

Intersectional Anti-Racist Organizational Development: Arts for Learning Indiana's Adaptation of the classic Western States Center tool Edited by Clockwork Janz {They/Them}, Director of Equitable Practices + Out of School Time; Indianapolis, IN, October 2023,

To view Anti-Racism through an intersectional lens when using this tool, please note that words like “dominant group” refer to those who have historically taken the most power. For most places in the U.S., this will refer to People with any combination of the following traits: White, Cisgender, Male, Straight, Able-Bodied, College Educated, Neurotypical, Salaried, Christian, Landowning, Thin, Upper/Middle Class, Grew up speaking English, Cultural Decedents of Colonizers. Before you use this tool to better understand your own collective and what it can be become, please honestly define what “dominant group” means to your organizational culture through this intersectional lens. Refer to the [Wheel of Privilege](#) for further assistance. With a good intersectional definition, this tool can assist you in setting goals for equitable redistribution of organizational power.

Who is the dominant group currently in your organizational culture? Who holds the most power, within the greater culture and within your organization? (take note here, and refer back to it as you navigate this chart)

This tool is intended to be used as a team. Go through this with others at your organization with capacity and interest. To your comfort level, invite in constituents, and pay them for their knowledge and their vulnerability. Re-asses every other year.

As you navigate this continuum, circle each tenet that applies to you. On a separate sheet of notes, or as “comments”, note points of conversation around where you are at.

	All White Club	Token Organization	Multi-Cultural Organization	Anti-Racist Organization
Decision Making	<p>made by dominant group, who are not affected by outcome</p> <p>made in private, methods and means for decision-making are secret</p>	<p>made by dominant group, decisions made in private</p> <p>methodology is shared but is unclear and not open to feedback</p>	<p>token attempts to involve those targeted by mission in decision-making</p> <p>made by diverse group of board and staff</p>	<p>made by diverse group</p> <p>people in non-dominant groups are significant leadership positions</p> <p>everyone in the organization understands how power is distributed and how decisions are made</p>
Budget	<p>developed, controlled, and understood by (one or two) people of Dominant Group</p>	<p>Developed and understood by (one or two) people of Dominant Group</p> <p>Token attempts at controlling small portions (25% or less of total) are made</p>	<p>Transparency is in place so people can potentially share understanding outside of dominant group and those targeted by the mission.</p> <p>Processes are in place for shared development and control of majority of budget outside of dominant group.</p>	<p>People outside of dominant group and those targeted by the mission are invited in and trained on understanding the budget.</p> <p>Processes are in place and open to feedback for development and control of 100% of budget, shared by dominant group, non-dominant group, and those targeted by the mission</p>
Money From	<p>select foundations</p> <p>wealthy or middle-class college-educated donors from dominant group</p> <p>often a small number of very large donors not from a constituency targeted by mission</p>	<p>Foundations who said “BLM” in 2020, but have since waned.</p> <p>1-3 wealthy / middle-class college-educated donors from non-dominant group</p> <p>token attempts to court donors from a constituency</p>	<p>Foundations who support anti-racism publicly</p> <p>5%-10% of donors are wealthy or middle-class college-educated from non-dominant group</p> <p>significant effort to court donors from a constituency targeted by mission (10-25% of total budget)</p>	<p>Majority of budget comes from donors from the community most affected by the problem(s) being addressed</p> <p>supplemented by foundation grants and donations from allies (those concerned but not directly affected) who have genuine</p>

		targeted by mission (5-15% of total donors)		relationships with the community affected
Accountable to	<p>funders</p> <p>a few people from dominant group on board or staff</p>	<p>funders</p> <p>board and staff</p> <p>token attempts to report to those targeted by mission</p> <p>No feedback loops present.</p>	<p>funders</p> <p>board and staff</p> <p>Attempts are made to report to communities affected. Feedback loops are in place, but the feedback is not incorporated with consistency.</p>	<p>funders, board and staff</p> <p>Reports are made with the communities most affected.</p> <p>Feedback loops are present, used with consistency, and those giving feedback are compensated for their labor.</p> <p>Direct lines of communication are open between funders and communities served. The org is a cherished convenor and thought-leader, not a necessary gatekeeper.</p>
Power and Pay	<p>Dominant group in decision making positions, paid very well (4x more)</p> <p>People outside of dominant group in administrative or service positions paying low wages.</p> <p>few if any benefits, and little job security people at bottom have very little power</p> <p>Conflict is punished</p>	<p>Dominant group in decision making positions, paid relatively well (2x more)</p> <p>People outside of dominant group in administrative or service positions that pay less well</p> <p>few, if any benefits for anyone</p> <p>sometimes people outside of dominant group and/or those targeted by the mission in token positions of power, with high turnover or low levels of real authority</p> <p>people at bottom have very little power</p>	<p>Dominant group in decision making positions, paid relatively well (2x more)</p> <p>People outside of dominant group in administrative or service positions that pay less well</p> <p>1 or 2 people outside of dominant group and/or those targeted by the mission, particularly if their work style emulates those in power</p> <p>training to upgrade skills is offered</p> <p>Feedback loops among staff hierarchy are in place, but the feedback is not incorporated with consistency.</p>	<p>people outside of dominant group and/or those targeted by the mission in decision-making position that pay within 50% of wages of dominant group.</p> <p>Administrative & service positions perceived as steppingstones to positions of more power, those positions reflect some decision-making power and authority</p> <p>those targeted by the mission are courted for paid training and mentoring to competitively apply for decision making positions</p> <p>Feedback loops among staff hierarchy are present, used with consistency</p>

