

5-18-1995

# The Process of Implementing an Un-doing Racism Through Inclusiveness Plan: A Case Study

Megan C. Toal  
*Augsburg College*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://idun.augsburg.edu/etd>



Part of the [Social Work Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Toal, Megan C., "The Process of Implementing an Un-doing Racism Through Inclusiveness Plan: A Case Study" (1995). *Theses and Graduate Projects*. 273.

<https://idun.augsburg.edu/etd/273>

This Open Access Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Idun. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Graduate Projects by an authorized administrator of Idun. For more information, please contact [bloomber@augburg.edu](mailto:bloomber@augburg.edu).

"The Process of Implementing an Un-doing Racism Through  
Inclusiveness Plan: A Case Study"

Submitted to the Faculty of Augsburg College in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for Master of Social Work

Written By: Megan C. Toal

May 18, 1995

Thesis Advisor: Sharon Patten, Ph.D.



MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK  
AUGSBURG COLLEGE  
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

*CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL*

*This is to certify that the Master's thesis of:*

---

*has been approved by the Examining Committee for the thesis requirements for the  
Master of Social Work Degree*

*Date of Oral  
Presentation:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Thesis Committee:*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Thesis Advisor*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Thesis Reader*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Thesis Reader*

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There were many people who helped, supported and pushed me to complete this research project. I wish to express a sincere and heart-filled thank you to you, without you I would never have completed this project.

To my partner, husband and friend...for the encouragement, and support; and for leaving our home so I could finish.

To Raquel my dear study partner and confidant, the 'all-nighters' were the only way!

To T. Williams for giving me the idea, direction, and chance.

To Sharon Rameriz for support and guidance.

To my parents for instilling the value of an education; and for supporting, encouraging, and convincing me not to quit.

To Sharon Patten, my advisor, for expecting excellence.

To all the staff at Agency X, who trusted me enough to talk candidly about this process.

To the Executive Director of Agency X, who continually pointed me in the right direction.

To all of you... my sincere and honest thanks.

## ABSTRACT OF THESIS

### THE PROCESS OF IMPLEMENTING AN INCLUSIVENESS PLAN: A CASE STUDY

Study Focus: Un-doing Racism in a Social Work Agency

Megan C. Toal

May 18, 1995

The United Way of Minneapolis has recently required all funded agencies to develop a plan to become more racially inclusive. The plan addresses five areas: governance, human resources, programming, administration, and community contacts. The purpose of this study was to develop an understanding of what the process of implementing an inclusiveness project looked like in one metropolitan social service agency. Theoretical and conceptual frameworks were derived from literature on organizational behavior, in addition to research on the history of exclusionary and differential practices in social work towards people of color.

Individual interviews, focus groups, and written documentation of the process were utilized to chronicle the events in this process. An analysis of this data produced a description of this agency's process of developing an inclusiveness plan, documentation of the plan, and a summary of the lessons learned from this experience.

## Contents

<u>Area Numbers</u>	<u>Page</u>
Chapter I Introduction.....	1-3
Chapter II Review of the Literature & Theoretical Framework.....	4-20
A. Historical & Contemporary Forms of Racism in Social Work.....	4-10
1. Exclusionary Practices in Social Work: A Historical Perspective beginning during Reconstruction.....	4-7
2. Differential Treatment of People of Color in Social Work Programs.....	7-10
B. Theoretical Framework.....	11-19
1. Organizational Systems & Cultures.....	11-13
2. Creating Change in Organizations.....	13-19
a. Type of Change Desired.....	13-14
b. Strategies for Change.....	14-16
c. Leadership in the Change Process.....	16-18
d. Scope of Change Accomplished.....	18-19
3. Diversity in Social Work.....	20
Chapter III Methodology.....	21-28
A. Overview of Research Project.....	21
B. Sample.....	21-22
C. Research Questions.....	22
D. Key Concepts and Definitions.....	23-24
E. Operational Definitions.....	24
F. Data Gathering & Field Procedures.....	24-26
1. Focus Groups and Interviews.....	24-26
2. Written Documentation.....	26
G. Measurement Issues.....	26-27
H. Data Analysis.....	27
Chapter IV Agency X.....	28-64
A. Agency Description.....	28-33
1. Historical Overview.....	28-29
2. Mission and Strategies.....	29
3. Budget and Funding Sources.....	29
4. Location & Descriptions of Services & Demographics.....	29-33
B. Development of the Un-doing Racism/Inclusiveness Plan.....	33-41
1. Beginning Steps.....	33-34
2. Baseline Information.....	34-37
3. The Developed Plan.....	37
4. Role of Stakeholders in Developing the Plan.....	37-40
a. Role of Board.....	38-39

b. Role of Administrators.....	39
c. Role of Directors.....	39
d. Role of Staff.....	40
C. Implementing the Un-doing Racism/Inclusiveness Plan:	
Role of Stakeholders.....	40-43
1. Role of Board.....	41
2. Role of Administrators.....	41
3. Role of Program Directors.....	42
4. Role of Staff.....	42-43
Chapter V: Findings, Discussions and Conclusions.....	44-64
A. Results of the Plan.....	44-48
1. Scope of Change.....	44-45
2. Perceptions of Change by Stakeholder.....	45-48
a. Board of Directors.....	45-46
b. Administration.....	46
c. Inclusiveness Committee.....	46-47
d. Program Directors.....	47
e. Staff.....	47-48
B. Lessons Learned from Process.....	48-61
1. What Worked or Facilitated Progress.....	48-51
2. What Impeded Progress.....	51-58
3. Limitations of the Plan.....	58-60
4. Other Lessons.....	60-61
C. Theory Comparison.....	62-63
D. Implications of the Research.....	63-64
E. Implications for Social Work Practice.....	64
F. Concluding Statements.....	64-65
References.....	i-ii
Appendices	
Appendix A: Focus Group Protocol.....	A1-A2
Appendix B: Focus Group Debrief Template.....	B1-B2
Appendix C: Letter of Intent.....	C1
Appendix D: Follow Up Letter.....	D1
Appendix E: Letter of Consent.....	E1-E2
Appendix F: Center Demographics: People of Color.....	F1
Appendix G: Review of Staff Perceived Changes.....	G1-G2
Appendix H: Inclusiveness Plan & Results.....	H1-H4

## CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

*Intercultural sensitivity is not natural. It is not part of our primate past, nor has it characterized most of human history. Cross-cultural contact often has been accompanied by bloodshed, oppression, or genocide. Clearly this pattern cannot continue. Today, the failure to exercise intercultural sensitivity is not simply bad business or bad morality—it is self destructive. So we face a choice: overcome the legacy of our history, or lose history itself for all time. (Bennett, as cited in Gardenswartz and Rowe, 1993)*

*"Un-doing racism is revolutionary; the United States as a country has not undone racism or acknowledged it. The agency and people in the agency must be willing to be revolutionary in order to make change." (focus group participant)*

Diversity has become recognized as a fact of organizational life. (see

Gardenswartz, 1993; Bolman, 1991; Boyett, 1991; Jackson, 1992; and Gentile, 1994).

