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**Introduction**

This chapter identifies some practical approaches to commence antiracist work in human service organizations, including how to build top-down support. The insidious effects of racism permeate all levels of organizations, transcending the worker-client relationship to include issues of staff relations, hiring and promotional practices, staff support networks and the systemic effects of racism on communities and the disproportional representation of clients of color in many human service programs (child welfare, poverty, housing, etc.). We agree with Derek Griffith who, in examining the effects of racism on institutions that deliver medical care, concluded, “in spite of professional standards and ethics, racism functions within organizations to adversely affect the quality of services, the organizational climate, and staff job satisfaction and morale.”[[1]](#endnote-1) We further agree with Griffiths and others that “a systems change approach is necessary to reduce and eventually eliminate healthcare disparities by illustrating how healthcare disparities are rooted in institutional racism.” And, like Griffiths and his colleagues, we believe that “The theoretical framework for dismantling racism is an anti-racist community organizing model that incorporates elements of power, sociopolitical development and empowerment theory.”[[2]](#endnote-2) It is our contention that addressing this multi-tiered impact of racism in human service organizations requires that antiracist work incorporate executive leaders (staff and Boards) who have a joint strategy and planning role and who formulate mission, set policy, create organizational structure, identify examples of disproportionality, advocate with public officials and influence systems change.

**Establishing Antiracist Human Service Organizations**

Many challenges face those who endeavor to incorporate an antiracist perspective into the executive management of health and human service organizations, but the benefits of embarking upon this path are compelling. As Scott Page, a professor of complex systems, political science, and economics has pointed out, “What each of us has to offer, what we can contribute to the vibrancy of our world, depends on our being different in some way, in having combinations of perspectives, interpretations, heuristics, and predictive models that differ from those of others. These differences aggregate into a collective ability that exceeds what we possess individually.”[[3]](#endnote-3) As the demographic shifts in the United States point toward a more and more diverse population,[[4]](#endnote-4) the need for culturally competent, race-sensitive practices in human service organizations grows. The necessity of this work has been articulated by many organizations in many different forms. In 2006, Barbara Trainin Blank noted, “The social workers and social work educators we interviewed indicated that while there has been some progress, the problem still exists—albeit in changed ways. They feel that reduced vigilance and a sense of satisfaction are premature.”[[5]](#endnote-5)

While deliberation on such practices is helpful, organizations must go further to engage in action. Action plans may include the assessment of white privilege within the organization as well as intentional efforts to engage both staff and board members who mirror the populations of the communities being served. As Trennerry and Paradies have noted:

In embarking on an organizational assessment, there is a need to ensure that findings from such assessments inform rather than replace action. Just because an organization is committed to being a diverse organization does not necessarily mean that they are one (Ahmed, 2006). Reflecting on developments in the U.K., where public bodies are required to have a race equality and action plan, Ahmed (2006, pp. 108-109) notes that the process of developing race-equality policies ‘quickly got translated into being good at race equality.’ Similarly, in undertaking an organizational assessment, what is essential then is not the process itself but the action that it generates. Accountability is therefore at the heart of this disjuncture between assessment, policy and practice. [[6]](#endnote-6)

Identifying manifestations of white privilege may require surveying staff at all different levels of the organization. Examples of manifestations of white privilege in organizations frequently include instances related to the work culture, an expected white, European racial worldview in the workplace, micro-aggressions impacting professional identity (such as a majority white voice prevailing in case disposition discussions, even when the client is a person of color), agency systems (disproportional white leadership in positions of power), professional opportunities (promotions influenced by an “old boys” network) and client care (where white staff may serve clients of color but the reverse may not often be true).[[7]](#endnote-7)

It would be unreasonable for two white male authors to embark upon a chapter about antiracist work in organizational leadership without first acknowledging the white privilege underlying this endeavor. The mere fact that we have held executive-level positions in large human service agencies already demonstrates the access to power and educational opportunities that have arisen from white privilege. Along the way, there have been numerous other manifestations of white privilege that valued our experience and background and paved the path for higher levels of responsibility. We acknowledge this privilege and the need to defer to the expertise of executives of color in our field; we share our perspective in the hopes that white people talking about and taking responsibility to integrate an antiracist approach into executive and board leadership will convey a useful perspective and, hopefully, broaden the commitment of others to this important work.

