve credit for taking the lead to create departmental and citywide expectations, keeping the focus on systemic causes rather than symptoms—in short, for challenging city employees to build their knowledge and skills, create an organization free of institutionalized racism, and align business practices with race and social justice goals. Residents' perceptions that government is not always equitable or inclusive may have been a precipitating factor for the initiative, but it was the recognition that institutional racism exists in any system—and the fact that Seattle's mayor and municipal government are willing to address that fact—that distinguish this initiative.

RSJI uses a sophisticated internal organizing model with a multilayered, well-coordinated infrastructure, and it is showing early signs of success. The initiative has a Subcabinet, a well-trained Core Team, departmental Change Teams, and cross-department work teams. The Seattle Office of Civil Rights serves as the management hub and coordinates the overall initiative by continuing to keep things moving and addressing gaps and implementation challenges. It has been challenging for SOCR to ensure that the initiative moves consistently forward while each department retains its authority and autonomy. It also is inherently difficult to put the top-down management structure of city departments to work creating a "new" system—work that inevitably involves shifts in power, changes in operating procedures, and redistribution of resources. Those changes must happen in a highly political environment with the potential for leadership change every four years. SOCR has learned to be flexible about each department's change process instead of instead of creating cookie-cutter approaches.

What makes this site unique is the city's ability to hold employees and department heads accountable and to expect a high standard of knowledge and behavior. The accountability agreement that each department director has with the mayor is an important tool in this regard. RSJI's

---

[31] National Diabetes Education Program factsheet, "The Diabetes Epidemic among African Americans." www.ndep.nih.gov/diabetes/pubs/FS_AfricanAm.pdf, Accessed May 14, 2007.

multifaceted strategy for change—using top-down leaders to move the process, organizing around specific issues, and working at the department level—also helps to generate accountability.

RSJI has the largest staff structure and the longest training program in our study, but building the capacity of 10,000 government employees remains a massive system-change effort. The training program developed by SOCR works well because it meets people where they are in their understanding of institutional racism. One of the training program's driving principles is to help Whites understand racism and privilege, realizing the challenges and barriers to sustaining their growth.

The Core Team and departmental Change Teams have the potential to be a model for an inclusive equitable work teams and processes. The Core Team's size and required time commitment (120 hours per year) provides substantial infrastructure for significant momentum and integration within the institution and the departmental change teams. The highly trained Core Team also serves as a model for practices, principles, and norms, some of which (e.g., racial caucuses) have been adopted by Change Teams and thus have potential to spread throughout city government.

Departmental Change Teams play a critical role in institutional change and capacity building. Change Teams are a good mechanism for identifying instances of institutionalized racism and making changes, although the rotation of members on and off the teams has slowed implementation in some departments. Some team members also have been diverted from RSJI responsibilities by priorities that were deemed more urgent within their department.

After three years of focusing on economic equity and structured enforcement, Seattle is seeing slight changes in the number of contracts given to WMBEs and Historically Underutilized Businesses. The tactic of cultivating relationships with more diverse vendors, and the effort to discourage acceptance of the status quo, seem to be paying off—although the city still faces the challenge of minimal increases in contracts among African-American business owners. There is potential for political fallout when departments begin to distribute a larger number of contracts equitably, but such a situation also could be a chance to educate business owners about RSJI's values and principles.

RSJI staff now are examining their activities, structures, and processes to see what to keep, refine, or modify in the next phase of work. A serious question is whether and how RSJI will partner more fully with Seattle residents outside city government; another is whether and how RSJI will hold itself more formally accountable for contributing to community-level outcomes, both through its business lines and direct partnership and leadership of race and social justice activities beyond the city departments. If RSJI becomes a truly citywide effort, there is much to be gained by residents working in full partnership with city government to leverage RSJI's strengths and to tackle racial disparities in many sectors. The number of city employees who are knowledgeable and skilled at supporting and leading has grown. But the process of taking RSJI into the community has both risks and rewards, especially when publicly stating the government's commitment to addressing institutional racism.

RSJI is young but off to a promising start with significant potential to produce major changes. Its focus on deep system change comes with a set of barriers ranging from active resistance and capacity issues to staying power. RSJI therefore deserves external recognition and support to ensure that the initiative is institutionalized and can weather changes in political leadership.

LESSONS SPECIFIC TO SEATTLE

1. Initiative leaders must sometimes be willing to take risks. It isn't always clear how to do this work as one goes along; but fear of the unknown can by paralyzing. Effective leaders do the best they can, recognizing that it won't be perfect and people may criticize them.

2. Build in time for training and follow up to see how well people are processing the new information. The *Race: Power of an Illusion* series seems a good way to reach diverse groups of people. Still, after training some people become overzealous about using the concepts in their daily lives, so reality checks are important. Others may struggle with the information and need more time to process and ask questions.

2. Take time to assess each department's challenges and readiness to change and create a plan that is reflective of their stage. Not every key player may want to participate, and some may not like the initiative's message and content. Some managers that were not ready for change blamed others (such as the trainers), others undermine work teams, or fail to submit plans. Some departments had to discuss diversity before they could tackle institutional racism. Initiative leaders found a better assessment could have paved the way for smoother implementation and lessen resistance.

3. All city employees need training, despite the logistical challenges especially with large departments. RSJI leaders ended up renegotiating some timelines for completion of training but did not eliminate the expectation that all staff would be trained.

4. Responsibility and accountability for results have to be broadly shared. Racial equity work won't succeed at a community level if it is done by a handful of people devoting a fraction of their time. It has to be integrated into the everyday work of many people and organizations.

5. Policies and procedures within city and state government can undermine efforts to give all companies equal access to public contracts. Examples include: bonding and insurance requirements set at levels that preclude new and smaller businesses from competing; the policy of accepting "best and lowest" bids without defining "best;" and the practice of paying contractors at the end of a job, which puts untenable cash-flow pressure on new and/or small companies. Though these structural changes may require higher risk, some believe they still need to be taken. In Seattle, these issues are being addressed through DEA's Small Works Roster Program and Job Order Contact Program.

6. Data shouldn't be rigidly interpreted the same way for all departments. If a department only makes large purchases every three years, for instance, the number of contracts it gives annually to WMBEs may not accurately reflect its intent. The solution is review each department individually and make adjustments.

7. It can be difficult for Whites to do this work without feeling guilt and sadness rather than hopefulness. Through anti-racist training, however, some White people have begun to see the importance of their involvement and become more motivated and passionate.

The story of St. Cloud—a predominantly white community for over 100 years that experienced an immigration of people of color—illustrates the stages a community can move through as populations change and the good choices, leadership, and vision needed to adapt in a positive way.

St. Cloud's demographic shift is not unique. Many historically white communities have become more diverse over the last two or three decades, often with tension and turmoil. Some communities have changed their laws to enforce exclusion; others increased institutional barriers to access through prejudicial practices and policy changes, or responded with harassment and hate crimes.[32] One of the overriding reactions for many communities to harassment and hate crimes is silence, or marginalizing victims for sharing their stories, and/or minimal punishment for the offender(s).

But some communities have responded differently. They have convened public forums, created task forces to make recommendations, hosted diversity celebrations, and/or required sensitivity training for the sectors (e.g., police, schools) involved in the racial incident. Different interventions may seem appropriate based on a community's history of racism or how residents talk about race. Typically, however, interventions are singular and intended to remedy a situation, lessen emotions, or protect reputations. The responses are usually not about asking questions like: "How can our community ensure that every resident has a good quality of life?" "What changes need to be made in policies, procedures, and culture to ensure that every resident has full access and equity?"

Indeed, during the first years of shifting demographics in St. Cloud, incidents of overt bigotry, race-motivated harassment, and hate crimes met mostly with silence. Such incidents have been documented since 1982, however, and the city ranked among the state's five worst cities for hate crimes in 1998, 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005. As recently as 2000, a survey of St. Cloud's residents of color revealed a sense that the community—nicknamed "White Cloud"—was unwelcoming.

But eventually St. Cloud's leaders stepped up, its residents stepped in, and with the beginning of Mayor Meyer's Racial Harmony Initiative, in 1998, they chose to become more proactive. It was been a tumultuous journey, but the work evolved into a long-term, regionally focused effort to close racial equity gaps and produce systemic change, now called Create CommUNITY. This case study focuses on two key aspects of St. Cloud's work: engaging and educating the community, and moving toward equity.

---

[32] Recent examples: *PENNSYLVANIA*: "Hazleton Mayor Lou Barletta told a gathering of Westmoreland County Republicans that he will not back off a controversial ordinance that fines landlords for renting to illegal aliens and revokes business licenses of firms that employ illegals." *Pittsburgh Tribune-Review*, "Hazleton mayor defends law for illegals," by Paul Peirce, 7/13/07. *VIRGINIA*: "Prince William County supervisors Tuesday voted unanimously to require police officers to ask about immigration status in all arrests if there is probable cause to believe that a suspect has violated federal immigration law. Supervisors also voted to require county staff to verify a person's legal status before providing certain public services." *Washington Times*, "County's alien crackdown may spread to other areas," by Natasha Altamirano, 7/13/07. *MICHIGAN*: "This year, police have investigated cross burnings in Dearborn Heights and Trenton and racially motivated graffiti in Warren. Warren's mayor drew fierce criticism when he called his city a "fortress" against crime coming from Detroit, whose population is mostly black." *Detroit News*, "Racial divide haunts Metro Detroit; Livonia store controversy, Detroit mayoral election and suburban cross burnings reopen old wounds," by Brad Heath and Catherine Jun, 9/22/05. *GEORGIA*: "Georgia Gov. Sonny Perdue signed a bill requiring jailers to check the immigration status of anyone arrested for a felony or drunk driving. Local officers will be trained to start the deportation process for illegal immigrants they encounter during routine law enforcement." *Los Angeles Times*, "Dispatch From Tifton, GA.; With a Little Help From Neighbors; After six savage slayings of Latinos in a small city, police seek recruits who can lift culture barriers," by Jenny Jarvie, 7/9/06.

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ST. CLOUD AREA

Population	City of St. Cloud[33]	Stearns County[34]	Benton County[35]	Sherburne County[36]
Total	63, 620	135,253	34,226	64,417
White	88%	94.3%	96.2%	96.7%
Black or African American	4.5%	1.7%	0.8%	0.9%
American Indian and Alaska Native	*	0.1%	0.5%	0.4%
Asian	4.7%	2.1%	1.1%	0.6%
Native Hawaiian, other Pacific Islander	*	0.1%	*	*
Hispanic or Latino(of any race	2.6%	1.8%	0.9%	1.1%
Some other race	*	1.3%	0.4%	0.4%
Two or more races	*	0.5%	0.9%	0.9%

*Although numbers are not listed because they are considered by some as "statistically insignificant," there are residents that self-identify in each of these race/ethnic categories.

SELECTED DATA ON RACIAL DISPARITIES

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

Secondary reading and math achievement: In the 2005-06 school year, 79% of Asian American students, 49% of Black students, and 67% of White students in 8th grade met the state standards for reading on the Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment (MCA). In math, 65% of Asian Americans, 20% of Blacks, and 58% of Whites met the state standard on the MCA.[37]

High school graduation: 63% of Black students, compared with 93% of White students in 2004-05.

University graduation: 52% of Asian-American students, 63% of Black, and 63% of American Indian students graduated from St. Cloud State University, compared with 75% of Whites and 82% of Hispanics in 2004-05.

Technical school graduation: 75% of Asian-American students and 65% of White students at St. Cloud Technical College graduated in 2004-05, compared with 50% of African-Americans.

HOUSING ACCESS

Homeownership: The ownership rate in St. Cloud, based on the number of owner-occupied homes in the community, is 97.1% for Whites, 1.31% for Asian Americans, .38% for Blacks, .37% for Hispanics, and .29% for American Indian, according to the 2000 U.S. Census.

Housing Cost vs. Income: The current median home price in St. Cloud is $171,600. The median income is $39,293 (no breakdown by race).[38]

Discrimination: In 2006, the St. Cloud's Human Rights Office reported 37 confirmed cases of housing discrimination.

HEALTH CARE ACCESS

Health insurance: Statewide, the proportion of uninsured residents in 2004 was 34.2% for Hispanics, 21% for Native Americans, 12.8% for African Americans, 9.8% for Asian Americans, and 5.9% for Whites.[39]

33 PowerPoint presentation, "The Power of Race and the Promise of Community," Dr. Michael Emerson, 10/10/2006.

34 2005 American Community Survey, www.census.gov/acs/www/, accessed 6/12/07.

35 2005 American Community Survey, www.census.gov/acs/www/, accessed 8/7/07.

36 *Ibid*.

37 Create CommUNITY Education Indicators Data, 2007.

38 Create CommUNITY Housing Indicators Data, 2007.

39 Create CommUNITY Health Care Indicators Data, 2007.

BASIC FACTS ABOUT THE INITIATIVE

Name of Initiative	**Mayor's Racial Harmony Initiative, which became Create CommUNITY**
Start date	1998 — Mayor's Racial Harmony Initiative 2003 — Create CommUNITY (regionally focused)
Administrative Home	First the mayor's office, then a community steering committee
Mission	To provide a welcoming, nondiscriminatory environment with respect and opportunity for all.
Strategies and Interventions	• Action teams organized first by sector, then by gap (disparity) • Community forums and seminars • Dismantling racism workshops • Dialogue groups and discussion • Research and focus groups • Re-granting process
Major Issue Areas	Educational attainment, housing access, health care access, and "strengthening our community through dismantling racism"
Definition of Racism	Racism is race prejudice and the misuse of power by systems and institutions
Long-Term Target Outcomes	• Open and full participation by the marginalized population • All programs and activities accessible to all without discrimination, with the initiative seen as the major reason that St. Cloud is a welcoming, nondiscriminatory community that offers respect and opportunities for all • Actions show that the community safeguards human dignity. • Individuals who have not been afforded their rights have an opportunity to participate in decision making related to government, business, education, health care, human services, and faith. • No equity gaps in educational attainment, housing access, health care access, and "strengthening our community through dismantling racism" • St. Cloud area is lauded as a model anti-racist community that embodies and celebrates diversity
Staffing	One part-time coordinator hired in 2005; became full-time in January 2007
Steering Committee	21 members
Budget	Operational budget $64,000 annually in operating funds, plus $200,000 for regranting
Major Donors	Otto Bremer Foundation, Central Minnesota Community Foundation, Morgan Family Foundation, City of St. Cloud, local businesses

HISTORY

St. Cloud is located in central Minnesota, 60 miles northwest of Minneapolis and St. Paul. With a population of almost 64,000, it is one of Minnesota's 10 largest cities. It spans three counties and serves as a hub for the surrounding rural and farming communities.

The central Minnesota region was home to two major indigenous tribes, the Ojibwa and the Dakota. In the early 1850s, the U.S. government required leaders of these tribes to sign treaties giving up their land in exchange for financial compensation. The Dakotas fought back but by 1880 the tribes were restricted to living on a reservation apart from their homeland.[40] The region became predominately White as German Catholics immigrated to the area, followed by Scandinavian Lutherans. In the 1970s, St. Cloud experienced its first major immigration of people of color, Southeast Asians. In *St. Cloud: The Triplet City, An Illustrated History*, local historian John C. Massman describes St. Cloud's changing diversity:

> The profile of the community isn't what it was 50 years ago, (or) 20 years ago. In 1900, three out of four individuals in Minnesota had been born abroad or had parents who were born abroad. In 1940, the two most commonly spoken languages in Minnesota were German and Norwegian. . . In the 1990s, a large number of African refugees migrated to St. Cloud, forming what is now the city's largest minority group.[41]

St. Cloud residents showed support for voting rights for Blacks in December 1965, when 700 people gathered at the United Methodist Church to show solidarity for the hundreds of demonstrators who marched from Selma to Montgomery, Alabama. The St. Cloud marchers traveled three city blocks—through nine inches of snow. Clarence White, one of the few Black residents at the time and a participant in the march, says it did not make his life different although he has observed gradual changes over the past 40 years.[42]

Between 1980 and 1990 Minnesota's minority population grew 72%, which was faster than the national average. (Minnesota ranks 12th among states with the highest proportion of White residents.[43]) In the 1990s, a large number of African refugees moved to the area, forming what is now the city's largest minority group.[44] St. Cloud has had the state's fastest population growth outside the Twin Cities, and the population is expected to grow another 35% by 2020.[45] St. Cloud State University is the second-largest university in the state. Its enrollment of 15,327 students in fall 2006 was 6.3% students of color.[46] Along with these changes, several locally owned businesses have been purchased by outside companies, with the result that there is less business-sector involvement in community programs.[47]

IMPETUS FOR THE INITIATIVE

From the time people of color began migrating to central Minnesota in the mid 1980s, and as the number of students of color who attend St. Cloud State University, College of St. Benedict, and St. John's University increased, there have been reports of racial incidents and hate crimes in the community and on local campuses. Three surveys conducted by St. Cloud State University in 1987-88

[40] Stearns History Museum website, *Community Beginnings*, Chapter 5, http://www.stearns-museum.org/index2.html, accessed 8/7/07.
[41] Behling, John, "Local historian holds signing." *University Chronicle,* April 3, 2003.
[42] Aeikens, Dave, "1965 St. Cloud march mirrored nation's shift." *St. Cloud Times*, March 28, 2005.
[43] Minnesota State Planning Agency, Population Notes. *Minnesota State Demographer*, September, 1991.
[44] Behling, John, "Local historian holds signing." *University Chronicle,* April 3, 2003.
[45] www.lpa.state.mn.us/sdspp/tsld014.htm, Accessed 5/16/07,.
[46] Office of Institutional Effectiveness, *Fact Book*, www.stcloudstate.edu/oie/research/factbook.asp, accessed 8/7/07
[47] Green, Leslie R. *Appreciating Differences Among People and Things*, July, 1999, p.3.

indicated that 50-60% of the respondents (faculty, staff and students) had suffered off-campus racial harassment, including physical abuse. The *St. Cloud Times* conducted a survey in 1987, posing the questions, "Would the area benefit from more racial minorities?" and "Should efforts be made to encourage more racial minorities?" Responses indicated a negative perception of minorities.[48] In 1990, six focus groups conducted with area residents, including people of color, concluded that the St. Cloud area was neither friendly nor hospitable.[49]

In 1995, a hot issue was whether multicultural education should be part of the public school curriculum. At that time, only one of the district's 900 teachers was African American and 5% of the 12,000 students were people of color. Some residents saw the issue as a competition between multicultural education and time spent on basic learning skills, such as math and reading.[50]

In spring 1995, six students of the MEChA *(Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlan)* and one community member participated in a hunger strike for 10 days to gain concessions from St. Cloud State University. University administrators agreed to six of their 13 demands, including: organizing a group to develop a cultural center, working with students to define a multicultural resource center, creating a steering committee to form a Chicano Studies program, and discontinuing purchases of California table grapes.[51]

In fall 1997, two racial incidents occurred on the St. Cloud University campus. An African-American student found "KKK" and a swastika drawn with an arrow to her name on a board in her residence hall, and twice a vandal scratched a swastika on the car of a Lebanese faculty member. The incidents terrified the individuals, and the University's slow response frustrated students. (The first case was dismissed as a prank and the second had to occur twice before it was deemed a hate crime.[52]) Also in 1997, a test of housing discrimination found that "in 27 of the 45 tests, or 60%, people were treated differently based on race.[53] Moreover, 40-60% of St. Cloud apartment owners were found by state, city, and independent sources to discriminate against some applicants.[54]

Various organizations did respond to interracial tensions by creating culturally relevant services and providing programs to increase residents' awareness of racial and ethnic diversity. For example, the Central Minnesota Community Foundation formed the Appreciating Differences Among People and Things (ADAPT) initiative in 1990 to reduce racism. ADAPT received a five-year planning grant in 1992 from the Ford and MacArthur foundations.

ADAPT's mission grew into supporting and encouraging "the evolution of positive attitudes toward racial and cultural diversity in all facets of community life."[55] Its focus was leadership and coordination in 12 outcome areas: leadership development, community outreach, awareness of positive people of color, education, and cultural arts. A large portion of the funding was given to community groups to host events to increase residents' awareness and knowledge of diversity.[56] The outcomes[57] ADAPT hoped to achieve by 2010 were:

- Visible awareness that the central Minnesota area recognizes and appreciates cultural diversity;

[48] Green, Leslie R. and Mahowald, Betsy G. *Final Report for Appreciating Differences Among People and Things*, July 1999, p. 5.
[49] *Ibid.*, p. 4.
[50] Hotakainen, Rob, "State is urged to stem racism; Multicultural education called key to diversity." *Star Tribune*, December 25, 1995.
[51] "College Hunger Strike Ends." *St. Paul Pioneer Press,* May 15, 1995.
[52] Shah, Allie, "Workshop is part of colleges' drive to improve race relations." *Star Tribune,* January 22, 1998.
[53] Kreb, Randy, *"Our View."*   *St. Cloud Times*, October 11, 1999.
[54] Schumacher , Lawrence, "Fair Housing Group drafts anti-bias action plan." *St. Cloud Times,* April 19, 2000.
[55] Document about ADAPT, untitled, undated. Included descriptions of the problem, mission statement, assumptions, advisory council, project goals etc.
[56] *ADAPT Project Update* , 1/17/94, no author listed.
[57] As of July 1999, ADAPT is no longer a project.