Because our society's demographic composition is changing (McMurry, 1993), the need to change the make up of organizations is imperative. In Minnesota, for example, the minority population grew by 72 percent between 1980 and 1990 (McMurry, 1993). In fact, it is projected that by the year 2010 Minnesota's population will grow by 15.5 percent (McMurry, 1993). Of that, minority populations will grow by 664.9 percent, compared to the European American population growth of 6.1 percent (McMurry, 1993). It is also projected that European American men will make up only 8 percent of new workers during the 1990's (Seck et al., 1993). The majority of workers will be women, people of color and immigrants (Seck, et al., 1993). Therefore, organizations must be prepared to change, in an effort to work effectively as a multicultural entity.

There are many theories that help to explain organizational change and diversity in the workplace. Organizational change can take place at many different levels, and can utilize many different techniques or strategies. Change that is well planned

involving multiple levels within the organization seems to facilitate the most meaningful change (Gardenswartz et al., 1993).

The ability to effectively implement change is influenced also by the leadership within the organization. Leaders who are able to influence and control the organizational environment often utilize a variety of techniques and styles which include exciting the organization, controlling, structuring and rewarding new behavior, and institutionalizing the changes (Mohrman et al., 1989).

Social service agencies must also change to become diverse. Social work has a long history of exclusionary practices (see Billingsley, 1972; Franklin, 1970; Rabinowitz, 1974; Kogut, 1970; Weaver, 1992; and Colby, 1985). Some theorists have discussed social work's role (as an institution) in perpetuating racism (See Burgest, 1973; McMahon et al., 1992; and Herrick 1978). Additionally, differential treatment of people of color within the profession of social work has been well documented (see Billingsley, 1972; Hogan et al, 1988; Stehno, 1982; Jenkins et al., 1983; and Shyne, 1979).

In recognizing these factors, the United Way of Minneapolis attempted to address the issue of racism. The United Way began a process entitled "Un-doing Racism through Inclusiveness" which required all funded agencies to develop a plan to become "inclusive". Inclusiveness in this case referred solely to race, and the plan was to develop goals and strategies which would make the agency become more culturally competent. The agencies utilized a tool, developed by Rainbow Research (Williams, Rameriz, and Mayer, 1994) to develop plans which focused on five areas: governance, human resources, business and administration, community connections, and programming. This tool

provides a format of gathering baseline information and developing a plan for each agency to become more culturally competent and inclusive. It examines the recruitment of board, staff and volunteers, the process of program development and evaluation, and agency contracts and connections within the community (1994).

Because of the changing demographics in society, the over representation of people of color served by social service agencies and the function of social work as agents of change, the need emerges for social work agencies to become diverse themselves and in doing so, address racism on an individual and organizational level. Failing to do so ignores the cultural context in which we live and may result in biased policies and practices. Failing to become racially and culturally inclusive (e.g. over-representation of European American staff) omits or excludes the perspective from people of color and ultimately possible solutions to the complex problems social workers are attempting to address.

This research project studied one United Way funded social service organization that has attempted to un-do racism by becoming inclusive. The case study provides a detailed examination of an agency's experience in this process and the lessons that can be learned from it.

The Research questions addressed include:

- ▶ What were the chronological steps involved in the implementation of an inclusiveness plan? How was it developed and implemented and what was accomplished?
- ▶ What can be learned from this agency's experience?



## CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The following review of books and articles provide the context for this study. First, literature pertaining to exclusionary practices and differential treatment of people of color by social services is reviewed, providing the context and establishing the need for creating change in social services to address racism. Next, theory pertaining to organizational change is reviewed, with specific emphasis on organizational systems and culture, scope of change, and leadership. This review provides the framework within which this study was conducted.

### Exclusionary Practices in Social Work: An Historical Perspective in the United States Following Reconstruction.

From an historical perspective, social work has a long history of exclusionary practices that dates back to Reconstruction when social programs either excluded or failed to meet the needs of people of color. There were three phases to reconstruction. The first lasted from 1865 until 1867 and was considered the "Presidential Reconstruction." During this time conservative former Confederates had control of the states. The second phase began in 1867 when Congress took control of southern states due to their resistance in implementing the changes required by the new government. The legislators were referred to as "radicals" as they attempted to force the states' to enfranchise the black community, write new constitutions and accept the new government. The third phase

began in most states by 1870 when the "radicals" were driven from power and former conservative Confederates regained control of the "new government." They were euphemistically called the "redeemers." (Rabinowitz, 1974).

During this time, the south was far behind the rest of the country in social reform because of the preoccupation with defending the institution of slavery (Franklin, 1970). The belief in the south was that slavery provided safeguards against "the evils of society, such as unemployment and all the problems related to it...if slavery was more widely accepted...man would not need to resort to such unnatural remedies as women's rights, limited marriages, child welfare and communism" (p. 381).

Eventually however, policy-makers in the south conceded that something must be attempted in order to maintain law and order. In efforts to prevent division among the white population, the first reforms in post-war years were to provide relief for whites. Relief and welfare programs were enacted for the Confederate veterans and their dependents. Some states created systems of direct relief (bushels of corn) and created county boards of police, who compiled lists of people they deemed qualified (Franklin 1970)

Public education was another area of public welfare that, during the first phase of reconstruction, Confederate rulers were determined to make exclusionary. "The sole aim should be to educate every white child in the Commonwealth" (Franklin, 1970 p. 380). The southern states either ignored or excluded African American people from public education. In Georgia, laws were enacted to provide a system of free public education for any white resident between the ages of six and twenty-one. In Texas, the constitution

specifically allocated funds for the education of white students exclusively (1970).