As we know from the literature on change management, effective change begins with a sense of urgency arising from dissatisfaction with the status quo.[[8]](#endnote-8) If an organization wants to maintain or grow “market share” and address emerging health and human service issues, then it is important to recognize the issues of the growing communities of color across the country.

In many cases, organizations that consider issues of becoming more culturally competent and race sensitive also need to reflect not only on the configuration of their staff but also the recruitment and retention efforts that allow staff to better mirror and articulate the racial and ethnic backgrounds of the communities being served. Bringing staff members into a work environment where they represent a small contingent of the overall workforce will present challenges. How does a staff member bring her or his authentic self into the workplace? Will that person’s voice be heard in programmatic and clinical discussions if s/he brings a different perspective, or even divergent view, from that of the dominant culture? Is there room at the decision-making table for people from diverse backgrounds, or are decisions still made by a homogenous (or at least not fully inclusive) subgroup of the organization’s workforce? What are the implications for retention when someone is “the only” of their race in the room or part of too small a group to have a seat at the table? Creating a revolving door of entering/departing people of color is not an answer to the challenge of diversifying a workforce; in fact, it may be counterproductive to those goals.

Human service agencies are practiced in seeking broad input when it comes to decision making, albeit in arenas that are more clinical than administrative in nature. For example, while not analogous to the power dynamic and historical context of oppression, other recent shifts in human service organizations—such as multidisciplinary team conferencing, interdisciplinary clinical decision-making, and the shift in mental health from the expert-to-patient relationship of clinicians towards a client-driven, recovery-based approach to service delivery—required a multipronged effort to educate staff, recognize and address the (perceived) loss of power of the privileged staff, and create feedback channels so that progress could be monitored. In human services, the concept and value of multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary teams (social workers, medical doctors, nurses, psychologists, counselors, direct care staff, family members, peers, and clients) is now widely accepted.[[9]](#endnote-9) But the understanding that these teams should also include cross-racial, cross-cultural, cross-class, and cross-gender representation is not yet as accepted.

Workplaces need to prepare to be more inclusive by rethinking how—and by whom—decisions are made. Embracing the views of an oppressed group may not be possible, however, until public consciousness is raised about the history of injustice and racism to which many clients and staff members have been and still are subjected. In his book *Erasing Racism*, Molefi Kete Asante described a “wall of ignorance”;[[10]](#endnote-10) this wall continues to affect practices of disparate treatment in bank lending, insurance underwriting, ethnic and racial profiling, healthcare, educational opportunities, unemployment levels, and incarceration that disproportionately impact people of color in the United States. How, then, can we expect people of color to speak freely and inform the thinking about service delivery unless we acknowledge such disparities?

At the executive level, building the infrastructure for antiracist practice in an organization involves a long-term, multifaceted approach. The baseline conversation must directly address the case for redressing issues of racism for clients and the organization. However, it is uncommon for senior leaders of an organization to share a language to discuss issues of race and racism. Perspectives on racism are as varied as the people that make up the executive team, not to mention the program managers, supervisors, and front-line staff. In many cases, experience, history, shame, guilt, ignorance, and political “correctness” get in the way of an authentic workplace dialogue about racism. The first task is to develop a common understanding and language through which to enter into a meaningful discussion. This early process must also include acknowledgement of differences around the table in definitions of racism.

Executive management must contemplate and create time, space, and structure for conversations and planning among the diverse racial and cultural groups represented in the staff. One structure for such conversations is the creation of “affinity groups,” which is a proven strategy to help people with shared interests support one another and foster direct action.[[11]](#endnote-11) Such affinity groups are already popular within many corporate as well as community organizations.[[12]](#endnote-12) For example, one large mental health and social service agency in New York City developed affinity groups in each county to contemplate the impact of race and racism on the organization and its client base. Although it might seem counterintuitive, staff members specifically requested separate affinity groups for individuals who identified as white versus those who identified as persons of color. As one staff member astutely explained, without these distinctions, it would be like creating an art class in which advanced artists worked in the same studio as those only able to finger paint; the advanced students might become quickly disinterested if they needed to routinely discuss finger painting or the use of primary colors. This analogy helped to highlight the need to create space for beginner, intermediate, and advanced levels of discussion about race. Moreover, various strategies for ameliorating the impact of race on the organization and client service should be allowed to emerge.