- Measurable change in the image that people of color have of central Minnesota and St. Cloud;

- Creation of a feeling of welcome and comfort experienced by all persons when they come to the community; and

- Evolution to a community that is inclusive by nature. The community will view intolerant racial behaviors as exceptional and abnormal, and individuals and agencies will respond to such behaviors in a fashion that causes the perpetrators to feel uncomfortable expressing hostility towards persons from diverse cultures.[58]

THE RACIAL HARMONY INITIATIVE

In January 1998, St. Cloud Mayor Larry Meyer invited 37 community leaders to a breakfast meeting where they would discuss how to address growing racial diversity in the community. "I [invite] you today knowing that because there is not a looming racial crisis before us some might not put this summit meeting [at the] top [of] their agenda," Meyer wrote. "But there have been enough scattered incidents in the community to catch my attention as mayor, and to realize we must make a serious commitment to the need for both a short-range and long-range plan to accomplish the following:

- "How do we make our community a warmer and welcome place for people of color?

- "What ideas can we implement to teach understanding, acceptance and a fundamental sense of fairness in our relationship with racial minorities?

- "How do we demonstrate zero tolerance towards incidents of racial hatred and bigotry?"[59]

Participants included the chief of police, county sheriff, executive directors of several nonprofits, pastors of churches, editor and publisher of the local newspaper, presidents of local colleges and university, St. Cloud Public School District superintendent, board of education chair, and president of the local NAACP. The meetings, initially framed as "Managing Diversity in the 21st Century," set the course for the Racial Harmony Leadership meetings.

Participants identified 12 focus areas: resources; youth programs; judicial prosecution and organizations; faith communities; law enforcement; advertising/radio and print media; festivals, celebrations, and cultural arts; awards and recognition; community diversity education; education; housing; and government. For the first two years, the mayor's initiative (which evolved from the meeting) focused mainly on developing awareness of different cultures and ethnicities and educating people about the importance of diversity.

Two other projects began in 1998, separate from the mayor's initiative. One was Parents of Children of Color and Concerned Citizens (PC-4), which worked with the school districts to make anti-harassment policies more "understandable and user-friendly."[60] The other was the Fair Schools Project, run by St. Cloud Area Legal Services, which "provide[s] assistance if students experience discrimination…and increase[s] awareness of problems children of color may be experiencing."[61]

---

[58] From a document [no title] faxed from the St. Cloud State University Education Department, dated 6/1/98. The ADAPT mission was changed in this document to, "The mission of the project is to create the perception and reality that racial harmony exists and that diversity is valued in the Central Minnesota area."
[59] Correspondence from the Office of the Mayor, dated 1/8/98.
[60] Krebs, Randy, "Our View: Find Methods to Embrace City's Diversity." *St. Cloud Times*, January 13, 2000.
[61] *Ibid*.

In 1999, Mayor Meyer and the city council hired a consultant to learn more about community race relations. The consultant surveyed residents to learn their attitudes about race issues and interviewed residents of color about their experiences. The local newspaper reported the findings of the surveys and interviews. The first described a community "scared but ready to face the challenge of increasing diversity" and the other "a White Cloud still mired in racial prejudice."[62] Of the 133 racially diverse residents surveyed, 98 rated the government poorly, citing distance, poor communication, and racism. Almost all respondents (131) felt the city did a poor job of helping newcomers feel welcome. All respondents believed that token employment of people of color was a serious factor in race relations.[63] The mayor responded by, among other things, initiating Community Circles—forums at which city staff met with residents of color to discuss services, answer questions, and build trust.

In 2000, the Racial Harmony working group noted these accomplishments:[64]

- Growing use of the *Workplace Integrity, Self-esteem, Equality and Respect* self-directed diversity training program for government and private business employees.

- New employment regulations within city offices to address minority concerns and increased efforts to recruit minority employees.

SAMPLE ACTIVITIES OF THE RACIAL HARMONY INITIATIVE, 1998-2000

Faith leaders gathered to develop a vision of racial harmony. They decided they wanted training to understand racism, so in May 1999 the Minnesota Churches Anti-Racism Initiative offered an intensive training for 17 people.

The mayor and city council convened a community "speak-out" on race relations in 1998 where residents discussed how to make the community fairer, more welcoming, and inclusive. The problems most frequently mentioned were: lack of diversity in curriculum and staffing in the schools, lack of affordable housing, no communication among services organizations, and racial tension.

The Regional Initiative for Diversity Education (RIDE) was created to promote racial harmony, inclusiveness, and equal opportunity by providing educational experiences to residents throughout central Minnesota. RIDE created WISER (Workplace, Integrity, Self-Esteem, Equality and Respect), an interactive workbook with exercises, self-assessments, and agendas for diversity discussions. The goals are to: study and learn about diversity, multiculturalism, ethical, and legal issues; understand how people are the same and how they differ; and recognize that the community is stronger, and individuals' lives are better, when everyone is valued and accepted.

The judicial system helped create local circle sentencing and restorative justice alternatives* in partnership with the St. Cloud Area American Indian Center.

The United Way convened a social service task force to "build understanding and develop strategies for recruitment and retention of non-Caucasian employees [and] consider communication and language barriers."

* "Circles are found in the Native American cultures of the United States and Canada, and are used there for many purposes. Their adaptation to the criminal justice system developed in the 1980s as First Nations peoples of the Yukon and local justice officials attempted to build closer ties between the community and the formal justice system." www.restorativejustice.org/intro/tutorial/processes/circles, accessed 8/7/07

---

[62] Schumacher, Lawrence, "Report: city losing racism battle." St. Cloud Times, January 11, 2000.
[63] Survey conducted by Bettye King, "Assessment of the City of St. Cloud: Living Status of People of Color." 1999.
[64] Schumacher, Lawrence, "City ready to broaden diversity efforts." *St. Cloud Times,* February 4, 2000.

- A civilian review board to respond to complaints regarding police procedure, including allegations of prejudicial treatment.

- Community initiatives to study housing needs and to eliminate barriers to fair, affordable housing.

THE CREATE COMM*UNITY* INITIATIVE

Create CommUNITY is a continuation of Mayor Meyer's Racial Harmony Initiative. This effort was revamped in 2002 by then-Mayor John Ellenbecker to focus on measurable change in the areas of government, business, education, health care, human services, and faith communities. The new name, structure, and mission were announced at a community-wide event in April 2003. The present mayor, Dave Kleis, is a member of the initiative's steering committee.

Create CommUNITY's mission is to provide a welcoming, nondiscriminatory environment with respect and opportunity for all in central Minnesota. In 2003, it had a steering committee composed of committee chairs from six community-wide sectors, plus at-large and ex-officio members. There were three operational committees (fundraising, grant making, and public relations) and sector-specific committees to address the following topics:

1. **Business**: Motivate the business community through education targeted at bottom-line issues, so that businesses actively pursue diversity among their customers and employees.

2. **Education:** Provide community support for students of color to meet higher educational standards. Teach respect and understanding for all. Make classroom and school climate more responsive to the needs of students of color and their families. Work collaboratively with existing diversity efforts to achieve our goals.

3. **Faith:** Bring together faith communities to learn, collaborate, inspire, create fellowship, take action, and hold each other accountable as catalysts for building racial harmony.

4. **Government:** Ensure that public services are accessible to all. Build relationships between community racial groups and local government. Increase diversity in government. Eliminate housing discrimination.

5. **Health Care:** Identify and eliminate barriers to health care for diverse ethnic, religious, and cultural groups in the St. Cloud area.

6. **Human Services:** Initiate and support ethnic and cultural awareness through training and educational seminars. Support the development of a multicultural children's conference.

FOCUS AREA ONE:
ENGAGING AND EDUCATING THE COMMUNITY

PRE-INITIATIVE SNAPSHOT

As noted earlier, St. Cloud's first inhabitants were Ojibwa and Dakota Indians, followed by German, Scandinavian, Southeast Asian, and Somali immigrants. Although the town changed from a small farming community to an urban hub, newcomers—Whites and people of color—say it remains insular.

Before the Racial Harmony initiative began, St. Cloud experienced several hate crimes and incidents of racial harassment. In fact, St. Cloud State University has experienced complaints of racism for more than a decade, including charges of anti-Semitism, bias, and retaliation. In 1994 *USA Today* reported that St. Cloud State University had to recall 3,000 "humorous" campus calendars that designated January 16 (Martin Luther King Day) as "National Nothing Day."[65] In addition to the swastika incidents mentioned earlier, there were at least two similar defacings, and a senior reported that someone yelled racial epithets at her in a campus parking lot.

The university president convened students to learn more and express his dismay over the incidents. The student who drew one of the swastikas was suspended from the dorm for five days, but a student who stood by watching was not disciplined.[66] School administrators established a zero-tolerance policy and provided training to students and faculty to discourage similar incidents.[67]

Problems continued, however. In the St. Cloud metro area in 1998, racist fliers were distributed in a neighborhood and racist graffiti were found at a local park.[68] In early 1999, a young African-American man walking near a downtown Chinese restaurant was punched, kicked, and called a derogatory name.[69] In late 2001, three professors and a student filed a federal lawsuit against the school, detailing reports of anti-Semitism The parties reached a settlement of $1.1 million in 2002. Recently, however, a former St. Cloud resident wrote to high school guidance counselors warning them that attending the university "can be hazardous for black people.'[70]

STRATEGIES

Until mid-2007, Create CommUNITY's steering committee structure was described as a confederacy. There was no centralized process for determining interventions and strategies; each committee focused on educating residents by sector and learning about institutional access barriers. For example:

- The **Business Committee** conducted a diversity seminar, formed dialogue groups, and hosted seminars and discussion groups to inform people in the business sector that diversity is good for the bottom line.

---

[65] "Across the USA: News from Every State." *USA Today*, December 7, 1994.
[66] Livingston, Nancy, "Hate Crimes on Campus; Racial Prejudice continues to Surface at St. Cloud State, and One Victim says she has Suffered for Coming Forward to confront it." *Saint Paul Pioneer Press, November 24, 1997.*
[67] Meryhew, Richard, "Racist incidents leave community reeling; St. Cloud leaders, college administrators, students and residents are working together in an ambitious initiative to combat racism and discrimination and to educate the community on racial diversity." *Star Tribune*, April 26, 1998.
[68] Aekens, Dave, "Few bias crimes reported in region." *St. Cloud Times*, July 25, 1999.
[69] Saez, David, "This beloved community needs circle groups." *St. Cloud Times*, March 7, 1999.
[70] Saigo, Kristina Torresroy, "Bias 101: Give us a little time. It is difficult to change attitudes and minds." *Saint Paul Pioneer Press*, March 24, 2002.

- The **Education Committee** developed lists of multicultural educational programs and connected groups working on educational diversity.

- The **Faith Communities Committee** sponsored a series of meetings on interfaith sacred texts and communities, endorsed a "healing vigil," and wrote a statement of welcome adopted by more than 70 faith communities.

- The **Government Committee** created a task force to research and advocate for a Regional Human Rights Office. The committee provided a forum for dialogue among local government officials, police chiefs, and community members.

- The **Health Care Committee** hosted focus groups with African American, Native American, Latino, Vietnamese, and Somali groups to identify barriers to health care.

- The **Human Services Committee** offered cultural awareness education to the general public and organized three Children of Multiple Cultures conferences. A fourth conference, Paths to Cultural Understanding, focused on child care providers. The committee also conducted a feasibility study on nonprofit status and governance prior to developing a multicultural center.[71]

Several organizations, including the Chamber of Commerce and United Way, offered training to increase awareness of cultural and racial differences. In 2004, St. Cloud State University launched the Community Anti-Racism Education (CARE) initiative, whose mission is to build a lasting anti-racist university and community. CARE's holds *Understanding Racism and Anti-Racism Organizing* workshops, ranging from a half day to three days, are open to students, staff, and community residents. Workshop topics include defining racial justice and racism, systemic power, access and control, power and privilege, and institutional transformation.[72]

Also during this period, the Central Minnesota Community Foundation took the lead in discussing social capital with the community, drawing from "Bowling Alone" author Robert Putnam's analysis of "bonding" social capital (in which people of like minds share what they already have in common) and "bridging" social capital (in which people with different backgrounds find things in common). The foundation adopted social capital as a metric to measure community health and conducted a survey to find a baseline level of social capital. The foundation then began intentionally funding projects that foster social capital, specifically "bridging" social capital. The local newspaper, a partner of the initiative, helped immensely by devoting six front-page articles and two editorials to the importance of social capital.

The Racial Harmony Initiative's transition into Create CommUNITY formally kicked off with a speech by Herman Boone, whose life story was the basis for the movie *Remember the Titans.* To engage the community in this event, organizers invited all of the service clubs to have their monthly lunch meeting with Boone as the speaker (a group of more than 300 people); later he spoke to a the broader community audience. With interest quickly mounting, organizers doubled their fundraising goal to $100,000—and achieved it.

Create CommUNITY's steering committee re-granted these funds to community groups for programs they hoped would address systemic change (e.g., mentoring Somali women to understand U.S. banking; helping new immigrants acquire the tools needed to integrate into American society; underwriting an exhibit on Latino life in the United States.)[73] This wasn't always easy. Initially, many grant proposals lacked substance or weren't focused on systemic change, and some members of the steering committee

---

[71] Document describing Create CommUNITY, Highlights section, Undated.
[72] St. Cloud University CARE website, http://www.stcloudstate.edu/care/workshops.asp, accessed 8/7/07.
[73] Grant proposal to Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Minnesota Foundation, April, 2007, p.3.

questioned how much impact the funding would have. To answer that question, Create CommUNITY would have to clarify what it meant to "address systemic racism."

FOCUS AREA TWO:
MOVING TO EQUITY

The steering committee held a retreat in early 2006 with consultants from the Effective Communities firm to learn more about how to generate long-term, systemic change. Steering committee members also participated in a dismantling racism workshop facilitated by CARE and the Minnesota Collaborative Anti-Racism Initiative. The committee then decided to focus on eliminating systemic racism by working toward achievable goals to close the gaps that prevent the community from being welcoming to all. Create CommUNITY introduced its new focus to the community in fall 2006 with a Conversation on Race that attracted 500 people, 30% of them people of color. Michael Emerson, a former Minnesotan who now teaches at Rice University, spoke about why the community needs to work toward fairness, justice, and equity from an economic perspective, and provided data on racial disparities.

Instead of emphasizing on one major issue, such as equitable housing, the steering committee chose to focus on several problem areas for which they believed they could make and track progress. The overarching goal became to "advocate and support programs that can be measured in [their] progress toward narrowing gaps affecting the many cultural, ethnic, and racial communities."[74] A local firm, UpFront Consulting, was the lead researcher and worked with Create CommUNITY's Gaps subcommittee to (1) identify indicators of the gaps between majority and underrepresented racial, cultural, and ethnic groups; (2) determine which indicators had metrics that could realistically and efficiently be used to measure change; and (3) select a short list of metrics for measuring progress in the city and the wider St. Cloud area.

After collecting baseline data, Create CommUNITY selected four areas of focus: educational attainment; housing access; health care access; and cultural competency education, later changed to "strengthening our community: dismantling racism."   The next step is to guide and support the committees as they identify goals for systemic change. Create CommUNITY expresses its target indicators as follows:

- Narrowing the eighth-grade MCA [Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments] scores between White students and students of color;

- Narrowing the gap of home ownership between Whites and people of color;

- Improving access to health care by underserved/underrepresented populations in central Minnesota, measured by patient satisfaction [within] communities of color; and

- Strengthening the community by dismantling racism.

Create CommUNITY recently released a request for proposals to address these four gaps. The steering committee is in the process of publicly explaining the racial disparity gaps, aided by a research partnership with the *St. Cloud Times*. The community will learn more about the four gaps at the Second Annual "Continuing the Conversation on Race" occurring in October 2007.

---

[74] Create CommUNITY document, "Research and Planning Project on Gaps," Gannett Foundation, Undated.

Because of the new focus on systemic racism and four of its major manifestations, in 2007 the steering committee voted to modify membership to include at least 19 appointed individuals but not more than 23. Steering committee members represent the following **institutions and organizations:** city government (i.e., the mayor), Central Minnesota Community Foundation, United Way, Chamber of Commerce, St. Cloud State University, Human Rights Office, and NAACP, plus one representative for the three public school districts. Criteria for institutional membership are: a long-term commitment to and focus on race; influence in the community; a high level of involvement within the represented organization; and historical involvement with the Create CommUNITY and Racial Harmony process. **Partnership links** include representatives from the faith, business (four positions), government, and health sectors.

Furthermore, at least one-third, and preferably one-half, of the steering committee members must be people of color (defined as African American, African, Latino/Latina, Asian American, or American Indian). The steering committee's **at-large membership** includes representation by African American, African, Hispanic, Asian/Asian American, and American Indian residents.
The new structure also increases the number of committees to improve coordination. Create CommUNITY now has four standing committees (Executive, Administration, Finance, Grants); four ad-hoc committees (Events, Gap Research, Structure, Nominations); and one committee for each of the four gap areas.

OUTCOMES

As is often the case, it's hard to link specific outcomes to the initiative. For some Create CommUNITY can claim direct responsibility, but for others the initiative was more of a catalyst, observer, and nurturer. We do know, however, the initiative raised $106,841 from 23 businesses, nonprofits and local governments and gave 15 grants to community projects. Furthermore, there is anecdotal evidence of positive change, including:

Improved community/police relations and responses. St. Cloud now has a community policing agreement and a reward system for reporting hate/bias crimes. Leaders of the African-American, African, and Latino communities now know that if there is a problem they can deal directly with the police chief. "Our police are willing to consider crimes as hate crimes over some other places in Minnesota that aren't … Five years ago St. Cloud wouldn't have been talking about [hate crimes]," says Human Rights Director Baba Odukale. "[Now] we're trying to address them."[75]

Community support for diversity and opposition to racism. Other community groups are now recognizing, discussing, and taking action to put diversity front and center and to address discrimination. As Create CommUNITY Coordinator Hedy Tripp observes, "It is more than tokenism. The ability for me to talk about tokenism and know that I will be understood and respected—that is a big difference." In November 2002, racist messages were scrawled on three immigrant-run businesses, including a Somali mosque and community center. Instead of ignoring the incident, residents quickly scrubbed off the buildings. The city council passed a resolution of support and announced that the community will have "zero tolerance" for hate crimes.[76] Create CommUNITY leaders sent a clear message that they would not tolerate this behavior in the community and offered a reward for the perpetrator(s)' apprehension.

---

[75] Santilukka, Chuanpis, "St. Cloud ranks high on hate crimes list." *St. Cloud Times*, November 23, 2004.
[76] Schumacher, Lawrence, "Local leaders Express support for Somalis." *St. Cloud Times*, November 26, 2002.

Support for human rights enforcement. In 2005, prompted by Create CommUNITY's efforts, the city council agreed to join counties and cities in fighting hate crimes. Planning soon began to establish a regional branch of the Minnesota Department of Human Rights in the area. Recently, the state's Human Rights Commissioner agreed to support a plan to provide the office with a higher level of service, including investigation and enforcement.[77]

Landlord sensitivity to racism in housing. Create CommUNITY worked with local governments to pass a resolution supporting a fair housing initiative. When the Human Rights Office opened, staff received many complaints about landlords' blatant discrimination, so they conducted audits and providing fair housing training for landlords. Not only have complaints against landlords lessened, landlords now are reporting racial incidents (e.g., harassment of one tenant by another) and asking for help responding to them.

Leadership and advocacy for equitable decisions. In 2006, the City Planning Board refused a zoning changed requested by Nu Way Missionary Baptist Church, a predominately black congregation with 200 members, which wanted to purchase a larger building. Almost 300 people, many of whom were non-residents, signed a petition opposing the church's request. But the church appealed to the city council, filling its chambers with a racially diverse group of supporters, and the council voted unanimously to overturn the planning commission's decision.[78]

CONCLUSIONS

St. Cloud is a model for how community leaders can step up when faced with the interrelated challenges of hate crimes, demographic shifts, and racial disparities and insist that every resident is entitled to a good quality of life. This community was not afraid to examine its shortcomings by collecting data on disparities and listening to harsh assessments from residents. Community leaders listened to the issues and responded forthrightly. City staff met with people from various communities of color to discuss services, answer questions, and begin building trust. The Central Minnesota Community Foundation's funding of projects that foster "bridging" social capital was crucial in sending a message to the community. Many residents and leaders of color were strong and resilient. They took the early hits and had the courage to take substantial risks. They relived the impact of people's hate and bigotry by sharing their stories. They took time to educate the ignorant and those in denial. And they supported their children, who also had to endure the impact of institutional racism and hate.

St. Cloud illustrates some strategic stages of the community change process. The maturation process is reflected in its name, which evolved from "Managing Diversity in the 21st century" to "Racial Harmony" and "Create CommUNITY." The initiative's focus similarly evolved from increasing awareness and knowledge **sector by sector** to focusing on **measurable changes in systems**—including government, education, business, health care, human services, and faith communities—and then to **closing gaps in the four focus areas** of educational attainment, housing access, health care access, and dismantling racism to strengthen the community. Along the way, the initiative's steering committee adopted a role that was increasingly that of a funder, catalyst, and supporter of other organizations' efforts rather than that of the primary actor.