During this time, many African American families migrated to urban centers, which many European American people found disturbing. Finding stable employment was difficult, and European American people began to question emancipation. One newspaper in Nashville wrote: "Some three hundred persons daily eat at the soup house, and full two hundred of these are Negroes of every size, age, color and sex. What rebuke is this to those who deprived these poor creatures of good homes, and good masters and mistresses, who fed and clothed them and did it well". (Rabinowitz, 1974, p. 329).

Most cities had insufficient funds to support the influx of new arrivals and sought to evade the responsibility of providing them with food and shelter. One southern newspaper urged people to aid the suffering poor in their community, but stipulated " our remarks are in behalf of the destitute white population" (Rabinowitz, 1974 p. 330). Shortly thereafter, a county poorhouse had been built exclusively for the European American poor.

Few European American dominated private charities provided assistance to African American women or men despite the high rate of poverty. Individual European American people did assist the African American community after the civil war, but the European American dominated charitable societies did little to help African Americans secure their social, political or economic rights or otherwise address their needs (Rabinowitz, 1974). Private charities continued to ignore the needs of African Americans due to location...[and] racist inattention (Abramovitz, 1992).

Charity Organization Societies made sharp distinctions between women they

regarded as deserving and undeserving of aid. They favored married women or previously married women who lacked a male breadwinner, through no fault of their own, and denied aid to separated, unwed mothers, abandoned wives and wives of permanently unemployed men (Abramovitz, 1992). Since very few African American men or women could find stable employment at this time, the nature of this policy differentially targeted this population for exclusion. Additionally, of those people who did find employment, compensation for their work was substandard (lower than white counter-parts) (Giddings, 1984). Policies of this nature, lacked a cultural context regarding (in this case) African American's relegation to lower-class social positions, which excluded them from decent jobs at decent wages and affordable housing.

#### Differential Treatment of People of Color in Contemporary Social Work Programs

Over time, the policies that specifically excluded people of color from services became not only less acceptable, but illegal. While services and programs began to work with people of color, racist or biased ideologies emerged in a more covert manner. Some policies and programs differentially affected people of color, often resulting in integrated programs with different treatment or effect, based on race.

In 1980, Shyne conducted a study that examined the characteristics of children served by public social service agencies and services provided. The study had a national sample of 12, 000 children under the age of 18 and was conducted in two stages. Each participating agency filled out two questionnaires pertaining to caseload information,

demographics and services provided. The study provided information on race, age of clients, services rendered and length of service. It explored foster care, adoption, and teenage pregnancy. Some of the study's findings included a gap between the number of children and the number of children being served, lack of specialized services to minority clients (such as residential treatment), limited accessibility of services to minority clients, and a longer length of time in the system (Shyne, 1979).

Another study (Stehno, 1982) examined differential treatment of children of color in service systems. This study outlined the patterns of out of home placements for minority youths based on data collected by mental health, child welfare, and juvenile justice systems. The study looked specifically at these three systems because treatment is determined by adjudication. " A child may be labeled a child in need of supervision and be referred to the child welfare system; be labeled a status offender and be referred to juvenile court; or diagnosed as adjustment reaction--adolescent and referred to the mental health system" (p. 39). The findings of this study included a higher rate of out of home placement of minority children, different patterns of referral for African American youths, disproportionate numbers of African American youth in less desirable placements, greater proportions of African American children served by the public sector than the private sector, and less social service support for minority parents (pp. 40-41). The article concludes by suggesting that social work agencies examine their policies and practices, in addition to developing minority controlled agencies (Stehno, 1982).

Children of color and the child welfare system were studied by Turner- Hogen and Sau-Fong Siu (1988). This study documented the historical account of racial bias in the

treatment of children of color by social service agencies. It gives a separate historical account for African American, Native American, and Hispanic children. The study began by reviewing demographics of children in the welfare system. In 1980, forty-two percent of out of home placements were children of color (Turner-Hogen et al.). They state that for African American children, 79% were in foster homes, 7% in group homes, 6% in residential treatment and 8% were in "other." Additionally, African American children were in foster care an average of one year longer than European American children (Turner-Hogen et al., 1980). Between 25 and 35% of all Native American children were placed in foster homes, adoptive homes or institutions. In 1977, a total of 34,538 Native American children were in boarding schools (Turner-Hogen et al., 1980). Additionally, they stated that few Native American families could qualify for foster or adoptive homes under European American cultural standards. The authors found it difficult to report on placements of Hispanic children because they were classified as "white" in census data. They estimated that Hispanic children represent 13% of out of home placements (Turner-Hogen et al., 1980). The article concludes by recommending the recruitment of minority foster and adoptive homes in addition to preparing culturally relevant training to social work professionals (Turner-Hogen et al., 1980).

Finally, ethnic differences in foster care placements were studied by Jenkins, Diamond, Flanzraich, Gibson, Hendricks, and Marshod (1983). The study analyzes data collected by the Federal Office for Civil Rights (OCR) in 1980, regarding the out-of-home placements of minority children. The OCR sent surveys to 2,439 public welfare and social service agencies. They had a 100% response rate. Excluded from this survey were

juvenile justice and mental health agencies. Their sample included 301,943 children, 58% of whom were European American and 42% were children of color. The survey asked the agencies to distinguish between African American, Native American, Hispanic, Asian and European American. The study looked at legal status (dependent, voluntary, delinquent, or status offender); type of placement (independent living, foster home, group home, residential treatment, child-care institution or secure facility); location of placement (in-county, out-of-county or out-of-state); and length of time in care (12 months or less, 12-36 months, 36-60 months or more than 60 months). The hypothesis of this study was that there was no significant difference based on ethnicity for any of the four placement variables. All differences that were reported were statistically significant at  $<.05$  using a chi-square test for significance. The study found that "...minority and white children do not differ dramatically in their entry status, minority children tend to stay in care longer, be placed in different types of facilities, and differ in the location of their placement....The major difference in the time spent in care is between Caucasian and African American children" (Jenkins et al., 1983, p. 44).