Conversations about race and executive-level interest in antiracist work are important steps, but action needs to take place as well. Executive-level members of the staff need to shoulder ownership and accountability for addressing the manifestations of racism within the organization. When executives support the development of antiracist action plans, those plans are more likely to garner agency support and to acquire priority among the myriad challenges that the organization must address. Affinity groups may be asked to detail the various manifestations of white privilege within the organization, or task forces may gather to report these issues directly to executives. Such steps move the work beyond discussion to concrete steps that require and are met with action.

**Challenges**

Acknowledging the barriers as one begins a process is an important step, and it would be unproductive to write about antiracist work in organizations without contextualizing the potential pitfalls of the endeavor. These include:

* competition with other *–isms*;
* legal concerns that acknowledging structural racism may give rise to and lend credibility to discrimination claims in employment disputes may make some executive staff or Board members wary about embarking on this work;
* interest in maintaining the status quo for those who enjoy privilege and power;
* anxiety about and resistance to conversations about racism in the workplace;
* and reluctance to owning personal participation in racist systems.
* perceived lack of resources

Experience has shown that focusing on one oppressed group can raise concerns that other oppressed people might be ignored. There are many other –*isms* that we face as organizations (classism, able-ism, sexism, anti-Semitism, heterosexism, and so on). A delicate balance is necessary to ensure that racism is not in competition with the organization’s efforts to ameliorate negative consequences of other *–isms.* It is important to create space to fully and separately discuss racism and to make sure that the conversations about other forms of oppression do not become a way to avoid the difficult and often emotionally charged task of discussing issues of racism. Attempting to address all forms of oppression simultaneously might risk watering down all conversations so that no single issue is actually explored and addressed. It is also the authors’ experience that exploring racism consistently allows other oppressions to be more effectively and authentically examined over time. It also encourages an organizational culture of openness and honesty.

Sometimes, antiracist work raises legal and/or human resource concerns about the increased likelihood for injurious conversations to occur in the workplace. Moreover, some feel that highlighting antiracist initiatives will call attention to previous and current problems in this arena, potentially lending credibility to claims of organizational racism. While these concerns have merit and particular caution needs to be paid to developing tools for managing emotionally charged discussions, there is also great value in demonstrating that an organization is publicly standing against racism and providing formal mechanisms to identify and redress the impact of racism in the workplace.

Many white people as well as many people of color respond to antiracist work within organizations with a refrain of “Why rock the boat?” Such a refrain presumes that the boat is not already rocking for many of the people on board. As mentioned previously, the demographics in the United States are shifting toward white people constituting the minority of the population; in this context, status quo thinking is not an option for an organization concerned with growing to meet the current needs of clients and staff as well as a workforce of the future.

Organizations embarking upon this work may also have concerns of being met by expressions of intolerance or simply silence. Intolerance, while often feared by administrators, is actually the easier of these issues to address because people are talking and making their feelings known, which allows for productive dialogue and sensitizing people to the needs of other staff and clients. If intolerance is then found to interfere with work performance and staff relations, it becomes a performance issue like others that we are already familiar addressing. Staff members who are wary of engaging in conversations about race and racism in the workplace often cite the issue of professional versus personal boundaries. In such cases, it is important to continue to link the antiracist work back to client service and staff relations to demonstrate the critical relevance of these issues to the workplace and the need to air those issues in a group conversation.

Concerns about lack of resources to incorporate antiracist work in an organization frequently focus on the unreimbursed staff time spent in meetings, trainings and developing policies/procedures or other structural cures to address the impact of race and racism. There may be foundation and philanthropic support available to support these unreimbursed efforts. Creating an affirming workplace where staff can bring their authentic selves into work, however, may lift morale, decrease the costly impact of staff turnover and increase productivity, so that this work, in a number of ways, pays for itself. Similarly, when service delivery includes a focus on addressing the trauma of racism experienced by clients, then business may also improve as evidenced by higher client referrals and better client outcomes and satisfaction. Government and private philanthropic funders may also be encouraged that their investment in an organization dealing with these issues is a sound one.