[77] Ryan, Mackenzie, "Korbel backs rights office." *St. Cloud Times,* May 30, 2007.
[78] Schumacher, Lawrence, "Nu Way wins rezoning decision, Church to open at northside site." *St. Cloud Times*, August 29, 2006.

By making these transitions, **Create CommUNITY has courageously started a process that will restructure how power and resources are distributed in the community.** The challenge ahead is to stay focused on how the four major focus areas intersect within a structural racism framework. Collaborators realize that the effects of structural racism will be resolved not by addressing a single issue but by changing the way all systems interact to create racial disparities. The re-granting process will be a good indicator of whether (a) grantee organizations are framing their interventions with a systemic-racism lens and (b) interventions are being designed with enough intensity and sustainability to make progress on closing the gaps.

This is also a story of leadership and values. In a relatively small, predominantly White community, people of color do not have anonymity. The repercussions of their actions can be serious. including how they are treated on the job, how their children are treated in school, and how they are treated when attempting to obtain services. But throughout St. Cloud's tumultuous journey, leaders of all races and ethnicities consistently stood up and encouraged each other's involvement and commitment, underscoring the fact that communities cannot address racial equity unless everyone acts collectively, responsibility, and with accountability to people of color.

St. Cloud has much to be proud of, although the road ahead is still long. Collaborators have successfully transitioned from the goal, "Let's all get along," to "Let's ensure this is an equitable community for all residents." It has been a process, hopefully, that will be replicated in other majority-white communities.

LESSONS SPECIFIC TO ST. CLOUD

1. Even a lightly staffed CCIR can achieve major results. Of the four sites in this study, St. Cloud had the most minimal staffing: one part-time coordinator who only recently became full-time. Her role is to coordinate and support the steering committee's work, and she is considered someone with great knowledge, skills, and passion whose contribution was crucial for moving the initiative forward. Staff capacity may become an issue as they move into this next phase of work. It is unknown how much support organizations will need to implement their grant projects as they work toward closing the gaps.

2. It may not be in the initiative's best interest to become a nonprofit entity. Steering committee members considered turning Create CommUNITY into a nonprofit but decided not to because it might cause some participants to step away, and the sustained involvement of top leaders is deemed essential. "As a community collaborative everyone is gathering for a common purpose, and if we believe that this is one of the most important issues in the community then we should all be at the table working on it," explains Steve Joul, president of the Central Minnesota Community Foundation.

3. It is important to have community buy-in and community leadership on board. Then community leaders and people of color need to talk about the issues in a frank and honest way. It is important to provide lots of training opportunities, since many times people are just in denial and/or don't know or understand the issue.

4. Bringing leadership together and getting on the same page regarding systemic racism is crucial. It is important to understand the root issues so you can figure out how to measure whether or not you are actually making a difference.

5. Dedicate time and expertise to research local data on indicators and gaps. This includes having focus groups from the community to create ownership for social change. Organize free community events to share the information with the larger community and offer opportunities for them to participate in addressing different issues.

6. The relationship-building stage was essential, even though an earlier focus on systemic racism might have generated more rapid progress toward equity. Participants don't believe they would have attracted the support and commitment they have today if they hadn't first focused on understanding cultural differences, increasing inter-group interactions, and engaging key leaders through the Racial Harmony Initiative.

PROFILE 3: CHARLOTTE, NORTH CAROLINA: CREATING "EYE-TO-EYE" LEADERSHIP AND DECISION MAKING

Charlotte, "Queen City of the South," is a community in which leaders of businesses, local government, and interracial groups have consistently stepped forward when their peers in other cities chose not to in similar racial crises. The first example came during the civil rights movement. In February 1960, 200 African-American students from the Johnson C. Smith College courageously decided to eat at the Whites-only lunch counters in town, which prompted the stores to close. Other Southern communities used violence and mass arrests to quell protests against Jim Crow laws, and indeed there were two rock-throwing incidents in Charlotte. But Mayor James Smith and Chamber of Commerce President Stanford Brookshire formed a biracial Friendly Relations Committee, which persuaded store owners to desegregate their lunch counters.[79]

Also during the 1960s, Charlotte's African-American urban core was targeted for renewal. Displaced residents lost their sense of community until Hugh McColl, the White president of NationsBank, began working with Charlotte's first African-American mayor, Howard Gantt, to revitalize residential neighborhoods. McColl and four other White business leaders known as The Group believed in and supported public/private partnerships, which some observers say kept poverty from growing in Charlotte. Their efforts won national awards for urban design and for intentionally mixing races and incomes.[80] Although The Group's influence lessened, its civic spirit and commitment to a full community left a mark on the next generation of leaders.[81]

In 1973, after the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that racially segregated school districts in Charlotte-Mecklenburg must begin busing students, 25 Black and White residents—both pro- and anti-busing—began working on a busing plan. Respect grew among the adversaries, and Charlotte eventually integrated its schools. Many people who in other cities might have used their wealth or privilege to circumvent busing instead chose to "put their own children on the bus."[82]

Based on this history, it is not surprising that two leaders started the Community Building Task Force after a series of incidents magnified racial divisions, including a "police shooting, [the] prospect of public school resegregation, [and] the increasing ethnic diversity of the community [which] all contributed to a climate of unrest."[83] In 1997, Charlotte Mayor Pat McCrory and Park Helms, chairman of the Mecklenburg County Board of Commissioners,[84] asked the Foundation for the Carolinas to be a neutral convener of a task force on race and ethnicity, later to be called the Community Building Initiative.

In 2000, Robert Putnam's Social Capital Benchmark Survey gave Charlotte high marks for faith community involvement, volunteering, and charitable giving but a poor score—second to last among 39

---

[79] Vaughan, John, "Segregation: The Legacy Endures." *Charlotte Observer*, September 14, 1997.

[80] MacDougall, Harold, and Shapiro, Barbara, *Boundary Crossers: Case Studies of How Ten of America's Metropolitan Regions Work, Charlotte: A Company Town.* College Park, MD: Academy of Leadership, 1998, p. 3.

[81] *Ibid.*

[82] Cunningham, Kiran, Furdell, McKinney, *Tapping the Power of City Hall to Build Equitable Communities: 10 City Profiles.* Washington DC: National League of Cities, 2007, p.89.

[83] *Phase One Responding to a crisis,* www.communitybuildinginitiative.org/history_phase1.asp, accessed 6/15/07.

[84] Charlotte is the county seat of Mecklenburg County. Though there have been discussions to consolidate these two government entities, currently their agreement is to eliminate duplication of services, such as police, parks, water, and sewer.

cities—on interracial trust. [85]   Civic leaders took low rating as a call to action. Community conversations led to the creation of Crossroads Charlotte, an initiative that became a large-scale civic engagement process. The Community Building Initiative is now a non-profit organization that operates several of its own programs, collaborates with other organizations to offer community programs, and serves as the process manager for Crossroads Charlotte on a fee-for-service basis. This case study describes the Community Building Initiative (CBI), with special attention to its Leadership Development Initiative and the Crossroads Charlotte project.

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF CHARLOTTE, 2005

Population	*Charlotte[86]*	*Mecklenburg County[87]*
Total	601,598	780,618
White	57.0%	62.4%
Black or African American	34.3%	29.1%
American Indian and Alaska Native	0.4%	0.4%
Asian	3.9%	3.8%
Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander	0.0%	0.0%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	9.7%	9.2%
Some other race	2.7%	2.7%
Two or more races	1.7%	1.5%

SELECTED DATA ON RACIAL DISPARITIES[88]

INCOME

In the 10 Mecklenburg County Census tracks that have 30% to 50% of the population living below the poverty line, 75% of residents are Black and 16% are Hispanic/Latino.

HOUSING ACCESS

The rate of home ownership is 75% for White households, 47% for Blacks, 28.2% for Hispanics, and 45.6% for other minority households in Charlotte.

The share of sub-prime refinanced loans is 41.9% for African Americans and 28.5% for Latinos in Mecklenburg County.

EDUCATION

Minority students drop out of high school at twice the rate of White students in Charlotte-Mecklenburg.

23% of Charlotte Mecklenburg public school students were given out-of-school suspension at least once during the school year (grades 6-12). This percentage increases to more than 37% for African-American students.[89]

HEALTH INSURANCE ACCESS

Nearly 20% of African Americans and more than 30% of Hispanics/Latinos in Mecklenburg County do not have health insurance, compared with slightly more than 10% of Whites.

---

[85] "Three dozen community foundations, other funders, and the Saguaro Seminar of the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University joined together to ask questions of nearly 30,000 people in the largest-ever survey on the civic engagement of USers. Social capital refers to social networks and the norms of reciprocity that arise from them. Communities with higher levels of social capital are likely to have higher educational achievement, better performing governmental institutions, faster economic growth, and less crime and violence," www.cfsv.org/communitysurvey/faqs.html, accessed 8/7/07.
[86] American Community Survey 2005 http://www.census.gov/acs/www/, accessed June 5, 2007.
[87] *Ibid.*
[88] Crossroads Charlotte, *Due Diligence Research: A Working Document*, September 2005.
[89] *United Way of Central Carolinas Indicator Data Report*, July 2006. p.13

BASIC FACTS ABOUT THE INITIATIVE (1)

Name of Initiative	**Community Building Initiative (CBI)**
Start date	1997 — Community Building Task Force 1998 to present — Community Building Initiative
Administrative Home	Affiliated with Foundation for the Carolinas from 1998-2005, became a nonprofit organization in 2006
Mission	To achieve racial and ethnic inclusion and equity
Strategies and Interventions	• Support people and institutions to study, understand, and act on the opportunities and challenges that come from Charlotte-Mecklenburg's dramatic demographic and social changes • Convene and engage individuals, organizations, and institutions in a structured, effective process to address issues of racial and ethnic inclusion and equity
Major Issue Areas	Leadership and organizational development, community partnerships and collaboration, raising community awareness, and building capacity to influence change
Definition of Racism	Systemic practices (formal and informal) in place within organizations, institutions, and society that benefit certain groups and deny other groups access to relationships, experience, and resources. These practices support exclusion, inequity, and distrust and emerge from historical attitudes and beliefs.
Long-Term Target Outcomes	• A cadre of recognized leaders who are knowledgeable and active in the community on issues of racial/ethnic inclusion and equity • Institutions and organizations that are more racially and ethnically inclusive • Comprehensive assessment tools in use by CBI and for ongoing application in the community • Heightened community awareness and clarity on how to address racial/ethnic inclusion and equity • Gains made in closing gaps and ending disparities between racial/ethnic groups
Staffing	3 full-time staff and consultants
Advisory Board	22 members
Budget	$504,500
Major Donors	Carolinas Healthcare Foundation, Duke Energy Foundation, Foundation for the Carolinas, John S. & James L. Knight Foundation, Mecklenburg County, Wachovia Foundation

BASIC FACTS ABOUT THE INITIATIVE (2)

Name of Initiative	**Crossroads Charlotte (Crossroads)**
Start date	2004
Administrative Home	Special initiative of the Foundation for the Carolinas and the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation, managed by CBI
Mission	To choose and pursue a future for Charlotte, not just arrive in one. With an emphasis on creating a community that is accessible to all, inclusive, and equitable, the goal of Crossroads Charlotte is to build a trusting, vibrant, sustainable home.
Strategies and Interventions	• Develop organizational capacity for change and cultivate essential leadership for community change • Spur public will for positive change and a demand for sustainable change • Involve broad constituencies of grassroots participants in Crossroads Charlotte • Build relationships through bridging and bonding opportunities • Establish a sense of urgency in addressing the community's future • Educate the public about trends that affect the future and the forces that drive them • Enable the public to respond to trends with specific deliverables that can be scaled from individual level to networks, organizations, and the community
Major Issue Areas	Access, inclusion, equity, interracial trust
Definition of Racism	Systemic practices (formal and informal) in place within organizations, institutions, and society that benefit certain groups and deny other groups access to relationships, experience, and resources. These practices support exclusion, inequity, and distrust and emerge from historical attitudes and beliefs.
Long-Term Target Outcomes	• Common language is used in the community around the four Crossroads scenarios and the issues included in them • A strong, interdependent network of at least 30 cross-sector organizations engaged in collective community change work • Multiple, on-going initiatives focused on addressing access, inclusion, and equity • A collection of real stories from the community in the form of video, prose, poetry, visual arts and performing arts that chronicle and influence Charlotte's transformation
Staffing	8-member consultant team and 2 part-time staff
Advisory Board	In development; the original planning committee had 21 members from 15 organizations
Budget	$450,000
Major Donors	Foundation for Carolinas, John S. & James L. Knight Foundation

HISTORY

In 1550, several American Indian tribes lived in the North Carolina area, including the Chowanoke, Croatoan, Hatteras, Moratoc, Secotan, Weapemeoc, Machapunga, Pamlico, Coree, Neuse River, Tuscarora, Meherrin, Cherokee, Cape Fear, Catawba, Shakori, Sissipahaw, Sugeree, Waccamaw, Waxhaw, Woccon, Cheraw, Eno, Keyauwee, Occaneechi, Saponi, and Tutelo. Two hundred years later, the Cherokee allied with the British military against the French and Shawnee, but they changed sides after being treated poorly by the English.

In 1814, the Cherokee helped Gen. Andrew Jackson defeat the Creek at the Battle of Horseshoe Bend in Alabama. Jackson told Chief Junaluska of the Cherokee, "As long as the sun shines and the grass grows there shall be friendship between us, and the feet of the Cherokee shall be toward the East." For a while the Cherokee tribe flourished, establishing a national supreme court, a new tribal constitution, and a newspaper printed in Cherokee and English. (They are the first group of American Indians to have a written language.) But Jackson, now President, signed the Indian Removal Act in 1830. Eight years later, 17,000 North Carolina Cherokee were forcibly removed from their land and sent west of the Mississippi; almost one-fourth of the Cherokees died on the 1,200-mile Trail of Tears.[90]

By 1860, Charlotte had a population of 17,000. About 41% of residents were slaves, and 293 were free Blacks. During the 1870s, 15 members of Charlotte's Board of Aldermen were Black, and two Presbyterian ministers established a college (later named Johnson C. Smith University) to educate newly freed blacks.

Around 1880 Charlotte's neighborhoods began to segregate by race and class; until then, business owners, hired hands, and white-collar workers lived side by side. When Andrew Carnegie gave the city money to build a library, it was restricted to Whites. A separate library was built for Blacks, but unlike the first it wasn't supplied with books and furniture.[91]

Charlotte lunch counters were desegregated in 1961, but other restaurants were slow to follow. In 1963, James Clairborne, a young White man, suggested at a meeting of prominent White executives and civic leaders that they invite Black leaders to lunch at expensive area restaurants. Mayor Stan Brookshire and Chamber of Commerce President Ed Burnside led this effort. Reporters were asked not to publicize the event until after it was over; three days later the dinner was reported with the names of establishments withheld.[92]

In 1965, Vera and Darius Swann sued Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools for assigning children to schools on the basis of race and using busing to keep Black and White children separate. Homes of four prominent Black leaders, including that of the Swann's lawyer, were bombed. No one was hurt, but the properties were severely damaged. Carpenters and bricklayers responded by volunteering their services, and the city offered a reward leading to arrests of the arsonists.[93] In 1971, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the busing as way to achieve desegregation in the Swann Case.[94]

Harvey Gantt, a former television commentator and the first black student at Clemson University, became the first African-American mayor of Charlotte in 1983. He later won his party's nomination for the Senate, defeating White rivals in the hopes of unseating Jesse Helms (Helms won).

---

[90] North Carolina Museum of History, *North Carolina American Indian History timeline,* http://ncmuseumofhistory.org/nchh/amerindian.html, accessed 8/8/07.
[91] This section is a synthesis from Vaughan, John, "Segregation: The Legacy Endures." *Charlotte Observer*, September 14, 1997.
[92] Shinn, Jerry*, "*Smashing Segregation: The Struggle is not Over." *Charlotte Observer*, May 8, 1997.
[93] *Ibid*.
[94] A Report from the Community Building Task Force, *Building Community: Something has Begun*, 1997. p. 64.

Police relationships with the African American community became tense after several police shootings in the 1990s. In 1993, Windy Gail Thompson was shot by a White officer when she drove off after being stopped on suspicion of drunken driving. The family settled a wrongful death lawsuit and the city accepted no liability. In 1996, 19-year-old James Willie Cooper was shot during a routine traffic stop when the officer assumed Cooper was reaching for a gun. Police were cleared of any wrongdoing, and the NAACP called for a citizen oversight board. In 1997, two White police officers fired 22 shots at a car that sped through a license checkpoint. The passenger, an African-American woman named Carolyn Sue Boetticher, was shot in the neck and died. The driver, a White male, was not shot. One of the police officers was suspended for 30 days without pay,[95] And the City Council established a civilian review board.

IMPETUS FOR THE INITIATIVE

The Community Building Initiative tells this story about its genesis:

> In the fall of 1996 a series of incidents and circumstances in Charlotte-Mecklenburg focused attention on racial division within the community. A police shooting, the prospect of public school resegregation, as well as the increasing ethnic diversity of the community all contributed to a climate of unrest. Another factor…was the influx of large numbers of new residents who were either unaware of or unconnected to Charlotte's historical image of having dealt positively with issues of race and discrimination.[96]

Voters ranked race relations the third most-pressing issue (trumped only by crime and traffic) before the November 1997 elections. The *Charlotte Observer* then reported that the leadership posts of Charlotte's major civic organizations were filled by an "all-White lineup." Diverse leadership would be an important indicator that things had changed, since African Americans and other people of color were being excluded from city decision-making processes. And, in the early 1990s, one organization was ahead of its peers: the Arts and Science Council made it a goal to have board and staff members reflect the community. Two-thirds of the mostly White board fired itself to make the goal a reality.

Organizations that traditionally have worked on race issues in Charlotte include the Urban League, NAACP, and CCSJ (Charlotte Coalition for Social Justice, formerly the National Conference for Community and Justice). The city and county have a joint Community Relations Committee responsible for promoting healthy community relations and monitoring racial discrimination. The committee also works to ensure fair housing and resolves disputes between residents and police.

In the mid-1990's, *Fortune* rated the Charlotte metropolitan region extremely high among 60 regions in terms of business climate.[97] But social protest,[98] one of the key indicators of social capital, is less present in Charlotte than in many of the other 39 communities surveyed by Robert Putnam. Community norms are defined partly by Charlotte's status as a major banking city—and, as one Charlotte resident said, "you don't make noise in the bank's lobby."

---

[95] Willis, Laurie, "Shootings raise Racial Questions in Charlotte." *News and Observer,* September 27, 1998.
[96] *Phase One Responding to a Crisis*, www.communitybuildinginitiative.org/history_phase1.asp, accessed June 15, 2007.
[97] MacDougall, Harold, and Shapiro, Barbara. *Boundary Crossers: Case Studies of How Ten of America's Metropolitan Regions Work, Charlotte: A Company Town*. College Park, MD: Academy of Leadership, 1998, p. 2.
[98] Protest politics are described in the Social Capital Benchmark Survey as taking part in marches, demonstrations, boycotts or rallies; participating in groups that take action for local reform; and/or participating in labor and ethnically related groups.

THE COMMUNITY BUILDING INITIATIVE

In February 1997, esteemed African-American leader and former corporate president Bill Simms proposed to the City Council that community leaders address residents' racial mistrust and hostility in a highly visible, structured way. Simms' ambitious plan followed a downturn in the city's racial climate after a White police officer shot an unarmed Black man and was not disciplined. One of the supporters in Simms' audience was Park Helms, chair of the County Commission, who had recently delivered a state-of-the-county report with a message similar to Simms': "Rebuild the splintering community."[99]

Helms and Mayor McCrory asked the Foundation of the Carolinas to convene a Community Building Task Force. This group of 24 Whites, 23 Blacks, 3 Hispanics, 2 Asians, and 2 Native Americans began its work in April 1997 by committing to:

- Gather information about the community's changing demographics

- Compile an inventory of existing organizational efforts to address race relations

- Hear concerns and ideas from a broad cross-section of citizens from the community, through a series of listening sessions using a focus group model

- Convene a community conference

- Make recommendations for carrying the process forward beyond the life of the Task Force[100]

CBI'S BELIEFS

These belief statements were written and adopted as a preamble to CBI's 2003-2006 Strategic Plan[1]. CBI is currently reviewing that plan and may rework some of the statements, although their essence will remain intact.

1. "We believe that race and ethnicity impact the lives of residents, the policies and practices of organizations and institutions, and the level of inclusion and equity a community exhibits."

2. "We believe it is essential to raise awareness of racial and ethnic inclusion and equity and to focus intentionally on building the capacity of individuals and organizations to work for an inclusive, equitable community."

3. "We believe that providing compelling information to a diverse group of individuals and involving them in an intentional constructive process increases their capacity and commitment to influence others and to promote racial and ethnic inclusion and equity in the community and their own organizations."

4. "We believe that collaboration is critical to achieve racial and ethnic inclusion and equity."