Clearly these data demonstrate a pattern of differential treatment in human service organizations based on race. Whether by policies that specifically exclude people of color or policies that differentially affect people of color, human service organizations must address racism to ensure programs are free from bias and reflect the needs of all people in need of services.

## Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework surrounding this study is intended to address how organizations implement change. For the purpose of this review, organizations will be viewed as systems, comprised of units and subunits existing in an environment. The ability to create change within an organization will depend on the scope of change desired, the strategy used to accomplish the change and the leadership directing the change.

### Organizational Systems and Culture

To begin understanding how change occurs within an organization, the organization must first be defined in terms of systems. Morgan (1986) suggests we think of organizations as organisms or systems that live interdependently within a larger environment. He utilizes biological theory as a metaphor to explain organizational systems. For example, in biology, organic systems are comprised of molecules, cells, and atoms that create more complex organisms which interact with other organisms in a continuous exchange. "The environment and system are to be understood as being in a state of interaction and mutual dependence" (p. 46). Like biological systems, organizations are systems that "contain individuals (who are systems on their own account), who belong to groups or departments, which belong to larger organizational divisions" (p. 45). All are interrelated, in the same way cells and complex organisms are related.

Morgan (1986) describes several characteristics of systems. For example, they can be open or closed based on their ability to interact with other units in the system, and



regulate themselves to maintain a status quo. Systems cannot be reduced to a simple structure of cause and effect, but should be considered a complex web of relations. All living systems must have "requisite variety" or an internal regulatory mechanism that is a reflection of the diverse environment in which it lives. Finally, systems evolve based on their ability to deal with the challenges and opportunities confronted in the environment.

Boleman and Neal (1991) also discuss characteristics of systems. The following characteristics cut across all sectors applying both to biological and human systems. First systems are interacting and interrelated. Open systems have permeable boundaries and are continually engaged in "importing, transforming, and exporting matter, energy, information and people" (p. 317). Systems are capable of negative entropy; they can survive and flourish, rather than decay and die. Systems contain hierarchies so every system exists within a system and contains many subsystems. Systems are synergistic; the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. "Its properties emerge from the relationship among its parts and from...[its]...relationship to its environment" (p.318). Systems maintain dynamic equilibriums, in which diverse forces attempt to maintain. When the equilibrium is threatened, many forces will work to restore the balance. Finally, systems "need adaptive processes, including feedback loops, that enable the systems to sense relevant changes in the internal or external environment and to adjust their properties accordingly" (p.318).

Boleman and Deal (1991) also address organizational culture. They define an organization's culture as "the pattern of beliefs, values, practices and artifacts that define for its members, who they are and how they do things" (p.250). These authors state that

culture is created by, "an accumulation of wisdom" of people currently present in the organization, and of those who have previously been members. New members are taught and relayed the ways of old members, and will teach and relay those ways to future members.

### Creating Change in Organizations

#### Type of change desired

The extent to which change is accomplished in organizational systems will depend in part on the scope of change desired. Change can take place at many different levels within an organization. Mohrman, Mohrman and Ledford ( as cited in Mohrman, Mohrman, Ledford, Cummings, and Lawler, 1989) state that change can take place on an individual level (e.g., training and incentive programs), team level (e.g., work group development and group decision making process), organizational level (e.g., policies), or on a trans-organizational level (many organizations) (p. 148).

Nadler and Tushman ( as cited in Mohrman et al., 1989) identify four different types of change: strategic, incremental, reactive and anticipatory. They believe the most effective type of change is both strategic and anticipatory or what they term a "reorientation" (p. 103). Reorientations are plans for change that are initiated prior to external events. Leadership therefore becomes an important factor in the ability to anticipate external events that create a need for change.

Cummings, Mohrman and Mitroff ( as cited in Mohrman et al., 1989) state that deep change involves feelings, values, behavior and the unspoken culture of the

organization. When the change affects the organization as a whole, the change process will be most effective when it is well planned, and involves all possible stakeholders and members of the organization (as opposed to a few key players). They claim the most impactful change happens when people at all levels of the organization are involved. This is because people at all levels of the organization have the power to support or undermine the change.

### Strategies for Change

The extent to which change is accomplished may also depend on the strategy chosen to implement the desired change. Mohrman, Mohrman and Ledford examine three types of strategies for deliberate change in organizations (as cited in Mohrman et al., 1989). The type of change coupled with the type of organization helps determine which type of strategy to use. The first strategy is termed "rational-empirical". This strategy relies heavily on the dissemination of information from experts. Methods range from scientific research, logic, rational argument, to research and development. Change is created by the demonstration of cause and effect relationships (Mohrman et al, pp. 145-146).

The second change strategy outlined by Mohrman, et al. (1989) is the "normative-reductive" strategy. This approach suggests that new patterns of behavior will emerge from activities that change norms or beliefs about something. This strategy recognizes that what people do in an organization, is based on "common beliefs, values, and norms that people hold" (p.146). Methods range from activities aimed at " increasing problem-

solving capacities and fostering growth and development, and organizational design approaches that communicate new relationships and structures" (p.146). The authors state that this strategy works best on deep organizational change.

Finally, "power-coercive" strategies are described as utilizing some form of power and influence to create change. Sometimes it is the power of the charismatic, persuasive leader, other times it is the influence of some form of organizational position. This strategy is aimed at the "political dynamics that drive organizational behavior" (p.146). This strategy utilizes methods that realign power relationships or use power to force changes.

Gardenswartz and Rowe (1993) make recommendations for moving an organization toward diversity. First, an organization must make a solid commitment to the process. This type of change requires a long-term change effort that "affects the bone marrow of the organization" (p.250). Organizations must commit resources to this process such as "time, energy, money and emotional commitment" (p.250). Training is an important part of the process but not sufficient by itself.

Secondly, Gardenswartz et al. (1993) discuss leadership in this process. Commitment and support must be visible from the "top". Organizational leaders must be willing to commit financial resources (even during financial hardships), be willing to attend trainings and be accessible to people involved. Change agents must be willing to go where the data directs the organization to go, not be defensive, and have the courage to implement the changes. Additionally, they must coach, guide and facilitate the process.