**Issues of Board Involvement and Leadership**

The charge for executive leaders among all of these potential barriers is to set the stage for this work and explicitly endorse it. Antiracist work must permeate all levels of staff in the organization, and executives must build an organizational culture in which conversations about race, critiques of the organization, and constructive problem-solving proposals are welcomed.

Once those expectations for the organizational culture are established, then they must extend beyond the staff to include board members as well. Diversity on boards of directors of nonprofit organizations (as well as corporate entities) has a direct link to the effectiveness of the organization and, ultimately, to its perceived legitimacy by the community it serves. While we are focused here on racial diversity, the advantage of having inclusive boards in regard to gender, sexual orientation, and other areas is also critically important for many of the same reasons as those outlined above for staff.

An organization’s board of directors can be a powerful resource in negotiating the turbulent environment nonprofits currently experience. There is intense competition for resources, increasing requirements for accountability and increasing regulations from external government and foundation funders. We often think of the need for board members to bring wealth, work, and wisdom to their positions. It is not necessary that each member bring equal amounts of each, but it is essential that the organization’s discussions about how to best achieve its mission are informed by a variety and a broad span of opinions and perspectives. Nonprofit boards are becoming more racially diverse or are facing pressures to do so. Board diversity has been increasingly seen as an important component of service outcomes and staff morale.

Analysis of board members’ diversity, attitudes, and recruitment practices reveal that boards with a higher percentage of people of color had increased awareness of different experiences and opinions of clients and staff. This increased awareness, in turn, was positively associated with all aspects of board performance: analytical, educational and strategic.[[13]](#endnote-13) Bantel and Jackson found that diversity encourages more creativity; a multiplicity of voices leads to more ideas, perspectives, and possible solutions. When boards initially diversify, they are more likely to exhibit conflict, but over time, as people are able to hear and learn from each other, they are most often able to accept the limits of their own perspectives and experience. Conflicts also create opportunities for creative problem solving for true learning to emerge.[[14]](#endnote-14)

There is broad consensus in both the literature and the reported experience of executives and organizations that racial diversity on boards goes beyond clear social value. The inclusion of more voices and more perspectives regarding the communities served promote better program design and outcome, better community visibility and legitimacy, and better staff and board relationships. The U.S. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration affirms, “Having board members from diverse groups helps establish the program's credibility with members of those groups.”[[15]](#endnote-15) LeRoux and Perry found that authentic diversity requires that people of color on boards represent and advocate for community needs and are not just on boards as tokens or to fulfill expectations about the organization’s wish to meet a certain quota.[[16]](#endnote-16) Truly representative diversity is a positive asset not only in terms of the social responsibility of boards to communities served but also in providing a competitive edge to raise funds from both the public and private sectors. Although boards sometimes feel that their fundraising needs contradict their missions to be socially responsible and effective, these are not mutually exclusive aims. Both functions of a board of directors can exist in a dynamic and mutually advantageous relationship. Boards who are focused only on recruiting people of wealth to the exclusion of diversity are not always aware of lost opportunities in both spheres.

Boards typically recruit and attract people with whom they are familiar and comfortable. This results in board members who have similar experience, background, social class, race, and, therefore, perspective. Change, especially the prospect of interracial interaction, often creates fear of the unknown, anxiety about conflict, and the concerns of exposing underlying bias and racism.

Diversification often brings differences in perspective to historically white boards; in this way, it can be a precursor to change as it challenges status quo thinking at the board level. Difficulties need to be acknowledged and processed in order for the transition to be effective. There may very well be a sense embedded in the organizational history that the board already knows what communities of color need and want. Communities of color and others will often feel that those judgments are inaccurate and patronizing. Where there is a history of organizational success and long tenure, it is harder for boards to understand how true representative racial diversity enhances programs and legitimacy in the community. Boards project their own values and experiences as to what a successful service is, and what successful individuals, families, and communities look like.