5. "We believe that by developing and equipping a diverse group of leaders to work collaboratively we increase their individual and organizational capacity to build more inclusive and equitable environments."

6. "We believe that by developing and promoting CBI as an organization we increase its capacity to serve the community, its organizations and residents, and its ability to fulfill its mission."

- From Community Building Initiative's website, www.communitybuildinginitiative.org

---

[99] Shinn, Jerry, "Call to Community is a Risk Worth Taking; Bill Simms' Bold Initiative on Bridging the Racial Divide is a High-Stakes Gamble that Charlotte Can't Afford to Pass Up." *Charlotte Observer,* February 6, 1997.
[100] *Building Community: Something Has Begun Conference Record,* pp. 1-2.

The task force held 15 focus groups, some multiracial and some with people of the same race. But the major focus of its early work was to plan *Something has Begun*, a two-day community summit to address racial tensions and discuss the community's growing diversity. Target outcomes for the conference included: educating the public about racism in community life, engaging the unengaged, identifying commonalities between people who normally do not interact, and laying a foundation for ongoing community building.[101] The conference planning team was guided by a seven-person leadership team, along with a conference planner and organizational consultants. Mecklenburg Ministries also was a key supporter of the summit.

At the conference, held in late 1997, Leadership Team Co-chair James Ferguson shared this message with the 600-plus attendees: "This effort can only succeed if each of you has come to do what we hope—to bare your souls, to talk honestly, to open your minds, to speak your mind, and to listen with your mind and your heart ... to be open to differences and to understand that no single one of us has an answer to this nagging, sometimes brutal, persistent problem of racial conflict."[102]

Two polar positions were apparent: people who didn't think there was a problem and people who believed the issue was so huge it couldn't be addressed during the Task Force's limited lifespan. The latter group turned out to be right. In fact, the conference kicked off a second phase of the work: Examining six of the 24 major issues that conference participants identified.

> ### BELIEFS BEHIND THE *SOMETHING HAS BEGUN* CONFERENCE
>
> An ongoing process, not a stand-alone event, is the best way to address issues of race and class.
>
> Creating relationships and personal connections among participants is an essential part of community building.
>
> Using personal interactions to share information and perspectives about the challenges we face as a community helps to build common understanding of the whole community.
>
> By sharpening our focus on current realities and building a common vision for the future we create "positive tension" for our work together.
>
> Racial issues can be talked about and addressed at the community level.
>
> Diversity of race and class brings different and valuable points of view into the room.
>
> Information about what other communities are doing is important input for our work together.
>
> Keep it simple; don't over-promise and under-deliver.
>
> —*Building Community: Something Has Begun Conference Record*, p. 14.

After the conference, CBI staff planned a structure and phases to support follow-up. They focused on a three-level cycle of change:

- *Individuals:* Internal work and change begins with personal awareness for individuals within organizations, institutions, and community networks.

- *Organizations* (institutions and networks): Individuals influence networks within their organizations, neighborhoods, places of worship, family and social circle.

- *Community:* Over time, change within community networks, organizations, and institutions results in community-wide change and prepares the ground for new levels of community-building and the cycle continues.[103]

---

[101] *Ibid.*, p. 13.
[102] *Ibid.*, p. 18.

CBI's second phase (1998-1999) combined a citizen-driven process with dialogue, research, and education to produce solution-based strategies. Issue Action Teams were formed, and their focus and strategy are described in the box below. [104]

Sector	Focus	Strategy
Education	Curriculum design and teaching methods	Work with school administrators and other constituencies to broaden and adjust teaching approaches and curricula so they show greater sensitivity to race and the contributions of people of color
Education	Equitable distribution of resources to schools	Work with school administrators and others to support the equitable distribution of resources to schools
Education	Debate over whether and how to integrate the school system	Work with various constituencies in the community to identify issues that feed the growing concerns about school integration, and offer concrete solutions to resolve the issues
Economics	Equitable distribution of resources to neighborhoods	Work with various constituencies to support the equitable distribution of resources to neighborhoods
Economics	Jobs and economic opportunities	Work with various constituencies to create equal access to jobs and economic opportunities
Public Safety	Recruiting, hiring, training, and promoting a diverse police force to serve a diverse community	Work with local government agencies and other constituents to increase the number of people of color in the police department, especially in positions of leadership; train all officers in racial equity

Residents were invited to join Issue Action Teams based on their interests, expertise, involvement with a particular issue, neighborhood of residence, age, gender, race, and philosophy. Each team had co-chairs, one of whom also was a member of CBI's Leadership Team, and they were assisted by a trained facilitator and CBI consultant. The Action Teams, which drew more than 120 volunteers, were designed as a vehicle for building relationships among members, collecting and synthesizing data, and developing goals and strategies. An important component involved challenging team members to explore their own views on race by sharing stories—intentionally "weav[ing] personal exploration into a results-oriented project."[105]

To build community awareness, CBI engaged more than 680 community stakeholders and institutions in *Face-to-Face Dialogues*. For this process to have an impact and avoid being another "report," each team knew it needed to connect with community institutions and key community stakeholders. Specialized dialogue opportunities were created, called *Community Connections*. Examples of these events were: four community conversations on school desegregation, meetings with city departmental staff, forums with neighborhood leaders, and focus groups with rank-and-file police officers.[106]

In 2000, judicial leaders invited CBI to research racially disparate treatment in the courts. CBI assembled a 22-member Resource Team and guided it through a 15-month process that produced recommendations for judicial and community leaders. Follow-up included "Judicial Leadership for a Diverse Community," a program to help district and superior-court judges increase their awareness of

103 Community Building Initiative website, www.communitybuildinginitiative.org, accessed 5/18/07.
104 Community Building Initiative, Phase II, January 1998-June 1999, *Building a Community: Worthy of The Crown*. p. 11.
105 English, Dianne, and Hopper, Mary. "Shaped by Circumstances One Community's Initiative to Address Race and Ethnicity," in *The Diversity Factor*, Summer 1999.
106*Building a Community: Worthy of The Crown.* Community Building Initiative Phase II, January 1998-June 1999, pp. 3-4.

the impact of race and ethnicity in the courtroom and community. CBI followed up with department heads and staff, including coaching supervisors on how to develop an inclusive work environment.

CBI's expertise and resources have been used in other areas of equity and inclusion, too. In 2002, CBI partnered with the University City YMCA, the Lee Institute, and others to collaborate on the University City Community Building Project, a resource team that undertook civic engagement around building the strength of diversity in the rapidly growing and naturally diverse community around UNC-Charlotte. After the kick-off of the third annual University City Leadership Academy, the YMCA's director said about CBI's involvement, "Your visionary leadership launched what has now become a sought-after program for local residents."

FOCUS AREA ONE:
LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

PRE-INITIATIVE SNAPSHOT

There was a time in Charlotte when the County Commission comprised a half-dozen White men who all attended the same Sunday school class at the same church. Even though this could be perceived as monolithic and paternalistic, fortunately some people believed that their view of what community "should be" was fairly enlightened. Five leaders—Hugh McColl (then-CEO of NationsBank, which is now Bank of America); Ed Crutchfield (then-CEO of First Union Bank, which is now Wachovia); Bill Lee of Duke Energy; John Belk of the Belk Stores regional chain; and *Charlotte Observer* Editor Rolfe Neill— became known as "The Group." They were viewed as powerful and influential, making many community decisions with the goal of developing community and corporate partnership. These White leaders did have a message for newcomers in individual corporations. According to Kermit Waddell, chief of the Community Development Resource Centers, they said that "If you are a receiver of benefits of the community, you have to be a giver when your time comes."[107]

Charlotte has two well-established leadership development programs, each with a different focus. The Lee Institute's flagship program is a regional chapter of the American Leadership Forum (ALF). Leaders from every sector participate in 12 months of seminars and dialogue (including a five-day wilderness experience) on such topics as collaborative leadership, consensus building, conflict management, understanding differences, ethics, and leadership systems.[108] Graduates of the program join a national network of 1,000 ALF fellows, and they continue to work together on regional problems. The second program is Leadership Charlotte, which since 1978 has offered a 10-month leadership development program for corporate-sponsored and community-at-large candidates. Leadership Charlotte participants meet with government leaders, are exposed to major issues affecting the region, and "address community needs in a hands-on manner."[109]

---

[107] MacDougall, Harold, and Shapiro, Barbara. *Boundary Crossers: Case Studies of How Ten of America's Metropolitan Regions Work, Charlotte: A Company Town*. College Park, MD: Academy of Leadership, 1998. p. 5.
[108] Charlotte Region Chapter of the American Leadership Forum, http://www.alfcharlotteregion.org/, accessed 8/15/07.
[109] Charlotte Leadership's website, http://www.leadershipcharlotte.org/home.html, accessed 8/15/07.

THE LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE (LDI)

Although African-American leaders had emerged in Charlotte, the power differential between White and Black leaders was always present. Some residents perceived that community decisions were being made at dinner parties in Eastover, an exclusive neighborhood where the majority of corporate leaders lived. A sense of estrangement with this lack of full access was perceived by some to be due mostly to race and ethnicity. CBI's Leadership Team recognized that leadership development was a key to racial/ethnic inclusion and equity in the community, so in 2001 Octavia Seawell,[110] a local consultant, created a year-long Leadership Development Initiative (LDI) as a signature program of CBI.

The CBI Leadership Team suspended its monthly meetings in order to pilot LDI. The process of working intensely to address racial and ethnic issues at the personal and group levels. It was curious to see if intentional and focused work such as this could change how the Leadership Team conducted its work and how individuals related to each other. This experience contributed to the Leadership Team's high retention rate as well as strong, growing personal relationships with each other, which supported this dedicated time and effort.

LDI develops, connects, and guides a diverse group of individual leaders as they improve their awareness of and ability to influence racial/ethnic inclusion and equity, intensify their commitment, and increase their capacity. [111] The assumption is that "capacity to affect community-wide change will increase exponentially over time as more leaders and their organizations are engaged."[112] And the hope is that LDI's lens of inclusion and equity will help emerging leaders identify the impact of institutional racism and create strategies for meaningful systemic change.

Participating organizations are asked to send a "team" of two individuals to LDI's orientation session and monthly meetings. (Two sessions are 8-10 hours, and the others are 4-5 hours.) Participants also are expected to get involved in small-group activities through Bridging Groups (racially diverse "learning laboratories" of five to seven people). Sample activities include: eating meals together, visiting jail inmates, taking neighborhood tours, attending worship services together outside their own faith communities, and attending cultural or community events. By selecting and participating in activities outside their normal daily contexts, participants become more aware and knowledgeable about each other and about racial/ethnic issues.

LDI originally recruited nonprofit board members and senior staff from community non-profit organizations. The rationale was that these participants also touch corporations and government agencies, which would magnify the program's effect. Another reason was that people of color often are recruited to boards and institutions to achieve diversity but aren't given authentic roles. Several years ago, CBI elected to include participants from public-sector institutions, including city and county government, the police department, and the public school system.

LDI's five areas of focus are expressed as follows:

- *Racial/ethnic inclusion and equity*: A conceptual framework

- *Leadership skills*: personal assessment; styles of leadership; influencing change at the individual, group, organizational, and community levels

- *Nonprofit organizations*: strategies for promoting inclusion and equity

---

[110] LDI was conceived and developed for CBI by Octavia Seawell, OZS Consulting, Inc. LDI is implemented in Charlotte as a partnership between OZS Consulting and the Community Building Initiative.
[111] Community Building Initiative's Leadership Development Class 5, 2006-07 internal document.
[112] Letter to Philip Morris USA, re: Program Support for CBI's Leadership Development Initiative, 11/25/2003.

- *Relationship-building*: interest, support, and challenge among participants to build understanding, support and trust

- *Charlotte/Mecklenburg:* historical, current and future challenges

STRATEGIES

LDI is a developmental process that builds on opportunities to address racial issues based on who is in the room, the way the participants are (or aren't) working together, and the issues they are (or aren't) examining. By being transparent about its process, LDI emphasizes that it's not just who a matter of who assembles in the board room but whether people are considering the impact of policies, to whom they are listening in the community, how decisions are made, and so on.

LDI is *not*: a training workshop; focused only on individual leadership; a highly structured, solution-oriented program focused only on external application; an experience generic to any community; a process of learning only through sessions; or a model focused on external expertise.[113]

LDI teaches people to use themselves as instruments of change and influence, personally and within their organizations. As one participant observed, "I've learned a lot and realize I wasn't as aware [of inclusion and equity] as I thought I was. But my scores in self-confidence and willingness to influence have only gone up."[114]

Relationships among participants are emphasized, to show that when people stand up and "call the question" there are others covering their backs.

The experiential learning process uses participants' interactions, experiences, and knowledge to show how they can affect inclusion and equity. Role-playing and coaching across racial identity groups are frequently used methods. For example, a White male lawyer and an African-American male executive who had had some difficult conversations were invited to discuss their differences in a fishbowl. Two women, one White and one African American, were asked to coach each man across race. The African-American woman was highly skeptical about the White man's commitment, but her role was to have his back, though in another situation she may not chosen to do that. As the men continued their work with each other, the coaches would call time-outs for reflection. Eventually the group discussed their perceptions and the process. At the end of the conversation, the African-American man said to his White counterpart, "I just want you to know that in whatever future setting [you find yourself], you are going to think about me." The White man heard this as a call for his personal accountability.

In 2007, LDI's third year of operations, staff and consultants delved deeper into the issues and provided technical assistance to organizations that employ a large number of LDI "alumni," helping them become more equitable and inclusive. Staff also nurtured their new alumni network, established in 2006 to serve the 160+ people (at more than 30 organizations) who will have completed the program by the end of 2007. The network is a tool to help people continue building leadership skills, stay connected to fellow alumni, and provide opportunity for collaboration. Discussions continue about how the network can develop a strong identity and become a force for community change.

---

[113] Leadership Development Initiative, "What it Is, What it is not," Undated.
[114] "Connections" Outline and Content, "What participants said about their LDI Class 4 experience." Spring 2007 Newsletter.

CBI is developing and initiating an assessment plan to measure and evaluate growth and change in local leaders, institutions, and the community. The anticipated direct results of LDI are:

- A cadre of recognized leaders who are knowledgeable and active in the community on issues of racial/ethnic inclusion and equity.

- Comprehensive assessment tools in use by CBI and available for application in the community.

- Tested models for leadership in a variety of organizations and institutions.

- Heightened community awareness and clarity about how to address issues of racial/ethnic inclusion and equity.[115]

FOCUS ISSUE TWO:
CROSSROADS CHARLOTTE

PRE-INITIATIVE SNAPSHOT

Robert Putnam, author of *Bowling Alone* and a Harvard University professor, conducted a Social Capital Benchmark Survey in 2000 in 40 cities, including Charlotte. Charlotte scored high in many areas, including faith community involvement, organizational connection, volunteering, and charitable giving. But it scored second-lowest on trust *between* races and *within* racial groups. Charlotte also got low scores in the areas of social protest and informal socializing and for having an isolated Hispanic community.[116] The survey came after a police shooting and divisive court battle on school desegregation—but also three years after the Community Building Initiative began. In discussions about why there is low trust, one of the sentiments heard was, "I don't believe I got a shot; I don't trust other people or the institutions of the community that I will have access, whether it's to jobs, housing, etc."

The Foundation for the Carolinas, which funded Putnam's survey and disseminated its findings, convened groups to discuss ways of leveraging Charlotte's positive markers of social capital and listening sessions to learn about the issues and barriers involved in interracial trust. The message from many people of color was that we do not want to sit around and simply discuss why we don't trust each other. One African-American woman in a discussion group said this is really the White folks' responsibility and problem. During these discussions, the idea of doing scenario planning and focusing on how the community was going to live together during the next decade, especially as Charlotte's population continued to diversify, emerged.

The Foundation of the Carolinas and the Knight Foundation provided support to engage consultants to guide this process of scenario planning and convened representatives from 15 organizations and Social Capital Working Group (SCWG) to conduct research and write the stories, or scenarios, of plausible futures for Charlotte-Mecklenburg. The scenarios were organized around six driving forces; (all but one were uncertainties):

- *Demographic change*. How much will the population grow and with what impacts on diversity? (the one certainty)

---

[115] Grant Application Narrative, John S. and James L. Knight Foundation, August 2000, p. 3.
[116] Haight, Kathy, "Charlotte Ranks High In Giving, Low In Trust Among Races In Survey." *Charlotte Observer,* March 1, 2001.

- *The economy.* Will it grow, stagnate, or decline?
- *Land use.* Smart growth or more sprawl?
- *Public education.* More segregation or more balance?
- *Civic engagement.* A continuing decline or a rebound in participation?
- *Community resources and their allocation.* More equitable access or a wider gap between rich and poor?

Many people felt the stories put issues on the table that typically were either not easy to put on the table or were not talked about very often, especially regarding the White corporate power structure's influence in the community decision-making process. The four scenarios were[117]:

1. **Fortress Charlotte** – Charlotte is a city gripped by racial division and fear, our economy has faltered, and our once bright future has given way to a bleak present. What happened, and how do we avoid Fortress Charlotte?

2. **Class Act** - The city has emerged as truly world class and offers a quality of life second to none. Still, old patterns of racial, ethnic, and social division remain in the midst of prosperity.

3. **And the Beat Goes On** – Old habits die hard, and Charlotte is positive proof. Growth and opportunity remain on the lips of those speaking about Charlotte, but the nagging question remains: Did we miss an opportunity?

4. **Eye to Eye** - We've found new ways to govern ourselves and make decisions in a city where diversity is the rule, not the exception. Our bright future is made up of many colors, and the choices we make reflect shared power and promise as we look at each other eye to eye.

Crossroads Charlotte is a large-scale and long-range public engagement initiative designed to transform Charlotte's civic landscape. Its purpose is to foster greater trust between and among races in the region by increasing access, equity, and inclusion for all citizens. Every organization that participates is asked to identify and commit to pursuing at least one tactic that can increase the level of access, equity, and inclusion in the larger community *and* advance the organization's own mission.

STRATEGIES

Crossroads Charlotte does not require organizations to commit to the initiative forever; rather, it poses reflective questions at each step along the way: "Is continuing on with Crossroads intriguing and in your organization's self-interest? Can you develop an initiative that is consistent with your mission and also have a positive impact on our community? Do you believe it is our collective responsibility to reach the more positive scenarios?"

The initiative began with two key resources: adequate funding and the freedom to experiment. Thus the 40 organizations that initially signed up for Crossroads Charlotte had to invest only their staff and volunteer time, not money, and could stop their involvement if Crossroads didn't meet their needs or interests.

---

[117] The complete stories and a short video can be found at www.crossroadscharlotte.org.

Interactive sessions help participants understand the region's issues and demands. During these events (one is called *Crossroads Live!*), representatives of various organizations discuss and respond to the scenarios from many perspectives and life experiences. For example, a participant who commutes to the city from Charlotte's suburbs to her corporate office may question whether Fortress Charlotte is a likely scenario, while a representative of the Public Safety department may explain how he lives the Fortress Charlotte reality every day. In other words, this is an opportunity to share stories from different life experiences and have a better understanding of the region's demands, issues, and possibilities.

Crossroad's next phase will emphasize community engagement. Plans are being made to share the scenarios and discussion opportunities with thousands of residents in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg area. As more funding becomes available, organizers also plan to create "Crossroads in a Box"— tools for people to use after they read the scenarios and are inspired to act and develop strategies for engaging networks, neighborhoods, small groups and organizations and individuals in Crossroads.

A learning network and accountability structure keep Crossroads participants focused on: evaluating the individual and collective impact of initiatives; establishing and maintaining a frame for Crossroads issues, by providing information and continuing to point out the gap between reality and the desired future; continuous feedback, learning, and adjustment; building collaboration and social capital among Charlotte organizations; and creating a bridge between organizational players and broader engagement with the community.[118]

Crossroads is proactive about evaluating its efforts. Staff engaged the University of North Carolina/Charlotte's Urban Institute to study the impact of the initiative, including documenting lessons learned, developing a data document on major disparities related to the driving forces, and evaluating the work connected to the accountability structure and learning network. Crossroads also engaged Central Piedmont Community College's Center for Applied Research to help administer and analyze the Crossroads Access Scorecard, which measures the effectiveness and impact of organizational initiatives on levels of access in the community. Crossroads intends to develop scorecards for both inclusion and equity and is exploring compelling, non-divisive ways to share the data on disparities.

Crossroads leaders and participants realize that interracial trust won't occur on its own. Crossroads holds that to achieve trust it will need to move along a continuum starting with access, then inclusion, and finally equity. Their definitions of these terms are[119]:

- *Access* means intentionally clearing the way for people to get what they need or desire by reducing barriers and opening doors to opportunities. It is the gateway to building trust.

- *Inclusion* authentically brings traditionally excluded individuals and/or groups into processes, activities, and decision/policy making.

- *Equity* is about fairness and justice. Initiatives or communities that are focused on equity put measures into place to correct past inequalities and to prevent future inequalities. (Note that equity should not be confused with equality, which is the state of being equal.)

---

[118] *Ibid.*
[119] *Crossroads Charlotte Individual Initiative Scorecard for Organizations Scorecard Overview*, revised 3/12/07.