Next, realistic expectations must be set. Clear expectations are to be set with

employees about the extent of changes desired. Raising expectations that cannot be met will result in "lowered expectations and cynicism" (p.250). These authors also believe that employees are quick to identify "lip service." Additionally, measurable and realistic goals and criteria must be set, and articulated as the process begins.

Gardenswartz et al. (1993) state that organizations must recognize the effort involved and expect discomfort. Organizational change is uncomfortable because the homeostasis of the organization is altered. Employees should be guided to see and understand the "big picture", and that something better will result. Creating a diverse organization will ultimately create an environment that is open to new and different ideas.

Next, these authors suggest organizations build on existing capacities. It is not always necessary to dismantle the entire structure of the organization to create a diverse environment. Review what systems are currently working, or partly working, that can be built upon.

Finally, Gardenswartz et al. (1989) claim that diversity is not an end in itself, but rather a continual process. Creating diverse organizations affects all systems within an organization which will require new ways of conducting business.

### Leadership in the Change Process

An agency must have strong leadership and guidance to successfully progress through organizational change. Nadler and Tushman examine leadership for organizational change (as cited in Mohrman et al., 1989). Two types of leadership, the "magic leader" and the "instrumental leader" are necessary for organizational change. The

magic leader is someone with charisma, the ability to be visionary, and enable people to perform their tasks. Instrumental leaders make sure people throughout the organization behave in a way that facilitates change (p. 108). They do this by structuring required behavior; controlling systems to measure, monitoring and assessing, and rewarding appropriate behavior. Leaders that are effective in implementing change are able to utilize both types of leadership styles.

Boleman and Deal (1991) define many commonly held perceptions of leadership. Leaders are a source of help in times of confusion, uncertainty, and threatening situations by helping to identify possibilities and discover resources. Leadership is equated with power, in that it has the ability to get others to do what they want. It involves values, vision and leadership in the context of relationships. Leadership can be judged by what it produces, by getting things done. Leaders provide vision, either of their own, or the collective vision of its parts. Leadership is facilitation; helping constituents find their own way.

Additionally, Boleman and Deal articulate what "good leadership" is. One universal characteristic of good leadership is the ability to articulate the vision. "Effective leaders help to establish a vision, to set standards for performance, and to create a focus and direction for organizational efforts" (p.410). Good leaders have the ability to articulate this vision effectively, often utilizing symbols to do so. Additionally, good leaders have commitment and passion. They believe and care deeply about the work of the organization and are able to communicate that belief to others. A third characteristic Boleman and Deal describe is the ability to inspire trust and build relationships. Finally,

they state that leaders need "skill in managing relationships with all significant stakeholder, including superiors, peers, and external constituents" (p.413).

### Scope of Change Accomplished

The extent to which change is accomplished in an organization depends on the integration, or the levels at which the organization buys into the change. Nadler, and Tushman ( as cited in Mohrman et al.,1989) discuss the process for institutionalizing change. Institutional change is created by empowering other people to work as leaders in the process of change. Specifically, this is conducted by creating a senior team, broadening the senior management and developing leadership throughout the organization (pp. 112-116). This process is reinforced by creating rituals and symbols to visually and publicly show the enhancement of power or leadership.

Senge, Ross, Smith, Roberts and Kleiner (1993) discuss the domain of enduring change. This conceptualization is a learning cycle based on three stages: new skills and capabilities, awareness and sensibilities, and new attitudes and beliefs (pp.17-21).

The first stage involves learning and developing new skills and capabilities. There is evidence of the learning cycle when constituents become confident that "real learning" is occurring (Senge et al., 1993 p.18). In this stage aspiration occurs. Individuals, teams and eventually organizations change because it is what they truly care about, not what they have to do. When new skills and capabilities are developing, there is reflection and conversation. The authors point out that true conversation and reflection moves past the traditional "ping pong" game of communication, whereby people take their "shot", toss out their opinion, and the other side responds. They state that when this happens, people

do not listen, instead they are forming their opinions before the other side finishes their position. Instead, they advocate for developing the capacities for listening, and reflection of both individual and group opinions. Ultimately, when this happens the organization will be able to conceptualize or express coherent descriptions of the "whole." Systems thinking is vital to this process (Senge et al., 1993).

The second stage in this process involves developing awareness and sensibilities. In time new skills and capabilities will shift the way organizations view the world. Situations are viewed systemically, and the ability to hear exact words or view behaviors increases. Constituents begin to imagine alternatives. They begin a synergistic way of listening; listening to the whole, not just the parts. The awareness of subtle thought emerges as people begin to listen to deeper patterns of meaning that flow within the group (Senge et al., 1993).

Emerging in the third and final stage of this process is new attitudes and beliefs in the organization's culture. Change at the deepest level in the organization occurs after new awareness assimilates into new behaviors and attitudes. Deep beliefs are often inconsistent with the perceived or actual values in the organization. The articulated value may often be followed by "they won't let us do it" (Senge et al., 1993 p.20). Simply declaring new values is described as naive and often produces cynicism. Deep beliefs and attitudes change, as experiences change. When this happens the culture changes. "The set of deep beliefs and assumptions...that develops over time...is so different from the traditional hierarchical, authoritarian organizational world view that it seems to describe a completely different world" (p.21).



## Diversity in Social Work

As pointed out earlier, social work has a history of exclusionary practices, and differential treatment of people of color, that makes it imperative that social work institutions address the issue of racism and become more diverse. Seck, Finch, Mor-Barak and Poverny (1993) have written about managing diversity in social work. They call for more diversity throughout organizations especially in supervision, middle-management and leadership positions (p. 67). They believe that conflict in the workplace is associated with the scarcity of women and people of color from key positions (p. 69). Further, they state training has been conducted around workplace diversity, however training on how to manage a diverse staff has not.

The article continues to outline change in organizational culture, and the need to address it at three levels within the agency. They state the goal is to create a new climate that assures all people are accepted and valued for what they bring, including different racial and cultural backgrounds (Seck et al., 1993). The top-level or "macro level" must understand the impact of the culture on productivity. Further, the top-level should hold employees accountable for making progress in this area by linking salaries and bonuses to goal achievement. Addressing the "mezzo-level" in changing culture involves training designed to help employees examine their feelings and behavior in addition to assisting individuals to build the skills necessary for discussing the differences that will occur. Finally, the "micro-level" must be addressed, by providing individual and group counseling to those experiencing difficulty in this process. (1993).

## CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

### Research Project: Overview

This research project is a case study of one United Way funded agency that implemented an Inclusiveness Plan, as part of the United Way's Un-doing Racism through Inclusiveness Initiative. A case study of an organization's implementation process was the most appropriate design for this study, in order to examine what happened, how it happened, and what can be learned.

Case studies chronicle an event without manipulating or controlling variables (Rubin and Babbie 1993 and Yin, 1989). Yin (1989) indicates five criteria for building a case. It should begin with a question to be studied which focuses on discovering *how* and *why*. Next, a study proposition should be developed which directs attention toward an area to study. The third step involves developing the units of analysis which are shaped by the study proposition and define what the case is. The fourth step is to link data to propositions to some theoretical proposition. Finally, criteria for interpreting a study's findings must be developed. Yin (1989) also discusses the need to build a theory based on literature reviews, discussions with colleagues, and challenging questions.

### Study Sample

Criteria for selecting an agency to study was a large agency, that was located within the Metropolitan area, that offers a variety of services. These criteria were chosen in order to provide a general framework that other agencies could duplicate. This agency was selected on a voluntary basis, and will be referred to as "Agency X".

## Research Questions

Since this researcher was interested in learning about Agency X's process, the following research questions guided this study:

### *Question 1:*

What were the chronological steps in implementing an Inclusiveness Plan?

- \* How was the plan developed?
- \* How was the plan implemented?
- \* What was accomplished?

### *Question 2:*

What lessons can be learned from this implementation process?

## Key Concepts and Definitions

Several key concepts that are used through out this research, are based on the "Inclusiveness Assessment Tool" created by Williams, Rameriz, and Mayer (1994). "Racism" is defined by Williams et al. as "...prejudice plus power. 'Power' means access to systems, institutions, and resources that are sanctioned by society" (p. ii). They further define "un-doing racism" as "...acting to share power, access, and resources with people of color" (p. ii). "People of color" are defined as "...people living in the United States of African, Asian, Latino(a), and Native origins (p.iii). Williams et al. recognize that issues of gender, disability or sexual orientation are critical and somewhat related, however, "inclusiveness" in this assessment refers solely to race (p. ii). Finally, the term "Inclusiveness Tool" refers to a comprehensive instrument for the purpose of measuring

racial and ethnic competence within five agency areas.

The five areas include and are defined as:

*governance*: the agency's board of directors, how they are recruited and trained.

*human resources*: the agency's staff, management, and volunteers.

*programming*: the services provided; how they are planned, developed, implemented, and evaluated.

*business and administration*: services purchased and contracted from vendors (e.g. toilet paper, accounting, food etc).

*community connections*: partnerships, connections, and communications established with people in the community being served. (Williams et al., pp. vii-xv)

Another term which must be defined is "Inclusiveness Plan". It is used to describe the written document that outlined Agency X's plan, and was submitted to the United Way for approval. "Affirmative Action Committee." This term is used to describe a committee of stakeholders at Agency X that was established to address issues pertaining to race as they arose. "Inclusiveness Committee", is a term that evolved out of the Inclusiveness Plan in which members of the Board of Directors were added to the Affirmative Action Committee and assumed the additional charge of overseeing the Inclusiveness Plan's progress. Finally, the term "participants" is used to describe people who attended focus groups (stakeholders that participated in the researcher's focus groups) and program participants (people who participate in Agency X's programs).

## Operational Definitions

*Inclusiveness Plan:* The Inclusiveness Plan is a document submitted by Agency X to the United Way and was created from the Inclusiveness Assessment Tool.

The process of implementing the Inclusiveness Plan will be measured in the following ways:

*Chronological steps* involve the actions taken by the agency to develop and implement the inclusiveness plan. The actions will be measured by written documentation about the process in addition to anecdotal information obtained in focus groups and interviews.

*Lessons Learned* refer to focus group and interview responses to the questions " What about this process did you think was useful or important?" , "What about this process did you not think was useful or important?" and "...one final thing you could say about this process." Additionally, lessons learned will draw from the theoretical framework previously outlined in this research.

## Data Gathering/Field Procedures

Data were gathered from reviewing existing documents and conducting focus groups and interviews. Individual interviews were conducted only when participants were unable to attend the scheduled focus group.

### Focus Groups and Interviews

Focus groups and individual interviews were held with key stakeholders in the agency including board of directors, administration, program directors, staff, and the inclusiveness committee. Six focus groups were conducted with staff; one focus group

was conducted with management; and one focus group was conducted with the inclusiveness committee. Additionally, two individual interviews were conducted with key stakeholders that could not participate in focus groups. Thirty-one percent of Agency X's staff participated in focus groups or were interviewed (n=33). In total, 51% were people of color (n=17).

Questions asked in the focus group were designed to promote discussion pertaining to the chronological steps in this process, in addition to identifying key lessons learned about the process. (See Appendix A: Focus Group Protocol) They were facilitated by this researcher and conducted at the agency. The focus groups and individual interviews were debriefed using a format that provided uniformity (see Appendix B: Debriefing Template). This same format was used with each group and interview in an effort to create and maintain consistency.

Initial contact was made via Agency X's Executive Director to both the Inclusiveness Committee and the agency Program Directors. This researcher attended meetings with both groups to explain the intent and the purpose of the research. After receiving approval, the researcher attended all center staff meetings, left a letter of intent (see Appendix C: Letter of Intent) and asked for volunteers to participate in a focus group. Participation was based on the subject's willingness to take part in this project. A follow up letter was sent to each participant confirming the date and time of the focus group and provided sample questions (see Appendix D: Follow up Letter). All participants signed a written consent form which outlined the purpose of the research project, the right to refuse participation, potential risks of participation, and the

investigator's role (see Appendix E "Consent Form"). All participants for focus groups were initially identified based on their connection to this agency as an employee, member of management, board member, staff member, or member of the inclusiveness committee. Subjects were identified first by their position in the agency or connection to this project. An additional interview was conducted with a key person from the United Way. This person was identified and interviewed at the suggestion of the Inclusiveness Committee, and was not included in the reported breakdown of focus group participants.