A board that is considering diversifying racially must begin with an initial open conversation. The board may or may not have experience with gender diversity, sexual orientation diversity, age diversity, and so on. The process of including racial diversity, while it can benefit to some degree from past board experience in other areas of diversification, is quite different and, often, more complex. After asking the preliminary questions—should we do this? do we want to do this?—discussion needs to be structured, intentional, and deliberate. It is often useful to have a task force composed of board members and executive leaders that is tasked with carefully planning for the discussion by ensuring that all of the issues are presented in an organized way. The rationale, challenges, and ongoing nature of the process should be clearly laid out. Given the complexity of the issues and the anxiety that often attends discussions of race, it is frequently beneficial to include an outside facilitator who is an expert in the issues of board racial diversity and strategic planning.

It is important early on to establish that this process is never finished; it will need enduring attention, focus, and priority. Ongoing evaluations, status reports, discussions of barriers as they occur, and the use of consultation, as needed, are critical to the process. If diversity is approached solely to change numbers by bringing board members of color onto a predominately white board, then the project will most likely fail. Successfully establishing racially diverse boards will require representing the breadth of the communities that the organization serves. Smaller organizations with smaller boards will have a greater challenge here as there are less board positions available. Planning should take into account the changing demographics as well as the needs of the communities served.

Before the recruitment phase begins, clear goals for that process should be determined. There must be a plan for developing consensus among current board members on both the value of, and a process for, diversification. A planning work group should consist predominantly of board members who are already convinced of the value of the effort and who have the leadership ability to bring others along. If the planning is weak, the outcome has less of a chance of being successful. Planning needs to be explicit about the challenges of diversification and the existing barriers the organization will need to address.

Board attitudes about racial diversity also need to be fully explored and discussed before a recruitment process begins. Board members of color might feel responsible for the success or failure of inclusion. White board members may consciously and/or unconsciously demonstrate a lack of commitment to an effective diversification effort and be concerned about what message that reveals about them and their organization. Moreover, board diversification efforts can only succeed with the full commitment and involvement of executive management. It may in fact be the executive leaders who provide the initial impetus for the board to address these issues. Executive leadership needs to be present in every step of discussion, planning, and recruitment. Executives, however, cannot be so far ahead of the board in “owning” the decision and moving ahead with the process that board members can never experience their own process and investment. Boards can and should expect full executive buy-in and support, but cannot diversify solely to please the executive or to meet his/her expectations. To be successful, board members need to commit to this effort and be prepared to support it of their own volition.

A database of potential candidates is a useful tool at this stage, and it should include names of people outside of the circles known by current board members. In other words:

One factor hampering the search for minority and female board members is the current face of most nonprofit boards.

“What happens on so many boards is that they recruit people who look like themselves—that's their circle of friends,” says Edith Falk, chairman of Campbell & Co., a Chicago-based firm that consults for nonprofits. With such homogenous recruiting, “you're not getting the rich conversation that you would if you had” a more diverse group, she says.[[17]](#endnote-17)

Having constituents and/or their families on boards must be considered. Constituents bring their own unique perspective and set of experiences as well as accumulated wisdom.[[18]](#endnote-18) They have clear ideas regarding what kinds of services are helpful and what strategies are (and are not) useful in service delivery. Nominations for potential board members can also be garnered by asking staff members of the organization, approaching elected officials about suggestions of active community members, and looking at board rosters of partner organizations. Consultants with experience in this area can also be helpful in suggesting additional ways to add to the database.

It is important to recruit potential board members who are committed to the organization’s general mission, who have knowledge of the broad range of communities that the organization serves, and who have the ability to envision what an improved service system might look like. Furthermore, potential board members should have a sense of what questions to ask to bring the organization closer to achieving the maturity and tools necessary to better serve all of its constituents.

Whenever recruiting new members, boards must be clear about what skills are being sought and how those skills might be used. It is not enough to recruit a CPA or marketing professional, for example; board leadership must understand how each new board member’s skill set will fit into the general mission and envision how that skill set will be put to work as soon as possible. In the process of diversification, it is especially important that the organization and older board members understand the “fit” and value of each person of color brought onto the board. Understanding what a new board member will do (rather than just focusing on who they are) is important as part of the initial thought process so that integration and inclusion has already begun.

Similarly, the recruitment process must clearly define what is expected of board members. It is not useful, for example, to bring on members who are wealthy but who do not understand the expectations about giving and convincing others to give. In much the same way, it is unworkable, for example, to bring on a Latino board member who is not willing to use their connections with the Latino community or their perspectives of being Latino to enhance the services the organization provides or should provide to the Latino community.