STEPS IN CROSSROADS' ORGANIZATIONAL ENGAGEMENT PROCESS

Executive Session: A representative group of key leaders, CEOs and executives were invited to a session to explore the scenarios, hear and see artistic responses, and dialogue about their own roles and the roles of their organizations in affecting these plausible futures.

Step 1: Crossroads Live! After leaders committed to the initiative, approximately 1,000 people from 50-plus organizations in Charlotte's corporate, nonprofit, and community networks participated in one of nine interactive sessions where they used the scenarios to begin developing possible organizational responses. Groups of 20 from each organization intermingled with participants from other organizations to share perspectives and discuss how to build advantages and avoid negative futures.

Step 2: Crossroads Internal. In small-group sessions within each organization (three sessions, three hours each), participants worked with a Crossroads consultant to explore the issues brought to light during their Crossroads Live! experience craft internal stories about where their organization would be in each of the four scenarios. They discussed implications for their organizations if the worst and best scenarios occur, and their organization's roles and reputation in the community.

Step 3: Crossroads Initiatives. Using the organizations' own internally focused stories and integrating their missions and work programs, organizations developed specific initiatives directed toward both internal and community-desired futures. They vetted ideas based on their missions, the Crossroads driving forces, and what is doable and bold; they thought about collaboration with other organizations. After organizations developed three potential initiatives they were invited to participate in a Learning Network.

Learning Network. Participating organizations agree to: "make a public declaration of its Crossroads initiative; evaluate the implementation and impact of its initiative through the Crossroads Scorecard; hold [themselves] and other Crossroads organizations accountable for the individual and collective impact of Crossroads initiatives; and… [participate] in network sessions to support collective learning and feedback."[1] Elements of the accountability structure and process include: "public declaration of commitment; quarterly forums; fact-based scorecard that tracks the impact of the Crossroads initiatives; a survey that tracks community perception and opinion; and a vehicle to communicate to the broader community via publication of Crossroads Charlotte data."*

* Crossroads Charlotte Learning Network, Accountability Structure and Process, undated.

OUTCOMES

CROSSROADS CHARLOTTE

At a recent press conference, 15 of the over 30 Crossroads organizations publicly announced their initiatives. Each organization made a commitment to leadership and other resources to implement a significant initiative to help ensure that Charlotte in 10 years will move toward the positive scenarios and away from negative ones. The next step is for organizations to hold each other accountable, to continue fostering collaboration with other organizations, and to model better ways of doing business. Although it is still early to learn the impact and outcomes of these initiatives, the following is a sample of organizations' plans that were recently announced: [120]

- *The Arts and Science Council* will increases access to cultural programs across the region through a new investment strategy in cultural institutions. The focus will be on racially/ethnically diverse communities, low-income neighborhoods, artists, and emerging cultural organizations. They will roll out a new investment initiative in fall 2007 and launch a new audience-development initiative to increase awareness and participation in cultural offerings.

---

[120] Crossroads Charlotte, www.crossroadscharlotte.org, accessed 5/14/07.

- *Bank of America* announced a two-part commitment to Charlotte Mecklenburg schools. They will work with principals and their teams to strengthen leadership development training and resources for existing and future school principals. A bank executive will be paired with principals in a coaching relationship focused on the challenges and opportunities of leadership. The second commitment is to increase the number of associates volunteering in the schools as student mentors, specifically in the middle schools.

- *Mecklenburg Ministries* is an ecumenical nonprofit that that plans to engage the community through its initiative, "Friday Friends." The mission is to identify 500 people (340 have signed up) of different races to commit to being lunch partners across differences. Residents are invited to "cross the road" and build a friendship by eating lunch together monthly for six months. They will provide questions for the meetings to help participants discuss issues of access, inclusion, equity and trust and a shared vision for the community.

- *UNC Charlotte* plans to integrate Crossroads Charlotte in several layers of its organization. The first is using the scenarios and the planning process in their freshman seminars. The focus is on developing citizen leaders to have a responsibility to participate in service learning. The chancellor's cabinet will use Crossroads as a template for its strategic planning process as it looks at becoming a more diverse institution in a more diverse community.

- *Wachovia Bank* is providing financial literacy to residents of the eastside and westside corridors. They will leverage MoneySmart and BorrowSmart programs to support neighborhood revitalization by financially empowering residents and help them understand how home and business ownership supports community development. They will partner with CM Development Corporation to revitalize inner city corridors through development and redevelopment of commercial projects.

LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE

CBI no longer has trouble recruiting participants for LDI. The original organizations continue to send participants and request slots in upcoming classes, which has allowed CBI to build a cadre of "LDIers" within such organizations as the YMCA, Mecklenburg County Bar Association, Foundation for the Carolinas, and Arts and Science Council. Those organizations recognize the value of LDI and its impact on the participants. CBI now is trying to involve one or two new organizations in each class.

Other outcomes of LDI are as follows:

- Many lawyers participated in the program, and the graduates are the lead in creating and maintaining a diversity committee for the Bar Association. Its current focus is to recruit people of color into major law firms.

- An LDI graduate who worked for the Junior League realized that the organization's photos at headquarters showed their leaders were all White women, and the pictures of people in their projects showed black children. Redoing the headquarters' photo montage sparked an internal assessment of race/ethnicity and other aspects of diversity. The Junior League wants to intentionally become an inclusive organization instead of just a diverse one.

- LDI graduates from one large nonprofit are forming a subcommittee on inclusion and equity for their strategic planning process. Another organization whose staff participated in LDI is changing its community-wide collaborations, board selection process, and a staff review process, including individual development plans that focus on inclusion and equity.

- The Board of Managers of an area nonprofit agreed unanimously on the importance of diversity in who serves on the board, the clientele they seek to serve, and the messages communicated by the organization.[121]

- Four LDI graduates who sit on the board of an organization intend to hold the group more accountable for fulfilling the LDI mission.

CONCLUSIONS

Charlotte is well-known for its community building work and has been featured in studies of topics ranging from economic equity to leadership. So in some ways it is not surprising that Charlotte is also noteworthy for its efforts to ensure racial equity. **It simply is part of Charlotte's culture that leaders believe in "doing the right thing."**

When faced with its abysmal rankings on interracial trust in the Social Capital Benchmark Survey, Charlotte could have turned to one of its strengths—residents' involvement in the faith community, perhaps—to solve the problem. Instead, leaders launched the much more comprehensive and far-reaching Crossroads Charlotte initiative, demonstrating their willingness to address the problem and their ambitious vision for racial equity and inclusion.

Crossroads took a logical but unique path: know your past, examine the current reality, and consider what could happen in the future based on such variables as demographics, the economy, land use, public education, civic engagement, and community resources and allocation. The use of scenario planning as the tool to address these issues was innovative; it prompted conversations across racial groups about previously unspoken issues, such as the White corporate power structure and its influence.

Crossroads Charlotte took scenario planning beyond talk through a sophisticated organizational engagement process and learning network. In many community-building efforts, leaders must constantly find and train new participants or accept a weaker level of organizational involvement. Crossroads' alternative strategy was much more successful. By asking participants at every step of the change process whether they wanted to continue, it bolstered participants' commitment and sustained their involvement despite the time-consuming nature of the work.

Three crucial success factors for Crossroads are leadership engagement, sophisticated process management and analysis, and the investment and access provided by influential institutions and prominent residents. The Leadership Development Initiative's process-driven approach to addressing racial and ethnic issues seems especially viable, and it will be important to track the long-term outcomes and impact of the critical mass of leaders that is growing within institutions and through the alumni network. Both LDI and Crossroads have benefited by engaging institutional leaders (typically senior managers and some mid-level ones); the next phase of work, especially for Crossroads, will be to engage residents and informal leaders in the future scenarios. This is uncharted territory for Crossroads, and as the initiative's planning for 2015 involves more and more residents, issues of shared and equitable decision-making, resource distribution, and accountability practices (with those most impacted by institutional racism), will have to be addressed.

---

[121] *Cross-Class Summary of Leadership Development Initiative Participant Evaluations,* p. 3.

The initiatives' staff and consultants, who are skilled in and knowledgeable about process management, organizational development, and democracy building, are a real strength. But the current staff/consultant team may be stretched thinly as Crossroads casts a wider net to engage participations region-wide. This situation presents an opportunity to build residents' capacity to initiate, facilitate, and manage a multilayered community-engagement process. It also might be possible to create a new governance structure that models inclusive, equitable teamwork for the community—for instance, the engagement governance model described by Judy Freiwirth, in which "governance responsibility is shared throughout an organization's [community's] key sectors …. It is based on the principles of participatory democracy, self-determination, genuine partnership, and community-level decision-making as the building blocks of true democracy … creating vehicles for constituent empowerment and community change"[122]

CBI and Crossroads Charlotte are less explicit about racism than other case study sites; they use democracy building as their strategy for addressing inequities. In this approach, "Each intervention works toward a similar end of engaging citizens, identifying common ground and community assets, and developing a joint action to create a new civic infrastructure that may help in addressing future community issues. The foundation of this approach is the belief that if citizens have appropriate public forums and inter-group dialogue skills then they will recognize their interdependence and find cooperative ways to address common concerns."[123] Some people prefer an approach that takes racism on more explicitly, but in Charlotte the decision was based on community norms. It will be important to watch how the democracy-building approach evolves within Charlotte's culture and whether becoming more explicit about racism may eventually be an indicator of progress.

Charlotte/Mecklenburg has worked tenaciously on issues of access, inclusion, and equity for 10 years. Its leaders have shown a courage and commitment to racial equity not found in many other communities, and its thoughtful, results-oriented engagement process has encouraged several organizations to help ensure that Charlotte/Mecklenburg reaches a positive future scenario by 2015. From an evaluation perspective, Crossroads Charlotte is too young to support an analysis of the initiative's impact on access. But in light of CBI's accomplishments to date and plans for the future, there is much to be learned—and replicated—from Charlotte/Mecklenburg's work to achieve racial/ethnic inclusion and equity.

---

[122] Freiwirth, Judy. "Engagement Governance for System-Wide Decision-Making." *Nonprofit Quarterly*, Summer 2007.
[123] Potapchuk, Maggie, with Villarosa, Lori. *Cultivating Interdependence: A Guide for Race Relations and Racial Justice Organizations*. Washington D.C., Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, 2004, p. 74.

LESSONS SPECIFIC TO CHARLOTTE

In a 1999 issue of *Diversity Factor*, CBI staff made these observations about the Action Team process that are still relevant today:*

1. **Focus and define the issues to be addressed.** The issues to be addressed by CBI teams were too broad. The teams that jelled most quickly had the most defined foci.

2. **Structure work on race, racism, and models for community change into the process.** It would have been beneficial to begin all elements of the process by taking time to explore issues of race and ethnicity at personal and group levels, as well as to begin to understand how racism operates within systems and institutions. When teams made time for this work, the payoff was considerable.

3. **Bring all points of view to the table if possible, including people on the leadership team.** Our track record in holding their participation was uneven. We were intentional about drawing people with differing opinions into public meetings. More success was achieved as we moved into different geographical areas of our community and engaged elected officials from those areas to assist in organizing events.

4. **Involve key community institutions in a systemic way.**

   * English, Dianne, and Hopper, Mary. "Shaped by Circumstances: One Community's Initiative to Address Race and Ethnicity," *The Diversity Factor*, Summer 1999.

Subsequent lessons include:

5. **Buy-in from a few key leaders paves the way for broader participation.** Early support, guidance, and involvement from well-respected community leaders can powerfully boost the initiative's visibility and appeal.

6. **It takes significant resources to work so intensely with organizations to create and implement their own initiatives.** In order to engage other organizations, Crossroads realized it needed to showcase the impact and the possibility of a different future to increase traction and recruitment. The initiative also was caught off guard by their its success and retention rate, which meant it had to quickly building capacity and process while also locating more resources. Crossroads is reviewing participants' initiatives to determine where important issues (e.g., land use) are not well-addressed and will try to find other organizations that may be interested in working on those issues. But there is an inherent challenge in recruiting new organizations and sustaining their involvement.

7. **Commitment and capacity need to be embedded in participating organizations so they are less vulnerable to leadership transitions.** This is easier said than done, but in Charlotte's case the involvement of the Foundation of the Carolinas helped to ensure consistent credibility, convening power, financial resources, and freedom to experiment with strategies.

8. **Financial costs should not be a barrier to participation.** Try to raise enough money that individual participants are not excluded simply because they can't afford to participate.

9. **Leadership development efforts work best when they emphasize personal sharing and interaction, participants have time for informal relationship building, and participants attend consistently.** LDI alumni endorse the theory that individual leadership capacity can lead to group and organizational capacity, but they acknowledge the difficulty of balancing time for informal networking across racial groups with more structured sessions that give people skills to make organizational change. An ongoing challenge is the need to balance informal networking time with skill- and tool-building sessions that prepare people to make change at the organizational level.

Mass migration from New York City to the new suburban mecca of Long Island, with its tree-lined streets and improved amenities, began in the late 1940s. This relatively small area now is home to a population larger than 18 of the 50 states. There are more than 1,000 government units (for county, town, city, and village) and 125 school districts (averaging 3,616 students) with different levels of authority.

As is the case throughout the United States, residential segregation has deep roots in Long Island. The island's Levittown community, which celebrated its 60th anniversary in 2007, was a "gated community" long before there was such a term or trend.[124] Press coverage of the anniversary featured not only the historic innovation of low-cost, mass-produced housing but some details of its racial exclusion practices. This is best expressed by Levittown's infamous Clause 25: "The tenant agrees not to permit the premises to be used or occupied by any person other than members of the Caucasian race."[125] Surrounding communities also enforced the racist covenant.

David Rusk, an international consultant who analyzed the segregation patterns, states, "For black residents, Long Island (74%) is the most segregated suburb in America." The only places more segregated than Long Island are big cities like Detroit (85%), Milwaukee (82%), and Chicago (81%).[126] Government bureaucracy, policies, ordinances, zoning, and municipal codes have created particular challenges to addressing segregation and the racial gaps in quality of life indicators:

- In 2002, 10% of Long Island's population was African American and "almost all Black residents are bunched into a dozen or so towns. [Meanwhile], two-thirds of Long Island's municipalities remained less than 1% Black, and half of those had no Black residents at all," James Loewen wrote in *Sundown Towns.*[127]

- The poverty rate on Long Island is more than twice as high for African Americans as for Whites.

- The typical African-American child on Long Island attends a school with a student poverty rate 2.5 times higher than the poverty rate in the typical White child's school.

- Thirteen school districts (about 10%) serve more than half of Long Island's African-American and Latino students. Seven of these school districts contain more than 90% of the students of color.

- Homeownership rates are 84% for Whites, 65% for African Americans, 55% for Latino/as.[128]

---

[124] "According to author Robert Kaplan, gated communities came to the United States from South America, particularly Brazil. In 1985, gated communities were rare, but by 1997, more than 3,000,000 American households lived behind walls." From Loewen, James, *Sundown Towns: A Hidden Dimension of American Racism*. New Press: New York, 2005, p. 391.

[125] Breyer, Bill, "The dream, 60 years later; William Levitt's town changed everything, and a new exhibit explores how." *Newsday*, January 28, 2007.

[126] Lambert, Bruce, "Study calls L.I. Most Segregated Suburb." The New York Times, June 5, 2002. "The central finding is that 74 percent of Long Island's blacks would have to move to be evenly dispersed across the population."

[127] Loewen, James, *Sundown Towns: A Hidden Dimension of American Racism*. New Press: New York, 2005, p.133.

[128] john powell, *Racism and the Opportunity Divide on Long Island*. PowerPoint presentation, Institute on Race and Poverty, June 2002.

Given this history of rampant inequity, especially in housing and education, many residents were pleased to see the ERASE Racism initiative emerge, with its first major campaign focused on improving fair housing laws and enforcement. ERASE Racism convened civil rights leaders and housing experts from across Long Island, listened to them, and created a very smart, thoughtful process for tackling housing and realtor practices while also changing the community climate. This case study focuses on two key strands of ERASE Racism's work: Changing the Climate and Fair Housing.

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF LONG ISLAND (2005)

Population	*Nassau County*[129]	*Suffolk County*[130]
Total	1,310,076	1,444,642
White	75.8%	84.3%
Black or African American	10.8%	6.9%
American Indian and Alaska Native	0.2%	0.2%
Asian	6.4%	3.1%
Native Hawaiian, other Pacific Islander	0.0%	0.1%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	11.7%	12.7%
Some other race	5.7%	3.8%
Two or more races	1.1%	1.8%

SELECTED DATA ON RACIAL DISPARITIES

HOUSING ACCESS

The homeownership rate on Long Island in 2000 was 61.7% for African Americans and 56.4% for non-White Hispanics, compared with 82.9% for Whites.[131]

Latinos in Nassau-Suffolk who earned more than $91,800 in 2000 were more likely to be turned down for conventional home loans than were Whites earning $38,250.*

African Americans on Long Island are more than twice as likely as Whites to get a high-cost (subprime) loan, irrespective of income or creditworthiness.[132]

The value per dollar of homes on Long Island was $3.23 for White homeowners and $2.76 for African-American homeowners. This can be viewed as a 15% segregation tax on African-American homeowners.[133]

EDUCATION

Of the 125 school districts on Long Island, 13 serve more than half of the African-American and Latino students. Of the 13 districts, 6 have 60% or more students of color, and 7 have over 90% students of color.*[134]

EMPLOYMENT

Compared with Whites, the unemployment rate is twice as high for African Americans and nearly three times as high for Latinos.

---

[129] 2005 American Community Survey, http://www.census.gov/acs/www/, accessed 6/13/07.
[130] *Ibid.*
[131] Gross, V. Elaine, and Harris, Cathryn. *Long Island Fair Housing: A State of Inequity*, ERASE Racism, March 2005, p. 10.
[132] *Income is No Shield Against Racial Differences in Lending: A Comparison of High-cost Lending in American's Metropolitan Areas*, Reinvestment Coalition, July 2007, pp. 16-18; and Appendix: Table 1- NCRC Analysis: African-American/White.
[133] *Ibid.*, p. 11: "Segregation tax is calculated by determining the home value per dollar of income for each race and then comparing the outcome."
[134] All racial disparities with an asterisk are from, ERASE Racism Powerpoint presentation, "Racism: A Long Island Legacy." Undated. It was originally reported that there were 127 school districts; research in 2007 revealed 125.

BASIC FACTS ABOUT THE INITIATIVE

Name of Initiative	**ERASE Racism: Challenging racial segregation and promoting racial equity through Education, Research, Advocacy, Support to Eliminate Racism**
Start date	2001
Administrative Home	The Long Island Community Foundation served as incubator. In 2004, ERASE Racism became its own nonprofit entity.*
Mission	To undo institutional and structural racism—the structures, policies, and behaviors that create segregation and inequity in every aspect of daily living.
Strategies and Interventions	- Fact-finding research to expose racial inequity - Public policy and private-sector advocacy - Collaboration with elected officials, government agencies, businesses, and other organizations - Report cards to track regional progress and regression - Education, training, and publications
Major Issue Areas	Fair housing, health care, educational disparities, building community capacity
Definition of Racism	The policies, practices and behaviors that contribute to inequities between African Americans and, frequently, other people of color as a group (not individual bias). This can happen because of the combination of racial prejudice and systemic power on the part of Whites, but it also does not require intentional, overt acts of racial prejudice. Do nothing and racism flourishes.
Long-Term Target Outcomes	- Specific public policy changes - Political leaders consider it in their self-interest to support ERASE Racism's efforts - Increasingly, others (individual leaders, organizations, larger institutions) will initiate proactive efforts to address institutional racism within their spheres of influence - A growing number of individuals (of all "races") participate in the two-day Unraveling Racism training and commit to turning on its head imbedded, internalized White supremacy - Perpetuation of institutional racism not only becomes illegal but also unthinkable on Long Island
Staffing	Four full-time staff and consultants
Board Size	15 members, including the president of the organization
Budget	$670,700
Major Donors	Ford Foundation, Greentree Foundation, Horace & Amy Hagedorn Fund, Sandy River Charitable Foundation, Rauch Foundation, Long Island Community Foundation, Caroline & Sigmund Schott Fund, Washington Mutual, Long Island Unitarian Universalist Fund, Lilo and Gerard Leeds Fund, Krasnoff Family Fund, Tilles Family Foundation

The Long Island Foundation supported the growth of ERASE Racism and provided an institutional home during its incubation period. ERASE Racism received its first grant from the Long Island Foundation after ERASE Racism was incorporated.