		Conflict is avoided	Conflict is encouraged	
Located	<p>in dominant group's community</p> <p>away from public transportation</p> <p>dominant group chooses sites for programming without transparency in criteria for this decision.</p> <p>decorations reflect a predominantly white culture</p>	<p>in dominant group's community</p> <p>public transit available</p> <p>dominant group chooses sites for programming, allows token representation from those being served, but does not share decision making power.</p> <p>decorations and aesthetics reflect some cultural diversity</p>	<p>Multiple sites for programming, some available in the community being targeted by mission</p> <p>public transit easily accessible and reliable</p> <p>Dominant group works with constituency of those targeted by mission to determine sites for programming.</p> <p>Feedback loops on programming sites are present, but the feedback is not incorporated with consistency.</p> <p>decorations and aesthetics reflect a commitment to multiculturalism</p>	<p>Majority of sites for programming located in the communities being targeted</p> <p>public transit easily accessible and reliable</p> <p>Locations of programming determined by those targeted in the mission</p> <p>Feedback loops on sites are present, are present, used with consistency, and folks giving feedback are compensated for their labor</p> <p>Decorations and aesthetics curated by the community being served</p>
Members (population served)	<p>Made of the dominant group, with token number of non-dominant group members, (if any)</p> <p>Decisions made in back rooms</p> <p>Members of communities targeted by the mission are not present</p> <p>members have no real decision-making power</p>	<p>Made of the dominant group, with token number of non-dominant group members, (if any) with token ability to participate in decision-making</p> <p>non-dominant group members are only aware of the organization because it is providing a direct service</p>	<p>Membership is diverse, reflecting variety of human experience</p> <p>Membership has token representation from communities being served by mission</p> <p>Membership is able to participate in decision-making but not encouraged or incentivized in doing so</p>	<p>from range of communities targeted by mission</p> <p>encouraged to participate in decision-making</p> <p>provided training to enhance skills and abilities to be successful in the organization and their communities</p>

		Members of communities targeted by the mission are not present		
Culture	<p>top down, paternalistic, often secretive</p> <p>success measured by how much is accomplished little if any attention paid to process</p> <p>little if any leadership or staff development</p> <p>no discussion of power analysis or oppression issues</p> <p>people who raise issues that make people uncomfortable are considered troublemakers or hard to work with</p> <p>leaders assume “we are all the same”</p> <p>*Workalism expected and punished if folks deviated</p>	<p>still top down although inclusivity is stressed</p> <p>those in power assume their standards and ways of doing things are neutral, most desirable and form the basis for what is considered “qualified”</p> <p>people expected to be highly motivated self-starters requiring little supervision</p> <p>some training provided</p> <p>no power analysis</p> <p>emphasis on people getting along</p> <p>discussion of race limited to inherent biases</p> <p>*workaholism desired and Rewarded</p>	<p>organization looks inclusive with a visibly diverse board and staff</p> <p>actively celebrates diversity</p> <p>focuses on reducing prejudice but is uncomfortable naming racism, sexism, ableism, etc.</p> <p>continues to assume dominant culture ways of doing things most desirable</p> <p>assume a level playing field</p> <p>emphasize belief in equality but still no power analysis</p> <p>*workaholism is talked about being negative, but policies not in place to protect work/life balance</p>	<p>organization actively recruits and mentors members of community targeted by mission</p> <p>celebrates diversity</p> <p>has an ongoing power analysis about racism and other oppression issues</p> <p>a diversity of work styles encouraged with active reflection about balancing what gets done and how it gets done (feedback loops)</p> <p>a willingness to name racism and embrace conflict</p> <p>resources devoted to developing shared goals, teamwork, and sharing skills and knowledge (mentoring)</p> <p>Conflict is embraced & rewarded</p> <p>Self-care is prioritized over work, and this is reflected in organizational polices and cultural practices</p>
Programs	<p>Ensure communities targeted by mission are dependent on org</p> <p>designed to help people</p>	<p>intent is to be inclusive</p> <p>little analysis about root causes of issues/problems people in programs</p>	<p>designed to build power until people speak up and out</p> <p>some attempt to understand</p>	<p>designed to build and share power</p> <p>designed to help people analyze and address root</p>

	<p>who have little or no participation in decision making</p> <p>emphasis is on serving or "helping" those in need</p>	<p>appreciated until they speak out or organize for power</p> <p>designed to help low-income people who have little or no participation in the decision making</p>	<p>issue/problem in relation to big picture</p> <p>some participation by those served in program planning</p> <p>constituency may have only token representation in the organization.</p>	<p>causes</p> <p>people most affected by issues/problems centrally involved in program planning</p> <p>opportunities for constituents to move into leadership roles in the organization</p>
--	--	--	---	---

Goals for the next two years? Contextualizing the above chart into your organization's practices, how can you move up a little toward becoming an anti-racist organization? Note that, because of the broader cultural context of your organization's industry, you may not be able to become a fully anti-racist organization while maintaining your current structure. But how can you make some sustainable progress? Write some goals below.