#### Written Documentation

Written information was gathered by reviewing the Executive Director's file on the inclusiveness process, in addition to published information by the agency. General sources of information included: Documentation such as letters, memoranda, meeting agendas, announcements, meeting minutes, written reports, administrative documents including proposals, progress reports and other internal documents; formal studies or evaluations of the same site under study and news clippings and other articles appearing in the media. Additionally, archival records such as service records, organizational records, maps and charts, lists of names and relevant commodities, survey data such as census records or data previously collected about a site, and personal records were used.

#### Measurement Issues

The primary measurement issue is validity. This case will be valid if the researcher can show through the collection of data that the implementation process produced the events and not some other outside factor occurring simultaneously at the agency. In

addition, the ability to get a representative sample of staff, management, board and other key stakeholders that represents the view of all agency personnel will affect the validity of this study. Also, the ability to protect the program's identity and the participants of the study is an issue for data collection. Finally, because this researcher is European American, the ability to accurately identify and document the process of "un-doing racism" may be limited.

### Data Analysis

Data gathered was chronicled and analyzed based on the results of focus groups and interviews, and written documentation gathered in this study. The debriefing template provided a uniform guide for chronicling information to address the research questions. Information gathered was reported in the following format: Agency Description, Development, Implementation and Results of the Inclusiveness Plan, and Lessons Learned. In some of the above mentioned areas, response was broken down by stakeholder in order to get the specific perspective. Finally, information about Agency X's process was compared to relevant theory.



## CHAPTER IV: AGENCY X

### Agency Description

The agency chosen for this study was a large multipurpose organization located in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area. It was chosen because of the diversity of services offered, its location in many different communities, and the length of time it has been in existence.

### Historical Overview

Agency X has grown out of pre-existing settlement houses and organizations dating back to 1879. It has evolved through mergers and acquisitions since that time until 1984 when two organizations merged to form the agency it is today. In some form, this agency has been serving metropolitan residents continually for over 100 years.

### Mission and Strategies

According to the 1990 annual report of Agency X, its mission is to "...help individuals and families who reside in the neighborhoods we serve to strengthen their abilities, expand their opportunities and change the conditions that limit their choices for the future". In the same report they identified nine strategies to accomplish this mission which include:

"

- work in partnership with the people we serve;
- acknowledge that our success is directly tied to the success of our neighborhoods' residents;
- emphasize accountability and responsibility as essential ingredients for a successful life;
- focus on approaches that are holistic and preventive in operation and effect;
- establish physical neighborhood centers that focus resources for people in need;
- provide services, directly and in partnership with other community institutions and

- leaders;
  - facilitate the organization of groups to advocate for changes in support of individual, neighborhood and community interests;
  - attract and work with people of diverse cultures and ideas;
  - attract, challenge and develop creative, adaptive and committed people who do superior work while maintaining high ethical standards."
- (\*no citation given to protect the identity of Agency X)

Budget and Funding Sources

Agency X has an annual operating budget of \$6,920,612.00 (based on unaudited financial statement of fiscal year 1994). Revenue is generated from the following sources:

SOURCE	AMOUNT
Contributions	\$ 48,370.00
Government	\$ 2,634,562.00
United Way	\$ 2,063,550.00
Foundation Support	\$ 510,697.00
Program Service Fees	\$ 364,663.00
Other Revenue	\$ 122,381.00
 Total revenue	 \$ 5,744,223.00

Location, Description of Services & Demographics (by Center)

The following information is derived from internal agency documents of Agency X that describe program goals and staff and community demographics from 1990 Census Data.

Agency X has six program centers which provide a variety of services and programs. According to the first quarter, 1994 program report, Agency X has 106 staff, 51% of whom are people of color (n=55). Demographics pertaining to staff and community percentages of people of color are reviewed by Center in Appendix F. The program served a total of 22,256 people in that quarter, 85% of whom were people of

color (n= 18,918). The following is a description of each center location, services offered and demographic information about staff and program participants.

Center A, located in a north Minneapolis community, is comprised of 86% European American's, 9% African Americans, 3% Native Americans, 2% Asian Americans and 2% Latino/Latina. This Center has 54 staff 39% of which are people of color (n=22). Center A served 2002 people in the first quarter, 47% of which were people of color (n=941). This center provides companionship, transportation and advocacy services to seniors. It provides employment services to people with disabilities, and houses a family resource center that offers home visitation, drop in/play time and referral services. Finally, it offers a program that works with people of color and low income city residents to develop and implement strategies to create change.

Center B is located in a Near North community, comprised of 40% European Americans, 33% African Americans, 17% Native Americans, 7% Asian Americans and 3% Latino/Latina. Center B has 4 staff. 100% are people of color (n=4). This center served 746 people in the first quarter, 80% of whom were people of color (n=597). This Center offers a youth program which focuses on leadership skills, school groups, summer youth programs, support groups and a drop in "house" on the weekends. They offer a family program that responds to the basic needs of families and celebrates African American culture and pride in the community. Finally, this center offers a family loan program that provides no-interest loans to families to help achieve or maintain economic stability.

Center C , located in a south-central Minneapolis neighborhood, with a

demographic composition of 45% European Americans, 20% African Americans, 23 % Native Americans, 8% Asian Americans, and 4% Latino/Latina. Center C has 8 staff, 74% of whom are people of color (n=6). This center served 15,971 people, 92% were people of color (n=14,693). One of this center's programs serves as a resource and referral center which helps low and/or fixed income participants obtain food, clothing and shelter. It also addresses teenage pregnancy by helping participants make informed choices about their sexuality while affirming the individual as well as the family. The center houses a "soup kitchen" serving over 500 people in a given month with food supplies. Finally, this center has a Asian/Pacific advocacy program to ease transition for refugees by providing a number of services such as housing and employment advocacy, citizenship classes, education workshops, cultural support services, and language interpretation.

Center D is located in another south-central Minneapolis community, comprised of 57% European Americans, 28% African Americans, 6% Native Americans, 6% Asian Americans, and 3% Latino/Latina. Center D has a total of 15 staff, 47% of whom are people of color (n=7). This center served 901 people, 58% of whom were people of color (n=523). Center D offers programs that support parents and special groups for first time mothers that provides information about child development, child care and nutrition. This center also has a cultural arts program that address the root causes of discrimination through productions, workshops and classes. Finally, this program offers housekeeping and chore services to seniors in addition to health and nutrition services and social activities.