HISTORY

The Algonquin, Shinnecock, and Montakett Indians were Long Island's first inhabitants. The main industries for 200 years were farming, lumber, whaling, and fishing. In an effort to bring the railroad to the east end of Long Island, leases with Shinnecock and Montaukett Indians were illegally broken to gain 14,500 acres of real estate, according to testimony at a U.S. Senate hearing in 1900.[135]

The local economy relied on slave labor to function; in fact, Long Island was home to a slave population larger than any other area in the North.[136] In 1799, the Gradual Emancipation Law stated that all people of African descent born into slavery after July 4, 1799 would be emancipated. But it also "mandated that women until the age of 25 and men until the age of 28 would become the bound 'servants' of those who previously owned them."[137] In 1817, a second piece of legislation clarified the fate of enslaved African-Americans born before July 4, 1799, who would become free on July 4, 1827, and reduced the earlier law's apprenticeship periods. However, children born to slave mothers on the eve of July 4, 1827, could still be apprenticed until age 21, which meant slavery was not banned in New York until 1848.[138]

The civil rights movement on Long Island typically resembled a polite protest. But on the first day of 1963, the centennial of the Emancipation Proclamation, Lincoln O. Lynch, chairman of the Long Island branch of the Congress of Racial Equality, called for defiance. During his acceptance speech for an award from the NAACP, Lynch emphasized the "shameless evidence of undisguised discrimination" and gave as examples the de facto school segregation in Malverne, Westbury, and Hempstead. Lynch called on his colleagues to "prepare and finance lawsuits, badger elected officials for legislation, picket, sit in, or boycott if necessary to win equal rights."

The call to action, with its focus on jobs, housing and school desegregation, was well-timed. Whites were leaving racially changing neighborhoods in New York City, and middle-class Blacks wanted more opportunities on the suburban island. The fight for equal rights was ugly at times, with cross-burnings, arrests, and many scuffles. Progress—such as the integration of fire department staff and the hiring of more Blacks by local businesses—was made through organizing and through legislation.[139]

In 1964, passage of the federal Economic Opportunity Act led to Nassau County to create its Economic Opportunity Commission, which worked to help minorities obtain housing. In Suffolk County, a group called Huntington Township Committee for Human Relations joined with Suffolk CORE to protest local developers' denying a Black couple the chance to live in an Amityville housing development. The action succeeded, and the couple signed a one-year lease. But despite these and other successes, as *New York Newsday* recently reported:

> Long Island remains segregated, with 95% of Black residents in Nassau and Suffolk concentrated in 5% of the Island's Census tracts. For residents in Black communities, the quality of life is substantially different from that of their white counterparts. Black communities generally are more crowded, pay higher taxes, and have fewer businesses and fewer services than white communities. And they generally have little political clout.[140]

---

[135] Wick, Steve, and Maier, Thomas. *"Lost Indian Lands: Shinnecocks and Montauketts fight to regain areas taken in questionable deals."* Newsday, www.newsday.com/community/guide/lihistory/, accessed May 13, 2007.

[136] Michael, S., and Eichberg S., *Vital Signs 2006: Measuring Long Island's Social Health*, Garden City, New York: Adelphi University, 2006, p. 6.

[137] Berlin, Ira, and Harris, Leslie M., *Slavery in New York,* New York: The New Press, 2005, p. 132.

[138] *Ibid.*

[139] Except the parts of this section which have specific footnotes. This is from a series of articles about Long Island history by New York Newsday. This history section is a synthesis of key points from the following article: Brown, Joye, "The Movement for Equality: Polite protests come to an end as Long Island activists accelerate the drive to secure a range of civil rights," *New York Newsday*, undated, accessed 5/13/07 from www.newsday.com/community/guide/lihistory/.

[140] *Ibid.*

There are many other examples of segregation's impact. In many towns on Long Island, no Black has ever been elected to office. In 2006, 40% of all Long Island districts did not employ a single Black teacher, and only half employed more than one. Racial issues will be more difficult to ignore as Long Island becomes more diverse; by 2010, one in three residents will be Black, Asian, or Hispanic.[141]

IMPETUS FOR THE INITIATIVE

The Long Island Community Foundation (LICF) was established in 1978 by The New York Community Trust, one of the nation's largest community foundations. Periodically, the community foundation surveys its donors to learn their interests. Donors expressed interest in funding social justice and race efforts that went beyond the usual scholarship or health care programs, but the foundation hadn't received many proposals from nonprofits focused on these issues. So a series of donor forums on the topics began in 1999.

At such a forum in April 2001, LICF Executive Director Suzy Sondenberg and consultant Elaine Gross presented a proposal for an initiative to address institutional and structural racism—a very novel concept at the time and a way for the foundation to become a catalyst for change. Although some audience members were apprehensive about the terms, the overall response was positive. With funding from participants in the donor forums and LICF board members, the ERASE Racism initiative (Education, Research, Advocacy, and Support to Eliminate Racism) was launched in June 2001. Gross was the founding director.

LICF served as the initiative's incubator for three years, until ERASE Racism incorporated as a nonprofit entity. The process of nurturing ERASE Racism helped LICF change, too; its staff and board are now more diverse, and it has new guidelines for grant making to ensure that grantees are accountable to communities of color and have diverse staffs and boards.

THE ERASE RACISM PROJECT

ERASE Racism's message is clear about the issues that stand in the way of dismantling institutional and structural racism: lack of common language and shared knowledge base; lack of candid conversations about race (and forums in which to have them); a belief that inequities are tied to intentional, individually generated actions; a belief in continual, linear improvement; lack of understanding that we have different starting points in understanding racial gaps and different perceptions of racism and of our (individual and collective) responsibility for outcomes.

ERASE Racism operates as a community resource and networking center for various sectors (e.g., education, housing, government, health care) and philanthropic organizations. It also "initiate[s] public discourse with regional leaders to increase awareness and develop strategies that address disparities and inequities for different racial groups … [and] shine[s] a spotlight on the history and perpetuation of institutional racism in order to help organizations recognize and reverse institutional racism within their own institutions and the community at large."[142]

---

[141]Brown, Joye, "The Movement for Equality: Polite protests come to an end as Long Island activists accelerate the drive to secure a range of civil rights," *New York Newsday*, undated, www.newsday.com/community/guide/lihistory/, accessed 5/13/07.
[142] Gross, V. Elaine, and Harris, Cathryn, *Long Island Fair Housing: A State of Inequity*, ERASE Racism, March 2005, p. 56.

ERASE Racism's implementation strategies encompass:

- Sophisticated fact-finding and research efforts to expose racial inequity, including the use of report cards to document ongoing, regional patterns of progress and regression

- Development of accountability systems with and for elected officials, government agencies, and businesses, through careful positioning, the use of media, and a mobilized constituent base

- Serving as policy advocates and implementation consultants to ensure that public policy and government changes to address institutional and structural racism and to promote racial equity are enacted and supported by related changes in private-sector institutions

Although 2007 is only the third full year of independent operation for ERASE Racism, a great deal of effort has gone into implementing a comprehensive fair housing campaign and responding to needs in the community as well as building capacity as new nonprofit organization.

FOCUS AREA ONE:
CHANGING THE CLIMATE

PRE-INITIATIVE SNAPSHOT

Before ERASE Racism, Long Island had some traditional civil rights organizations such as the NAACP, certain unions, the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN), and faith coalitions. Each mostly responded to constituent issues (although ACORN was involved in some early research on fair housing). Great Neck also had a history of Black/Jewish dialogue dating to the 1960s, which continues today. But generally in the 1990s, there were few community discussions about race and racism.

In 1994, *The New York Times* took an in-depth look at Long Island's racial segregation and "big-city problems." It quoted Nassau County Health and Welfare Council Director John O'Connell's description of Long Island's bar-the-door attitude: "It's a mentality that says, "I've got mine, the hell with you … Cut my taxes, because I don't see the common good anymore."[143] In neither county of Long Island had an African American been elected to a countywide office. The response was finally a court order for Nassau County to overhaul its government to better represent minority residents.[144]

In the late 1990s, there was an influx of Mexican workers (many of whom were considered illegal immigrants) who moved to Farmingville to work in restaurant, landscaping and construction businesses. In 2000, two Mexican migrant workers were brutally beaten and stabbed. A pattern of violence and abuse toward Hispanic day laborers[145] continues and was documented in the PBS film, *Farmingville.*[146]

[143] *Ibid.*
[144] Schemo, Diana Jean, "Persistent Racial Segregation Mars Suburbs' Green Dream." *The New York Times,* March 17, 1994.
[145] Michael, S., and Eichberg S., *Vital Signs 2006: Measuring Long Island's Social Health*, Garden City, New York: Adelphi University, 2006, p. 34.
[146] Information about the film is available at, http://www.pbs.org/pov/pov2004/farmingville/about.html.

STRATEGIES

During ERASE Racism's formative stage, staff conducted **informational interviews** with community leaders to surface issues and potential solutions. When told about the new initiative, there were different reactions from interviewees, raised their eyebrows and moved away; they didn't believe racism should be included in the name of the organization; or they thought it was an impolite topic. Some insisted that "there is no problem with race;" instead, they discussed the history of Levittown. The interviewees' message was clear: "Racism just isn't talked about on Long Island."

Thus one of ERASE Racism's first challenges was to increase public discussion of racism in a way that Gross describes as "taking away some of the fire that is deeply associated with the conversation and getting people in the habit of talking without fear." The initiative did this by **convening and supporting study action groups**. Resident volunteers were invited to work on specific issues, such as housing, public school education, organizational assessment, and health care. The groups moved through four phases. First, they held a roundtable discussion with invitees who were knowledgeable about a particular issue. Participants identified manifestations of institutional racism within that area and proposed steps to address them. Next, the groups prioritized actions to address institutional racism in each arena. Participants then established action plans and/or projects, often with assistance from specially convened task forces of people with related expertise and prominence. Finally, supported in part by the Community Foundation, they implemented the plans through targeted special projects and evaluated their strategies.

Staff and steering committee members of ERASE Racism worked with the study action groups and with local and national legal, research, and policy experts to develop a menu of tools and strategies for the action plans. About 200 residents participated in the study action teams. The housing team was one of the most active groups; it helped shape a research report and provided significant support to the fair housing campaign.

The staff also spoke at public meetings, appeared on cable TV, and wrote op-ed pieces to encourage community members to talk about racial equity. Their message emphasized the idea that race is a social construct, outlined the history of racism in terms of inferiority/superiority and power and the lack of power, and unpacked the definitions of institutional racism and white privilege.

In 2002, Gross drafted an editorial on white privilege for *Newsday,* a local New York paper, entitled "Racism Feeds on Embedded Privilege." She wrote, "How does white privilege work? … it hampers the "undoing" of institutional racism because it fosters the illusions that the privileges that Whites enjoy are entitlements based on merit and should be fiercely guarded. Sure, some Whites may think, I want improved schools for Blacks, but that isn't going to have any impact on my school district, is it?"[147] When Gross shared the draft with stakeholders, some were concerned that it would be perceived as an attack on Whites. After publication, however, the naysayers acknowledged the message and later believed it was the right thing to do.

ERASE Racism became skilled at **attracting positive media attention**. Its press conferences were attended by all of the local stations and newspapers and sometimes *The New York Times* and National Public Radio. This was partly because the initiative's board and staff worked to develop media relationships, made themselves accessible, and always had data to support their positions. ERASE

---

[147] Gross, V. Elaine, "Racism Feeds on Embedded Privilege." *Newsday*, July 19, 2002.

Racism also hired a consultant to train and coach staff and board members for press conferences, solicit media coverage, and provide advice about messaging.

One of the organization's approaches is to maximize its impact by **helping other organizations build capacity**. In 2003, ERASE convened 70 people from various organizations to introduce the concept of organizational self-assessment of behaviors, structures, and policies that perpetuate institutional racism. The conversation was well-received and several participants requested follow-up assistance. Participants from Stony Brook University formed a committee to assess policies and practices and created an organizational climate survey, and the university's president sent staff to Unraveling Racism workshops.

In 2004, ERASE Racism promoted **community education** by holding a major conference, *Brown V. Board of Education: The Unfinished Agenda*. This conference attracted more than 600 participants, drawn from 15 local universities and colleges and 36 public school districts, along with 5 locally elected officials. ERASE Racism produced a collection of briefing papers for the conference that analyzed options for addressing public education inequities and segregation, and the gathering served as a catalyst for ERASE Racism's current campaign on educational racial disparities.

In 2005, the organization launched the Partnership for Racial Equity to **give individuals a concrete way to support the work**. More than 400 people have joined the free partnership. The message they receive is, "Dismantling institutional and structural racism is the responsibility of everyone—the under-privileged and the over-privileged. Inaction perpetuates racial inequities and disparate outcomes." Partners are invited to help with policy campaigns by attending public hearings, write to elected officials and other key leaders, attend educational offerings to learn more about specific issues, and participate in a members-only instant messaging forum where they can share stories and find co-collaborators.

ERASE Racism's leaders recently decided to implement a more structured community education process, **public dialogues about race and racism**. The following types of questions will be addressed at these monthly gatherings:

- What do we mean by diversity and racial inclusion?

- What is the relationship between valuing diversity and inclusion and achieving outcomes that reflect fairness, justice, and equity?

- How are public programs and policies affected by color-consciousness and colorblindness?

- How does personal identity and concepts like individualism, merit, and personal responsibility influence our understanding of institutional and structural racism?

- What influences our opinions and actions when it comes to understanding complex policies related to race and racism?

The dialogues will be launched in fall 2007 by john powell, director of the Kirwan Institute on Race & Ethnicity at Ohio State University and an internationally recognized authority in the areas of civil rights, civil liberties, and issues relating to race, ethnicity, poverty, and the law.

TRAINING

The People's Institute for Survival and Beyond was initially hired to provide Undoing Racism training sessions. One of the first groups to be trained was the staff and board of the Long Island Community Foundation. Some participants pushed back on learning about institutional racism and white privilege,

but support for the initiative—and the training—continued. The executive director of the foundation serves on ERASE Racism's board.

ERASE Racism then invited Cultural Bridges, New Mexico-based organization led by jona olson, to provide its training, Unraveling Racism One and Two, to foundation, faith, and civic leaders and community residents. At the first training workshops, staff were pleased with whoever showed up at the training. Their strategy now is to build relationships with an organization/sector, increase its knowledge of racism, and then work with people within the system who can create traction for change. They believe it is especially important to work with organizations that work daily in communities of color to ensure understanding of the systemic concerns rather than having organizations offer paternalistic and condescending services. More than 450 residents have participated in Unraveling Racism workshops.

ERASE Racism also created a curriculum for school districts, *Understanding Race: A Tool to Improve Student Achievement.* For two years, the initiative provided Half Hollow Hills School District with in-service seminars (15 hours) for teachers. Staff have also trained Eastern Suffolk Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) administrators. The curriculum covers early socialization concepts, Long Island's history of racism, institutional racism concepts, case studies of teachers' and students' interactions, and the video *Race: Power of an Illusion*.

OBJECTIVES OF UNRAVELING RACISM TRAINING

Unraveling Racism Training 1 (2 days)

- To provide a framework and common language for genuine dialogue about racism and to create an environment that encourages such dialogue. To clarify historical, political and social context for racism in the U.S.

- To uncover the systemic linkages among racism, sexism, classism, heterosexism, ableism, anti-Semitism, ageism, and all forms of oppression.

- To probe the reality and daily experience of individuals, institutional racism, and White privilege.

- To offer individual participants opportunities to deepen their own awareness and understanding of racism and their commitment to racial justice.

Unraveling Racism Training 2 (Overnight)

Applied skills training effectively builds on the skills and behaviors learned in the Core Training to deepen participants' knowledge and sharpen their intervention skills to address institutional and structural racism. This workshop:

- Examines communication styles and barriers to effective, respectful, cross-cultural communication;

- Allows participants to practice skills for identifying and analyzing racist practices and policies that occur in institutions; and

- Prepares participants to translate and articulate this expanded knowledge and to make the case for racial justice to others in their spheres of influence.

FOCUS AREA TWO:
FAIR HOUSING

PRE-INITIATIVE SNAPSHOT

Housing segregation constrains many educational and job choices and undermines wealth accumulation for people restricted to fewer neighborhoods, compared to people with more freedom to live where they choose, and thus escalates racial disproportions in many areas of life. ERASE Racism's report on fair housing includes some examples of the role housing plays as a determinant of opportunity, based on national research:

- "All else being equal, children of parents who own their homes and live in neighborhoods with low turnover have a higher probability of completing high school."

- "Better quality housing is related to lower levels of psychological stress, which in turn reduces health care costs and improves productivity."

- "White families have more than twice the wealth of African-American families, even when they make the same income. Much of this gap is due to home equity and family inheritance."

- "Housing has a direct effect on employment. Segregation creates separate information networks for Whites and African American communities. Individuals living in White communities receive information about skilled job vacancies that are not promoted in African-American communities, while unskilled, low-paying positions are marketed in communities of color." [148]

To ERASE Racism leaders, therefore, fair housing was a good issue to start with. It involved a system that didn't work, even though civil rights laws exist, which demonstrated that when laws are not enforced and when inequities are maintained by key community institutions, the impact on people of color is devastating. The burden is further revealed by reviewing the racial disparities in the school

> **FINDINGS ON HOUSING DISCRIMINATION FROM *ERASE RACISM'S* REPORT**
>
> The fair housing enforcement system is inefficient and lethargic.
>
> Housing discrimination is not deterred by the current enforcement system because it is designed to be reactive, not preventative.
>
> Realty agents are perpetuating segregation by steering and other forms of discrimination without fear of reprisal, due to lack of serious fair housing enforcement and the weakness of penalties.
>
> No accurate numbers exist on housing discrimination incidents on Long Island because enforcement agencies do not use the same criteria for counting fair housing complaints.
>
> Government agencies mandated to ensure fair housing often impede the development of integrated housing and the enforcement of fair housing laws by encouraging restrictive zoning; implementing unequal taxation policies; and funding municipalities that knowingly discriminate against African American residents.
>
> There is a lack of leadership and accountability for promoting integration, implementing preventative strategies, and dispelling myths and fears about affordable housing.*
>
> *Gross, V. Elaine, and Harris, Cathryn. *Long Island Fair Housing: A State of Inequity*, ERASE Racism, March 2005, p. 2.

---

[148] Gross, V. Elaine, and Harris, Cathryn, *Long Island Fair Housing: A State of Inequity*, ERASE Racism, March 2005, p. 10.

districts and the impact of a limited commercial tax base for communities of color.

ERASE Racism's housing study action group researched the state of fair housing enforcement agencies at the federal, state, and municipal levels. Questions were asked to obtain statistics, and the staff and participants soon found there were no data on how many people made complaints, how many won their cases, and how many cases were dismissed. Clearly, systematic data collection was needed to ensure accountability and to draw attention to enforcement issues.

In April 2005, ERASE Racism released the result of its research, *Long Island Fair Housing: A State of Inequity* at a press conference with task force members and both county executives present. For some individuals and institutions the report was scathing. It effectively raised political and public awareness of the level of segregation on Long Island and the need for stronger enforcement, and it prompted the county executives to publicly commit to working with ERASE Racism on the issues. ERASE Racism continues to use the report to keep the issue in the public eye.

HOUSING DISCRIMINATION IS AN EMOTIONAL FLASHPOINT

"Long Island was settled as a suburb to escape the city and all of those 'bad things' in the city. You are really talking about blue-collar and working people whose major asset is their home. They worried about someone different than them hurting their property; they really believed 'these people' would be dangerous and their property values would go down and it would be an invasion of this wonderful utopian society they created. NIMBYISM is thriving on Long Island."

—Marge Rogatz, housing activist, ERASE Racism board member

STRATEGIES

ERASE Racism's primary tools for policy change are **hard-hitting data analysis** and an **expert civil rights team** that provides guidance to county administrators (which one of the county governments requested).

The initiative also had to deal with political maneuvers and personalized attacks, since there was resistance in some government circles to this legislative change. One of the political methods used was verbally committing to work together and then publicly stating a different agenda. Another method was delaying sharing of documents to avoid analysis and potential recommendations. The process would continue despite these delays, and then the response by some government officials was to accuse ERASE Racism of not being faithful to the process. The staff's strategies were to **remain on top of the issues; use the media to ensure their analysis of the issues were known; engage their allies to testify; and continue to keep local elected officials accountable to their agreements and eventually the intent of the law**.

ERASE Racism then **organized island-wide support** to encourage the counties to make policy changes. The original plan was to have Nassau and Suffolk counties collaborate on a strategy to put some teeth into their enforcement processes. Unfortunately, this unraveled when a difference in philosophy regarding local enforcement arose between the two counties. One of the unexpected relationships built during this process was with the chief operating officer of Coldwell Banker, who ended up being the only realtor to provide testimony for the bill at the Nassau County legislature.

Suffolk County initially introduced a bill that ERASE Racism could not support due to deficiencies in the administrative enforcement system in the bill. The organization expeditiously arranged meetings with

Democratic and Republican legislators to **educate them on the issues, increased constituents' understanding about the need to amend the bill**, and arranged for local leaders from 16

organizations to give testimony in favor of the amendments. From this organized educational process, key amendments were included in the legislation.

Fourteen months after the release of the report, supported by **technical assistance** from ERASE Racism, the Nassau County Executive's office drafted, negotiated, and signed into law a new fair housing law that included local enforcement. Suffolk County initially introduced a similar law. One of the main differences between the laws is that Nassau County explicitly allows civil rights groups involved in a fair housing case to have standing as plaintiffs. In other words, the burden of proof—and enforcement of the law—does not lie with individual "victims" coming forward, who may be reluctant if concerned about repercussions. Organizations can demonstrate that the fair housing laws are being broken and that those breaking the law can be appropriately punished. In Suffolk County organizations can also be plaintiffs but many bureaucratic steps are required to make this happen.