It is helpful to bring on several board members of color at the same time to avoid tokenism or a sense that any one board member of color is responsible for representing all people of color. The initial plan needs to include quantifiable goals regarding the number of board members of color an organization intends to recruit. That way it is clear, from the beginning, that each new board member of color is just the beginning of the effort. Hopefully, new board members of color will help in the recruitment of other board members of color. It is the full board’s responsibility to diversify, however, and not a responsibility that should be given to only board members of color. This would reflect a lack of organizational commitment to the value of diversification. The goal, again, is not to make the board look more diverse. The goal is to make the board, in fact, more diverse.

The organization’s plan for diversification should be intentional and specific; it should outline who will be responsible for what task and in what time frame (the nominating committee, the whole board, a special task force), when reports will be due back to the board, who will evaluate the effectiveness of the plan’s implementation, and when and how the plan will be evaluated and modified to ensure that it moves forward. Finally, the plan needs to include ideas of how to enhance board cohesion as new members join and are integrated.

Newer board members will need to be oriented to the organization and be ready to learn from the existing board about the history and issues involved in an organization’s current functioning. This “onboarding” process is always important, but particularly so when attempting to orient new members who may bring different perspectives and experiences from the dominant culture. Older board members need to be ready to ask for, and really hear, the perspectives and experience of newer board members, and to encourage new members to share their ideas and perspectives even if they appear to be divergent from the dominant view. It is useful, where appropriate, to provide mentors and resource people (board and staff) for newer members. These resource people can also be an instrument for ongoing evaluation of how effectively newer board members are being integrated. Board leadership should conduct evaluations at different intervals to ensure that newer members are feeling included and valued, that they understand what is expected of them, and know what they can expect from others.

Diversification will ultimately fail if newer members are just dropped into current board activities and expected to simply adapt to preexisting ideas, policies, and processes. Such a situation defeats the value of diversification; soon enough, board members of color will feel as if they are on a board that does not really value their input or include them. New board members will depart or become inactive if there is not honest discussion of what went wrong and why inclusion did not work. One danger at this point is for boards to say, “Well, we tried,” and revert back to business as usual, without ever really understanding or acknowledging how diversification was undermined.

While the benefits of diversification need to be subject to measurement, the benefits are nuanced and many will be less quantifiable at first. The quality and authenticity of organizational discussions at all levels, as well as the morale of constituents, staff, and board members may be difficult to capture unless rigorously measured against past experience. Human service organizations have a paucity of reliable data on effectiveness of performance because while many measures of accomplishment are required by public and private funding sources, these may often be different from the actual effectiveness of services. Thus, retrospective research is not reported widely in the literature.

It is not clear what percentage of diversity a board needs to achieve to get improved service outcomes. Further research would contribute a good deal if it could provide answers to questions such as these: Is some diversity better than none? What are the minimum and maximum levels of diversity a board needs to achieve to have effective impact? Given the wide range of human service organizations and countless variables needed to evaluate organizational success, future research questions and methodology design will need to be carefully constructed.

Just as undoing structural or organizational racism itself is a continuous process, organizations cannot develop their boards and staff and be “finished.” Organizations must remain vigilant to maintain their efforts by continuing to evaluate which goals have been reached and which have not. It is important to acknowledge that the work is challenging and ongoing; we must continually not only retool the work but also clarify the reasons for doing it. As Kathleen Fletcher explains, the effort to diversify “takes real commitment over time, constant flexibility and openness, and a true desire to succeed for the good of the organization rather than for the approval of outsiders.”[[19]](#endnote-19) The knowledge that this continuing and demanding work will add immeasurably to the organization’s relevance, legitimacy, and effectiveness will, hopefully, be motivation enough for many to start and maintain the effort.

**Questions for Discussion**

* In considering my own (or one particular) organization, what challenges or barriers to antiracist work do I perceive? How might this answer be different if I asked a colleague of a race or background different than mine to respond to the same question?
* What evidence of white privilege can I list in regard to this organization?
* What benefits (emotional, structural, financial, or others) might come of a true commitment to diversification of this organization’s staff and board?
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