ERASE RACISM'S RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR FAIR HOUSING POLICY AND ENFORCEMENT

Government fair housing enforcement agencies at all levels must immediately take swift steps to overhaul the administrative complaints process by ensuring that complaints are investigated thoroughly; are processed expeditiously; and are subjected to the same standards, measures, and procedures.

Systematic and regular auditing of fair housing and enforcement agencies must be implemented to monitor the effectiveness of fair housing enforcement and make recommendations for agency reform.

Housing discrimination must become cost-prohibitive to the realty community. Realtors and agents must face stiff penalties such as suspension, loss of license, and larger monetary fines as deterrents.

Integrated complaint counting systems among agencies must be established to allow victims of discrimination to track case progression and make Long Island housing discrimination data easily accessible.

Proactive enforcement activities must be engaged in by all government fair housing enforcement agencies.

Local government should take a proactive role in educating the public by promoting the positive aspects of integrated housing on Long Island. This should include a plan to offer incentives to the public for purchasing homes in integrated communities, such as tax breaks or buy-back programs.

A non-partisan task force should be created to promote integrated housing and monitor integrated community development, and fair housing efforts."*

*Gross, V. Elaine, and Harris, Cathryn. *Long Island Fair Housing: A State of Inequity*, ERASE Racism, March 2005, p. 3.

OUTCOMES

Community education. ERASE Racism has been included in more than 30 articles on racial equity in local newspapers and publications, and more than 5,000 people have been educated through its conferences, workshops, seminars, and speaking engagements. ERASE Racism's website has received accolades for being a valuable source for accurate information.

Climate change. Race has become something that many more residents of Long Island can discuss publicly and openly, and thanks to the public education efforts they have the language to do so more productively. All sorts of people—local elected officials, university presidents, nonprofit managers, volunteers, and parents—are recognizing and naming racist behaviors and policies. NIMBYISM has not been eliminated, and segregation is still present, but ERASE Racism staff and board members believe that the climate is more conducive to change now than it was before the initiative.

Fair housing. ERASE Racism was instrumental to the passage of Nassau and Suffolk counties' fair housing bills. The initiative now gives both counties technical assistance on implementing the laws and helped Nassau County establish a Fair Housing Officer position. Nine agencies participate in fair housing trainings designed and provided by ERASE Racism, and all Nassau County employees who have contact with the public, from 22 county agencies, must attend training. The fair housing campaign also:

- Developed a fair housing access program through which employees of 22 Nassau County departments collect data on instances of housing discrimination from program applicants. This collection process provides an opportunity to educate residents about housing discrimination and the resources available to them and to identify "hot spots" of discrimination.

- Collaborated with the largest real estate brokerage on Long Island to rectify the role some realtors play in perpetuating segregation. In January 2006, 25 branch mangers attended a two-day Unraveling Racism training.

- Presented the New York State Division of Licensing with recommendations for revoking or suspending real estate professionals' licenses when they violate fair housing laws. The division's staff then met with ERASE Racism staff to discuss implementation of the recommendations.

- Negotiated with the Department of Justice to gain access to statistics and information on Long Island fair housing cases prosecuted by the Department of Justice.

Despite these early wins, it will take time for the legislation to have an effect—time for residents to trust that the laws will be enforced, time for workers and managers in government agencies to create new systems, and time for bureaucrats to adjust to the community's higher expectations for enforcement.

CONCLUSIONS

ERASE Racism is a model for other communities on how to have an explicit institutional racism message. What some people might perceive as an unlikely consequence of being explicit, residents in different sectors and roles stepped up and forward to learn more and address critical issues. The staff is more skilled at working with the media, which resulted in opportunities for them to tell their story and challenge misconceptions or a "blame-the-victim" rationale. ERASE Racism's use of data has

been the cornerstone of its effectiveness and success. In a relatively short time, ERASE made an impact on fair housing on the Island. Some thought this needed to happen, many thought it couldn't happen, and most thought it definitely would not happen with a structural racism lens. Yet it did. The process was smart, thoughtful, and adaptable; the staff and board were unswerving on the message; and they persevered with tenacity.

ERASE Racism confronted head-on the attitude that "we don't talk about racism here" and came out on top. Leaders did not dilute their message about structural racism and white privilege—from the choice of an initiative name to the content of op/ed pieces to the explicitness of their research report.   This initiative was not always embraced, but it surely was not marginalized, nor did it beg for participation at events. ERASE Racism's leaders travel in the circles of influence, and the president serves on various mainstream committees and boards on Long Island.

This said, it is not to minimize the importance of thoughtfully framing a message, especially when it involves explicit language and racial issues. Rather, ERASE Racism staff and board members consistently rely on facts to respond to misconceptions about race and to explain the systemic nature of racial disparities. The result of their stand is that a racially diverse group of people—not just people of color or political "progressives"—have come forward to learn, partner, and act.

ERASE Racism's use of data is a cornerstone of its effectiveness and success. Data inform the initiative's conceptual explanations of structural racism in the media, workshops, events, and conferences. The fact-finding process and sharing of findings helped make the report on housing inequities not just another report but a tool that moved elected officials to action. The process of collecting, analyzing, and using data has proved to be smart and strategic.

ERASE Racism now faces the challenge of build its own capacity to meet the community's ever-changing needs. As individuals and institutions become more knowledgeable about racism, more are ready and willing to become involved. At the same time, many people start to realize how much they still don't know and want additional training and education. Finding a way for residents to become more knowledgeable educated and to participate, and then managing that process, is imperative for sustained, effective work. ERASE Racism is figuring out how to balance its community education while also keeping up with the issues occurring in the community and the launch of new campaign.

Of the four case study sites, ERASE Racism is working with the largest population and the most jurisdictions. As it moves forward with a campaign on public education inequities, it will have to build a new critical mass of allies. The Partnership for Racial Equity has more than 400 members, and it is premature to tell how this level of participation can be leveraged in the work.

As the initiative moves into reforming the education system, it faces a new concern: how to operate with 125 school districts and with the massive population affected by education inequities (compared with housing inequities). There are more layers of constituents to engage and also grassroots organizations with whom ERASE Racism does not have a track record. The initiative will have to build credibility, trust, and relationships all over again, and it is not clear whether and how ERASE Racism will engage and partner with residents on the education campaign. They will need to focus on being community-centric, which means being accountable to the residents most affected by institutional racism and creating a change agenda that reflects and responds to residents' concerns.

The initiative's approach may have to change. Instead of leading and coordinating the process, as it did with the fair housing campaign, it may need to serve as a guide and technical assistance provider to a coalition of education advocates. Initiative staff and board members also must increase their own

knowledge of how institutional racism within the educational system affects different racial and ethnic groups and how cultural racism shows up in the system. To date, ERASE has focused mostly on racism's impact on African-Americans Long Islanders because of the severe historic and present-day disparities When it comes to education, the challenge will be to reach a multiracial constituent base.

LESSONS SPECIFIC TO LONG ISLAND

1. Be grounded in your values of equity and your racial analysis of the issues. Be prepared to walk the line even if individuals are not ready to embrace these values and analysis. Be flexible and creative with strategies to move the group to the next level and allow space for them to struggle with learning the analysis of the issues.

2. Being clear and transparent about the initiative's goals and actions helps to generate support for change. This is especially true for individuals and organizations stuck on old, ineffective ways of responding to racial inequity. There may be some static and tension regarding moving ahead with new methods, but resist being blocked by these groups by being clear on your intent.

3. When attempting policy change, do your homework and be prepared for all contingencies. It's especially important to build relationships on both sides of the political aisle so that election coups don't derail the initiative's legislative efforts.

4. Real-life stories of discrimination are a powerful advocacy tool, but it takes a lot of trust-building and education to convince residents to share their discrimination complaints. The difficulty of collecting a large number of real examples has been postponed to focus on educating residents and increasing their comfort in making complaints.

5. Passage of a law is only the first step; its implementation can be an ongoing challenge. Many factors interfere with enforcement, including turnover in housing agency staff members, competing demands on their time, and varying levels of awareness of and commitment to equity. ERASE Racism learned to invest time in making housing staff aware of the law, continuing to prod leaders, and paying attention to new developments that could help or hinder implementation of the new law.

6. The community's immediate needs have to be balanced against long-term community-change goals. ERASE Racism sometimes feels drawn to respond to topical issues, which is hard to do with limited staff and resources. The organization wants to increase the number of ongoing, strategic partnerships to address a variety of issues while also building a critical mass of trained individuals who are engaged and involved, so the initiative has both immediate and long-term relevance.

7. Ultimate outcomes should determine activities, not the multitude of distractions along the way. It's important to take a long view or the initiative can get swept into every racial incident that comes along. Set clear boundaries for involvement, based on the community's ultimate goals, and stick to them. Focus on the long view; avoid getting swept into responding to or getting involved in every incident about race. Set boundaries for what you will and won't get involved in and tell people. Some may feel slighted, but it's important to stay focused on the work to be done.

n *Lessons Learned: How Communities are Addressing Racial Inequities*, we hypothesized that five broad capacities are needed to develop and sustain CCIRs:

1. **Capacity to engage a diverse leadership stakeholder group** in which members (a) shape and lead the process and (b) have the individual and group knowledge needed to frame community problems and goals in racial-equity terms.

2. **Capacity to implement a community assessment process** to (a) identify the barriers to racial equity and improved race relations, (b) understand community members' awareness of racial and ethnic issues, (c) establish baseline data in different disparity areas, (d) understand the state of race relations and historical trends in disparities, and (e) understand past and current community-change processes.

3. **Capacity to use multi-pronged strategies** to address racial inequities based on a theory of change that is created from historical and current knowledge of the community's disparities, barriers to change, and decision-making and community engagement processes.

4. **Capacity to create an organizational and programmatic framework** that can weather the variable, demanding, and complex nature of this type of community initiative by: (a) marshalling necessary resources to fund and staff the effort; (b) partnering with elected officials, public and private sector stakeholders, community organizations and residents, and encouraging them to create collective goals; (c) learning about best practices of different race relations and racial justice approaches and community building and engagement strategies; (d) using the media and other communication sources to frame and convey the information about community racial disparities and the goals of the initiative; (e) developing an inclusive and equitable process and framework that can serve as a model for community institutions; and (f) assessing and measuring progress using participatory evaluation practices, adjusting strategies, and sharing information readily with the community.

5. **Capacity to engage a critical mass of diverse residents and institutions** in proactively, effectively, and strategically addressing racism. This may entail: (a) increasing residents' knowledge and awareness; (b) providing opportunities for diverse residents to build relationships and work together on issues; (c) developing diverse leadership; and/or (d) transforming institutions by changing policies, practices, and procedures to eliminate barriers to racial equity.

The chart that follows summarizes data from the four study sites on similarities, differences, and challenges for "the field," organized by capacity area. It is important here to clarify the use of the term "field." There is controversy within groups that work on racial justice about whether the organizations, practitioners, activists, and academicians are working within a field of practice, or whether we are growing a justice "movement" (and some people are averse to both terms). The use of "field" in this document is not meant to advocate for standards or even academic credentials. It is about creating a learning community that discusses theory and practice, shares lessons learned, keeps up with the trends and the nuances of racism, and develops accountability practices.

1. Capacity to engage a diverse leadership stakeholder group in which members (a) shape and lead the process and (b) have the individual and group knowledge needed to frame community problems and goals in racial-equity terms.	
SIMILARITIES	**DIFFERENCES**
Governing body. Each initiative engaged a diverse leadership group that was involved in programmatic strategic planning, decision making, and implementation to differing degrees.	**Responsibilities.** Long Island's leadership group is a non-profit board, as is Charlotte's CBI, although Charlotte transitioned to a board from an advisory committee in 2006. Each type of leadership groups has different governance responsibilities.
Leadership composition. Each leadership groups' composition typically had middle-management and/or senior-level members representing institutions, sectors, or city departments.	
Retention of leaders. Each site reported a high retention rate among leadership group members, which they attributed to relationships forged among members, the opportunity to increase one's personal knowledge of issues, and/or the sense members were making a difference in the community.	
Leadership training. All sites' primary leadership groups received training together, which lasted from two to 10 days.	

CHALLENGES FOR THE FIELD

Continuity. Interviewees say that leadership groups need a common analysis and language, but ongoing turnover and expansion of membership make that hard to maintain. It may even be necessary to revisit such basic terms as "racism," one site learned.

Inclusiveness. Certain constituents tend to be overlooked when leadership groups are being established, especially grassroots leaders, informal community leaders, youth, emerging leaders, and the residents most affected by the issue at hand. Organizers need to focus explicitly on the values of inclusion and equity and then figure out what practices need to be changed to ensure alignment.

Full participation. As the leadership group begins to encompass new voices, it is crucial that those voices are fully heard and not tokenized. Organizers must keep in mind that the community residents who are most affected by racism have the most at stake: they have much to gain from changing the status quo but much to lose from the risks and political fallout of actions taken in their community.

Equitable practices. Leadership groups need to follow a democratic governance structure, inclusive and transparent decision-making processes, and consistent accountability systems, especially with residents most affected by racial disparities. Equitable practices include jointly created agendas, attention to cultural differences when discussing conflicts and making decisions, building in time for same-race/ethnicity caucuses, and an ongoing learning process.[149]

Cultural relevance. Leadership groups must make sure that the norms of predominately white institutions don't supercede the community's cultural norms, especially when reporting to predominately white grant makers (e.g., by give timelines and products more priority than relationship building).

---

[149] Potapchuk, Leiderman, Bivens, and Major. *Flipping the Script: White Privilege and Community Building*. 2005. MP Associates and CAPD, pp. 112-113.

2. Capacity to implement a community assessment process to (a) identify the barriers to racial equity and improved race relations, (b) understand community members' awareness of racial and ethnic issues, (c) establish baseline data in different disparity areas, (d) understand the state of race relations and historical trends in disparities, and (e) understand past and current community-change processes.

SIMILARITIES	DIFFERENCES
Value of data. Each site found that data collection and analysis helped participants: • Decide what strategies to implement • Make a case for policy or legislative law change • Increase the community's awareness of disparities • Learn about a specific issue • Establish baseline data	**The range of vehicles** for collecting data included: • Action teams (Long Island and Charlotte) composed of activists, experts on specific issues, and community members • Focus groups, surveys, and other instruments (Seattle) that focused on reinvesting in youth, environmental justice, immigrant/refugee issues, and economic equity • In St. Cloud, a consulting firm worked with the steering committee to identify research indicators of gaps between the majority community and underrepresented races, cultures and ethnic groups in four focus areas – educational attainment; health care access; housing access and strengthening our community: dismantling racism.

CHALLENGES FOR THE FIELD

Using data accurately. Data can be intimidating and daunting to people unaccustomed to working with statistics. Data can also be manipulated to reinforce stereotypes and blame the victim. Major issues in using data are[150]:

• What sources of support (government, media, organizations) are trying to advance their agenda through the data? Who trusts these sources and who does not?

• Some people find meaning in what they hear and observe, while others rely on statistics. How do the data represent people's learning styles, worldview, and culture?

• Who is posing the questions behind the data? Who is analyzing the data? Who is interpreting the story based on the data?

• Are the data being aggregated by racial and ethnic subgroups within major racial categories to determine whether strategies need to be different for different groups?

• To what degree are residents involved in determining what data to collect; in collecting, analyzing, and framing the data; and in determining a response?

Another perspective on the challenges of collecting and using data comes from Barbara Major, co-author of *Flipping the Script: White Privilege and Community Building*. Although Major's statement is framed in the context of foundations, it applies to other institutions:

"Foundations also have to understand that other cultures often have other ways of measuring success besides the ways that foundations find credible … In the white foundation model, the community is forced to do what is unnatural because the community's nature is not to list all of what is supposed to happen during a process, but rather to look at itself in a holistic way (not in pieces) … Further, many different types of indicators can be useful, but foundations tend to value most what they can count. We as a community have to show what has been accomplished using the foundations' way of knowing (numbers) and not necessarily our way of knowing (living it and seeing it every day). Actually, it's even deeper than that. We have to prove what we know in the foundations' institutional language, a language that is foreign to us."[151]

---

[150] *Ibid.* These challenges are based on Sally Leiderman's chapter 9, "Doing Evaluation Differently.".

[151] *Ibid.*, p.73.

3. Capacity to use multi-pronged strategies to address racial inequities based on a theory of change that is created from historical and current knowledge of the community's disparities, barriers to change, and decision-making and community engagement processes.

SIMILARITIES	DIFFERENCES
Multi-faceted approach. Each initiative used several types of strategies to reach their long-term outcomes (see Appendix for a list of primary strategies organized by site).	**Type of strategy.** The selection varies according to the initiative's theory of change, the level of infrastructure in the community, and the degree to which initiative leaders and staff understand various strategies. For example, only Seattle has a significant network of community organizations working specifically on race and ethnic issues on which to build; other sites had to piece together the activities of traditional civil rights organizations and community agencies that focused on race relations or racial equity issues.
Capacity building. Each initiative built the capacity of staff and community members, including their knowledge, shared analysis of the issues, leadership skills, awareness, and ability to work with organizations/departments in a peer network.	
Data orientation. Each gathered and disseminated data, either as a stand-alone exercise or to support other strategies (e.g., by sharing data on racial disparities in a training workshop).	**Training purpose.** Training and group facilitation serves different purposes across sites, including: building the capacity of organizations and/or individuals, creating common analyses and language, increasing people's awareness of and knowledge about racism at multiple levels (individual, inter-group, institutional), and moving people to action.
Training. Each used training and group facilitation to increase the knowledge and skills of residents and community leaders. Long Island, St. Cloud, and Seattle have training programs whose theory of practice reflects anti-racism (e.g., "*Provide an analytical framework for examining systemic forces at work in the community*"). The theory in Charlotte reflects democracy building: "*Construct deliberative public forums and processes to promote inclusive, engaged, cooperation of citizens across non-profit, business, and government sectors.*"[152] Each training program, to differing degrees, has a theory of change in which individual change leads to changes in organizations and/or the community.	**Training process and methods.** Some sites created their own training curricula and processes, while others hired or partnered with organizations that provide training. Sites used different methods to engage people in training, depending on their staff capacity. For example, Seattle requires all staff to attend training. Long Island uses strategic recruiting, based on its current or future campaigns, and opens training sessions to the public. In St. Cloud, each sector's action team chose the training content and decided how to engage sector representatives. Charlotte's Leadership Development Initiative focused initially on training board members and senior staff from selected non-profits but later expanded to include government employees, police, and educators.

CHALLENGES FOR THE FIELD

Funding. Funding is limited because some people view this type of community change process as risky. That makes strategic planning for future activities very difficult.

Isolation. There is no "community of practice" for CCIRs at this time, so there is no easy way to collect and share information on what does or doesn't work. The staff of initiatives in our study sample didn't know about each other's work, and there was no vehicle for them to communicate with each other. There are groups that research and publish information on racial inclusion and lessons learned about equity approaches, but there is no clearinghouse of information. There are no annual or regional convenings where newcomers to this work would receive needed support and have opportunities to share their insights and lessons.

---

[152] Shapiro, Ilana, *Training for Racial Equity and Inclusion: A Guide to Selected Programs*. New York: The Aspen Institute, 2002. p. 101.

CHALLENGES FOR THE FIELD

Competition. There are spoken and unspoken hierarchies of approaches to race relations and racial justice, and they tend to compete instead of forming a common vision for changed based on a broad understanding of how change happens and what role each approach, when implemented well, plays in producing change.

Knowledge gaps. As a field, its important to increase our knowledge about: (a) when to introduce a particular approach into a community change process; (b) the variables and conditions that enable success; (c) indicators for measuring success; (d) whether a more significant, sustained amount of change will occur if the initiative addresses structural racism at the individual, intergroup, and structural levels simultaneously; (e) when and how to phase in different approaches; and (f) how to keep up with the trends and nuances of racism.[153]

Training. As noted in Ilana Shapiro's *Training for Racial Equity and Inclusion: A Guide to Selected Programs:*[154]

- There are too few training programs grounded in theories that directly address the structural dimensions of racism. If communities are to build their capacity to address structural issues, more opportunities must be available to help community leaders develop their own curricula and cadre of trainers.

- Training programs need to include specific strategies for participants to apply what they learn. More effort should go into developing innovative tools and skills.

- Trainers typically operate in isolation and have few opportunities to meet and share promising practices, coordinate their approaches, build on successes, and create new strategies.

- Training programs need rigorous and systematic processes for linking theories to outcomes and for analyzing results.

Community Education and Engagement. As many racial justice organizations know, once you begin to educate people about racism they realize how much they really don't know and may choose to pursue more education; or they may be in a position to encourage their institutions to seek education and start an assessment process to become more inclusive and equitable. The last thing a racial justice organization wants to do is turn someone away who is interested, willing, and possibly ready to act. Organizational capacity building is imperative for sustained effective work, yet it's typically last on the list for organizations as they juggle all the other demands, including some that involve life and death issues. And, too many times, it also is last on the list for funders. As the credibility of CCIRs and racial justice organizations grows, they face a critical time to build their capacity, secure their infrastructure, and make the necessary transition to meet the needs.

---

[153] This section is based on *Cultivating Interdependence: A Guide to Race Relations and Racial Justice Organizations,* Potapchuk with contributing writer Lori Villarosa. Washington D.C.: Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, 2004. pp. 59-61.
[154] *Ibid.*, pp. 109-112.

4. Capacity to create an organizational and programmatic framework that can weather the variable, demanding, and complex nature of this type of community initiative by: (a) marshalling necessary resources to fund and staff the effort; (b) partnering with elected officials, public and private sector stakeholders, community organizations and residents, and encouraging them to create collective goals; (c) learning about best practices of different race relations and racial justice approaches and community building and engagement strategies; (d) using the media and other communication sources to frame and convey the information about community racial disparities and the goals of the initiative; (e) developing an inclusive and equitable process and framework that can serve as a model for community institutions; and (f) assessing and measuring progress using participatory evaluation practices, adjusting strategies, and sharing information readily with the community.

SIMILARITIES	DIFFERENCES
Resources. Each initiative has attracted resources despite the challenge of working through bureaucracies, making a compelling case to funders (although planning was hampered when financial support was uncertain).	**Stakeholder roles.** Long Island used data to persuade two county executives to improve fair housing policies and enforcement. In Seattle, St. Cloud, and Charlotte's CBI, local elected officials were catalysts for change.
Partnership. Each initiative had some type of partnership and/or relationship with local elected officials, public and private stakeholders, community organizations, and residents.	**Relationship building.** In St. Cloud, each of the senior leaders from major institutions (United Way, chamber of commerce, corporations, schools, community foundation) and city and county government were or are involved in the initiative's steering committee.
Community involvement. In each initiative, community organizations served as allies, partners, collaborators, leaders, and resource providers.	**Media.** Long Island cultivated relationships to ensure positive media coverage, and St. Cloud partnered with the local newspaper to publish data on race-based gaps on key outcomes.
Evaluation. Each initiative minimally conducts program evaluation, although they are in different stages of increasing these efforts (ranging from discussing how to accomplish it and finding resources to arranging a partnership with a local institution to conduct evaluation and implementing a process of to review outcomes and incorporate findings into strategic planning).	**Inclusive Process.** Seattle's Core Team uses guiding and operating principles and norms, including using racial caucuses within their meetings, to assess decisions. Charlotte' CBI created a set of beliefs.

Evaluation. Crossroads Charlotte engaged the University of North Carolina-Charlotte to study the initiative's impact, evaluate the accountability structure and learning network, and distill lessons. Seattle is currently in an assessment process to clarify outcomes for Phase 2, identify national best practices, and select future strategies. |

CHALLENGES FOR THE FIELD

Sustainable funding. Racial justice organizations are a declining priority for funding in the world of civil rights and social action. The top 50 recipients of foundation grants for civil rights and social action receive 77% of all grants in this category.[155] Grant applicants often use euphemisms to describe their work, believing that foundations are reluctant to tackle racism (although there have been efforts over the past decade to improve funders' understanding of racial equity issues[156]).

---

[155] Pitz, Will and Sen, Rinku, *Short Changed: Foundation Giving and Communities of Color*, Oakland: Applied Research Center, 2004. pp. 5 and 7.

[156] For more information about these efforts, see Resources and information on Philanthropic Initiative for Racial Equity's website, www.racialequity.org

CHALLENGES FOR THE FIELD

Alignment of values and actions. Initiative leaders, participants, and funders need to be very clear about whether their policies, practices, and relationships with other organizations reflect the new reality they are trying to create or align more with the old system they are trying to dismantle.[157] The challenges are to find points of commonality rather than excluding colleagues whose power or racial analysis differs, and to maintain solidarity rather than dividing to conquer.

Opportunities for cross-fertilization. There are not enough venues for academicians, practitioners, and activists to come together and discuss issues, strategies, and expected outcomes. There is no national convening for sharing information across communities, approaches, and disciplines.

Evaluation. Although there are evaluation techniques to determine whether participation in a program played a part in causing change, it is hard (if not impossible) to know whether the initiative was the sole reason for the change. Evaluation can be used as a tool to create reasonable expectations of what can be accomplished. Evaluation "reflects Western ideas about cause-and-effect relationships, which means that change is typically understood from a rational and sometimes linear process, although [evaluation] can be designed to be anti-racist and [used] as a tool to dismantle white privilege."[158]

Framing messages to the media. The challenge is to communicate about structural racism and the problems it causes rather than "blaming the victim." Recent research on how to frame issues to the public and media [159] may help in this regard.

---

[157] Potapchuk, M., *Cultivating Interdependence: A Guide for Race Relations and Racial Justice Organizations.* Washington D.C.: Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, 2004. p. 59.

[158] From Sally Leiderman's chapter 9, "Doing Evaluation Differently," in *Flipping the Script: White Privilege and Community Building.* By Potapchuk, Leiderman, Bivens, and Major, 2005.

[159] In the Annie E. Casey Foundation's *Race Matters Toolkit*, there is a tipsheet on How to Talk about Race, www.aecf.org. Frameworks Institute conducted an intensive project to learn how Americans think and talk about race, available at www.frameworksinstitute.org/clients/race.shtml. The Opportunity Agenda has a Communications Toolkit, www.opportunityagenda.org/site; and the Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity looks at strategies for framing policy debates to promote racial justice, www.kirwaninstitute.org.

5. Capacity to engage a critical mass of diverse residents and institutions in proactively, effectively, and strategically addressing racism. This may entail: (a) increasing residents' knowledge and awareness; (b) providing opportunities for diverse residents to build relationships and work together on issues; (c) developing diverse leadership; and/or (d) transforming institutions by changing policies, practices, and procedures to eliminate barriers to racial equity.	
SIMILARITIES	**DIFFERENCES**
Knowledge and awareness. Each initiative increased residents' knowledge and awareness in differing degrees.	**Knowledge and awareness.** St. Cloud has held two community gatherings focused on race, with almost 2,000 residents in attendance for both events. Long Island involved more than 600 participants in their *Brown v. Board of Education: The Unfinished Agenda* conference.
Diverse leadership. Each initiative engaged diverse leadership.	**Opportunities to build relationships and work together.** In St. Cloud, 10,000 residents have participated in initiative activities since 1998, including seminars, dialogue groups, workshops, forums, and focus groups. For Crossroads Charlotte, more than 40 organizations have participated in a process to discuss how their institutions might help the community move to one of the positive future scenarios in 10 years. Long Island created a new program, Partnership for Racial Equity, that gives residents a chance to learn more and get involved. Seattle engaged residents through a Neighborhood Matching Fund program by incorporating race and social justice grant opportunities into the RFP. In 2006, $759,015 was distributed among 69 programs.

CHALLENGES FOR THE FIELD
Authentic participation. Community engagement is crucial for sustaining community initiatives, and it is part of most major community-change efforts. The challenge is to move beyond inclusion to ensure that different perspectives, insights, and opinions about change actually are integrated into planning, leadership, and implementation. Too often, the community engagement process is structured by people who represent the dominant culture. As Sally Leiderman, co-author of *Flipping the Script*, writes that whites need to be able to "tak[e] direction from people of color, who often see white privilege or [structural] racism before we do, [and] challenge the results of inclusive processes—not on the basis of who is included but on the result's consistency with the group's analysis of white privilege…." Doing so, Leiderman notes, has the advantage of being "among the people who are marginalized for consistently insisting we view our work through a racialized lens" and forces the question, "Do we have processes, vocabulary, and analyses that permit us to look at the values underlying our work from [multiple] racial and cultural perspectives?"[160] Conversely, the community engagement process also has to allow for mono-cultural/racial discussions, when necessary. **Distrust and cynicism.** Whites and predominantly white organizations have a long history of betraying people of color, and it isn't easy for people of color to believe that the new initiative will be any different. The only way to overcome the cynicism and distrust is to acknowledge the history, recognize that white privilege and racism are inherent in almost any existing process, and then transparently co-create a new process that provides for equitable decision making, resource sharing, and accountability.

---

[160] Potapchuk, Leiderman, Bivens, and Major, *Flipping the Script: White Privilege and Community Building,* 2005. p.85.

CONCLUSIONS

The four cases presented in this report tell inspirational stories about what it takes to launch a racial equity initiative in a community. Not surprisingly, courageous and committed leadership is critical. But all four have also learned how to bring a wider range of community actors into the initiative, how to use data about racial disparities to mobilize residents, and how to give people the language and analytical frameworks needed to understand and address the disparities' causes.

Through this research, *Community Change Processes and Progress in Addressing Racial Inequities,* we learn about the outcomes and strategies of four successful CCIRs. But there is still much we need to know about community change initiatives that address racial inequities. For instance, we learned that during a CCIR's formative stage it is essential to engage leaders (of different races and from established and community-based institutions) who will invest in the process and serve as its messengers. In three of the sites, major racial incidents increased the coverage of race by the media and in some ways served as part of the momentum needed to raise the question of how to address these inequities or hate crimes. We still need to know, however:

- **What internal and external community supports** exist that could help a CCIR gain traction during the formative stage

- **What methods** work best to engage leaders from different sectors in racial equity work

- **How to engage national associations** of professionals from relevant fields to educate their members about creating equitable communities

- **What community factors** need to be present for a CCIR to gain early momentum

- **What technical capacities** are needed within communities (e.g., data and analysis about racial disparities, facilitators trained to address racial equity issues) to provide sufficient support for CCIRs, and whether we need to build capacity for these technical gaps on a regional or national level

We also learned more about the processes used to build capacity among a critical mass of residents. For instance, some CCIRs implemented their ideas by focusing on a particular issue area, others used training to build a critical mass, and others convened community gatherings to discuss racial issues. One site in our sample engaged people across sectors, another approached the work sector by sector, and another began by engaging organizations mostly in the non-profit, government, education, and corporate sectors. But we still need to know:

- **What community conditions, attitudes, and behaviors encourage a CCIR to choose one strategy** over another and whether a community's demographic characteristics, racial history, and/or current leadership involvement influence strategy selection

- **What peer pressure and influence strategies work best** to engage leaders and/or key community institutions, especially those that may have served as gatekeepers to access and information in different community sectors

- **What intensity and duration of various strategies is needed** to institutionalize and sustain change

- **What layers or staging of interventions work best** to (a) engage residents and increase their knowledge and confidence to act and (b) create a community infrastructure to promote and sustain policy and institutional changes

- **What amount of investment** (i.e., funding, staffing) gives CCIRS flexibility to experiment, enough staff capacity pursue long-term outcomes, and the agility to address community crises as they arise

We conclude this report with four themes that emerged in our study sites as the CCIRs built capacity to promote racial equity: leadership, language and analytical frameworks, data, and institutional alignment.

1. *The initiatives in our study gained traction by intentionally engaging community leaders.*

Some leaders came from unexpected circles of influence: corporations, major nonprofits, local elected officials, foundations, chambers of commerce, police, etc. They each played different roles—as catalysts, messengers, program developers, or active participants. Why did these leaders do what they did, and why haven't leaders in other communities stepped up? Was it because of personal values and beliefs? Was it exposure to the reality of racial disparities and their impact on community members? Did they develop relationships with people of different races? Did they listen to elders' expectations, or were they moved by peer pressure? It will be important to tease out what helped propel these leaders to become engaged and how each initiative supported them in future research.

2. *Most of the initiatives addressed racism explicitly.*

The used various terms: "institutional racism," "structural racism," "racial disparities," "White privilege." The terms led people of different races, including those not "part of the choir," to join in, take action, lead, spread the word, facilitate, and become actively involved in efforts to address racial inequities. CCIR staff were thoughtful about framing, tone, and choice of words, and wanted to make sure their messages represented the work with integrity. In the past few years there has been much research on how to talk about racism to a mainstream audience. The research offers lessons for community leaders and initiative staff, but we also believe that researchers can learn more about how CCIR leaders frame effective messages for their communities.

3. *Data on racial disparities are an essential tool and mobilizing force.*

Each of our study sites collected data about racial disparities in its community. For Crossroads Charlotte, the data helped shape the future scenarios, and community organizations across sectors have used the data to create projects that move Charlotte closer to positive outcomes. Seattle's Race and Social Justice Initiative tracked and monitored contracts with women and minority businesses to establish a baseline, implement outcome-based accountability agreements, and design strategies for overcoming systemic barriers. St. Cloud's Create CommUNITY mapped the next phase of its work by identifying gaps in educational attainment, health care, and housing access between people of color and

Whites; Create CommUNITY leaders expect to be held accountable for reducing the disparities through their re-granting program. Long Island's ERASE Racism went on a fact-finding mission and learned that the region's fair housing system was dysfunctional. It used data to demonstrate how people of color were impacted by poor implementation of this civil rights law and to persuade elected officials to improve both the law and enforcement procedures.

4. *Actions, processes, and programs must constantly be aligned with racial equity values.*

Part of designing a complex community change effort involves understanding each community's history, culture, and areas where change can be leveraged. In doing so, however, it is easy to align practices and policies with the very system the initiative is trying to transform. Sometimes oppressive behaviors, processes, and standards can even be replicated. It's important for the initiative's structure and strategies to reflect community cultures while also challenging the status quo. Few such models have been implemented, much less sustained. But the following elements can help: making sure advisory groups truly reflect all dimensions of the community and all members are genuinely involved in governing the initiative; creating accountability practices with the people most impacted by institutional racism; developing meeting processes and decision-making procedures that are transparent, inclusive, and equitable; and identifying ways that the dominant culture and White privilege may be influencing the initiative's goals, strategies, and definition of success.

St. Cloud, Long Island, Seattle, and Charlotte-Mecklenburg have taken important steps toward undoing historical and contemporary manifestations of racism. They have mobilized their communities, developed racial equity plans, and achieved initial changes in the policies and practices of key institutions. It is too early to know whether they will succeed in improving community-wide indicators of racial equity in such areas as education, employment, income, health, housing, and so on. Aggregate change throughout their communities will require alignment across many institutions over the long run. Nonetheless, they have clearly demonstrated that it is possible to enter into territory previously considered taboo, too difficult, or too explosive. And they have shown us how to do it well.

The final message of this report involves the **development of a community of practice for CCIRs.** A growing number of communities have committed themselves to addressing racism, and they should no longer work in isolation. They should be recognized and supported collectively as a nascent "field" of racial equity initiatives. The four communities profiled here are in a position to lead that field; their experiences need to be lifted up and shared with other communities that face similar challenges. If we want the field to advance, we need to distill and disseminate more lessons, go deeper in our research, and engage communities in a network of learning and peer-to-peer support. In short, we need to encourage and support a community of practice around community change initiatives to address racial inequity. Doing so will be crucial if we expect to make national progress on racial equity.

ॐ

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

APPENDIX: SUMMARY DATA ON STUDY SITES

	SEATTLE	ST. CLOUD	CHARLOTTE	LONG ISLAND
Name of Initiative	Race and Social Justice Initiative (RSJI)	Mayor's Racial Harmony Initiative, Which became Create CommUNITY	Community Building Initiative (CBI) Crossroads Charlotte (Crossroads)	ERASE Racism: Challenging racial segregation and promoting racial equity through Education, Research, Advocacy, Support to Eliminate racism
Start Date	2004	1998: Mayor Racial Harmony Initiative 2003: Create CommUNITY (regionally focused)	1997: Community Building Task Force 1998 to present: Community Building Initiative 2004: Crossroads Charlotte	2001
Administrative Home	City government	First the mayor's office, then a community steering committee	**CBI:** Affiliated with Foundation for the Carolinas from 1998-2005; became a nonprofit organization in 2006 **Crossroads:** Special initiative of the Foundation for the Carolinas and the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation, managed by the Community Building Initiative	Long Island Community Foundation served as the incubator until 2004, when ERASE Racism became a nonprofit entity
Mission	To end institutionalized racism in city government and to create a community that is enriched by its diverse cultures, with full participation of all residents	To provide a welcoming, nondiscriminatory environment with respect and opportunity for all	**CBI:** To achieve racial and ethnic inclusion and equity **Crossroads:** To choose and pursue a future for Charlotte, not just arrive at one. With an emphasis on creating a community that is accessible to all, inclusive, and equitable, the goal…is to build a trusting, vibrant, sustainable future for the community.	To undo institutional and structural racism—the structures, policies, and behaviors that create segregation and inequity in every aspect of daily living

	SEATTLE	ST. CLOUD	CHARLOTTE	LONG ISLAND
Strategies and Interventions	• Assess the impact of race on organizational culture, policies, practices, and procedures • Transform business practices by aligning personnel and contracting activities with race and social justice goals • Conduct outreach and provide public engagement opportunities • Provide different levels of training and build staff's capacity and skills of staff to address institutionalized racism • Collaborate with stakeholders to address Central Concerns • Provide technical assistance to department change teams and department/executive leadership groups	• Action Teams, organized at first by sector and later by gap (disparity) • Community forums and seminars • Dismantling racism workshops • Dialogue groups and discussion • Research and focus groups • Re-granting process	**CBI:** • Support people and institutions to study, understand, and act on the opportunities and challenges that come from Charlotte-Mecklenburg's dramatic demographic and social changes • Convene and engage individuals, organizations, and institutions in a structured, effective process to address issues of racial and ethnic inclusion and equity **Crossroads:** • Develop organizational capacity for change and cultivate essential leadership for community change • Spur public will for positive change and a demand for sustainable change • Involve broad constituencies of grassroots participants in Crossroads Charlotte • Build relationships through bridging and bonding opportunities • Establish a sense of urgency in addressing the community's future • Educate the public about trends that affect the future and the forces that drive them • Enable the public to respond to trends with specific deliverables that can be scaled from individual level to networks, organizations, and the community	• Fact-finding research to expose racial inequity • Public- and private-sector advocacy • Collaboration with elected officials, government agencies, businesses, and other organizations • Report cards to track regional progress and regression • Education, training, and publications

	SEATTLE	ST. CLOUD	CHARLOTTE	LONG ISLAND
Major Issue Areas	• Workforce equity • Economic equity • Immigrant and refugee access • Public engagement • Capacity building	• Educational attainment • Housing access • Health care access • Strengthening the community by dismantling racism	**CBI:** • Leadership and organizational development • Community partnerships and collaborations • Raising community awareness and building capacity to influence change **Crossroads:** • Access • Inclusion • Equity • Interracial Trust	• Fair housing • Health care • Educational disparities • Building community capacity
Case Study Focus Areas	Capacity building Economic equity	Engaging and educating the community Moving to equity	Leadership Development Initiative Crossroads Charlotte	Changing the climate Fair housing
Definition of Racism	Racial prejudice plus the misuse of institutional power	Racism is race prejudice and the misuse of power by systems and institutions	Systemic practices (formal and informal) in place within organizations, institutions, and society that benefit certain groups and deny other groups access to relationships, experience, and resources. These practices support exclusion, inequity, and distrust and emerge from historical attitudes and beliefs.	The policies, practices and behaviors that contribute to inequities between African Americans and, frequently, other people of color as a group (not individual bias). This can happen because of the combination of racial prejudice and systemic power on the part of Whites, but it also does not require intentional, overt acts of racial prejudice. Do nothing and racism flourishes.

	SEATTLE	ST. CLOUD	CHARLOTTE	LONG ISLAND
Long-Term Target Outcomes	• Hiring/promotion of employees who represent Seattle's cultural and ethnic diversity • Significant increase in the amount of business city government does with minority-owned businesses • Diversity within the city's boards, commissions and neighborhood groups • Diversity reflected in city policy decisions • Race and social justice used as a standard for good business practice and government action	• Open and full participation by the marginalized population • All programs and activities accessible to everyone, without discrimination, with the initiative seen as the major reason that St. Cloud is a welcoming, non-discriminating community that offers respect and opportunities for all • Actions show that the community safeguards human dignity • Individuals who have not been afforded their rights have an opportunity to participate in decision-making related to the government, business, education, health care, human services, and faith • No equity gaps in educational attainment, housing access, health care access, and "strengthening our community: dismantling racism" • The St. Cloud area is lauded as a model anti-racist community that embodies and celebrates diversity	**CBI:** • A cadre of recognized leaders who are knowledgeable and active on issues of racial/ethnic inclusion and equity • Institutions and organizations are more racially and ethnically inclusive • Comprehensive assessment tools in use by CBI for ongoing application in the community • Heightened community awareness and clarity on how to address issues of racial./ethnic inclusion and equity • Gains are made in closing gaps and ending disparities between racial/ethnic groups **Crossroads:** • Common language is used in the community to discuss the four scenarios and issues included in them • A strong, interdependent network of at least 30 cross-sector organizations in collective community change work • Multiple, ongoing initiatives focus on addressing access, inclusion, and equity • A collection of real stories from the community in the form of video, prose, poetry, visual arts, and performing arts that chronicle and influence Charlotte's transformation	• Change specific public policies • Political leaders consider it in their self-interest to support ERASE Racism • Increasingly, others (individual leaders, organizations, larger institutions) will initiate proactive efforts to address institutional racism within their spheres of influence • A growing number of individuals (of all "races") participate in the two-day Unraveling Racism training and committed to turning on its head imbedded, internalized White supremacy • Perpetuation of institutional racism not only becomes illegal but also unthinkable on Long Island