Center E is located in a north Minneapolis neighborhood, comprised of 60% European Americans, 26% African Americans, 6% Native Americans, 3% Asian Americans, and 4% Latino/Latina. This center has 8 staff, 50% of whom are people of color (n=4). This center served 570 people, 79% of whom were people of color (n=450). Center E offers a youth program to help youth make the transition into "healthier" adulthood, crime and drug free, sexually responsible, self-sufficient, and form healthy close relationships with peers. It offers a family skills program to build stronger families in the community through education and support, ultimately reducing family violence. It offers crisis advocacy and support to address the emergency survival needs of low-income families and of women who are victims of domestic violence. It offers services to adults with developmental disabilities, who live in semi-independent living situations, while decreasing their social isolation and vulnerability. Finally, this center provides economic development and technical assistance to the community such as developing low income housing, and commercial property by creating partnerships with local community development centers's. Also, this center leverages public and private investment in inner city projects, provide technical assistance and support to enhance the capacities of small, local non-profit, and connects local businesses with nonprofit organizations to promote more effective economic activity.

Center F is in a central Minneapolis community which has a demographic makeup of 69% European Americans, 11% African Americans, 2% Native Americans, 17% Asian Americans and .5% Latino/Latina. This center has 17 staff, 53% of whom are people of color (n=9). Center F served 1,869 people, 78% of whom were people of color

(n=1,383). One of the programs at this center works to strengthen the family unit in the areas of literacy, youth and family development and basic needs. Students from the University of Minnesota are connected with youth ages 5 to 14 and foreign born adults as tutors to increase reading skills. Additionally, this program works to develop the self-esteem of kids through a variety of after-school and pre-school activities. This center also is conducting a pilot project which has been working with 60 children since the 6th grade (they are currently in 10th grade) and will follow them through high school. The goals of the participants are to finish high school and go on to college, to be sexually responsible, chemically healthy, and to be contributing members of society. Finally, this center offers employment services through STRIDE (Success Through Reaching Individual Development), JTPA (Job Training Partnership Act) and METP (Minneapolis Employment and Training Program).

## How The Un-doing Racism/Inclusiveness Plan Was Developed

### Beginning Steps

It should be noted that Agency X had already begun an un-doing racism process prior to the beginning of the United Way's Inclusiveness process. Agency X had an Affirmative Action Committee established in the agency to hear grievances pertaining to race (among other things). The Affirmative Action Committee was comprised of the Executive Director, selected program directors, agency personnel and ultimately board members. In 1992, Agency X's Executive Director attended a training on un-doing racism conducted by the People's Institute in New Orleans. Following that training, the

Affirmative Action committee and the Executive Director, with the support of the Agency President, committed to examining racism at both personal and organizational levels.

The process began by requiring all personnel of Agency X to attend an un-doing racism training conducted by the People's Institute. At the same time, the agency was selected to participate in a field test of the Inclusiveness Tool (defined earlier), by participating in focus groups that tested the questions in the tool. Agency X then received a draft of the "Inclusiveness Tool", to develop agency specific goals and objectives and ultimately the Inclusiveness Plan for the United Way. The Affirmative Action committee was responsible for overseeing this process that hereinafter will be referred to as the Un-doing Racism/Inclusiveness Process (plan).

#### Baseline Information: Gathering and Results

The Affirmative Action Committee divided the five sections of the Inclusiveness Tool (governance, programs, human resources, business and administration and community partnerships) and determined how it would gather and measure the base line information in each area.

Governance section data was gathered by sending a questionnaire, comprised of questions from the Inclusiveness Tool, to all board members (n=22). Ten board members responded, four of whom were people of color. According to a document submitted to the Affirmative Action Committee, which reviewed these findings, the board had no articulated strategy for recruiting racially and culturally diverse board members. Eight of the twenty-two board members in the 1992-1993 Board of Directors were people of color. Of those, seven were African American. Absent from the board was representation

from the Native American, Latino(a), Asian and Pacific Island communities. Additionally, the document indicated support and information disseminated by the board did not take into account culturally specific learning styles, racial and cultural diversity training was not offered, and cultural experiences were not always valued and sought.

Baseline information pertaining to the business and administration section was conducted by a committee member who left the agency prior to its completion. The President and the Executive Director completed this section by reviewing all current vendors and identified businesses owned by people of color with whom the agency could do business. Also, they researched banks that had been assessed by the Community Reinvestment Act Performance Evaluation as being outstanding at meeting community credit needs.

Baseline information for the human resource section was gathered by surveying 75 of the then 154 staff, with questions derived from the Inclusiveness Tool. According to a document submitted to the United Way, human resources were considered both paid and volunteer personnel. This document recommended diversity be reflected at all levels in the organizations which may require the organization to expand its ideas about how people are qualified. Also recommended was staff preparation for working with people from diverse cultures and cautioned further that, this effort not be perceived as solely meeting United Way requirements. Additionally, organizational leadership must ensure that new and diverse perspectives are incorporated into the operations of the agency. Finally, census records were reviewed for each community where Agency X is located, and compared to the racial composition of staff.



Baseline information for the programming section was gathered and reviewed in an internal agency document. Information was gathered by conducting thirty-eight interviews (30 with staff and 8 with community leaders). All of the community leaders were people of color, as were 19 of the staff interviewed. In summary, the programming at Agency X was perceived to be accessible to people of color, but did not include input in program planning and design. Also, program participants were believed to reflect the community composition in some centers, but not at all. The agency was recognized as facilitating culturally specific events, but staff indicated the need to establish credibility in communities of color.

Finally, baseline information was gathered pertaining to community partnerships and was summarized in an internal agency document. Information was gathered by sending twenty-five surveys to people at fourteen community organizations. Fourteen responses were received that indicated the agency had meaningful contact with communities of color. Most were unsure whether Agency X disseminated information in languages appropriate to cultural groups, but reported the agency using culturally sensitive communications to provide information. In general, communications to communities of color was reported as sporadic with the African American community being the recipient of the most information. Improved communications were recommended to Native American, Pacific Island, and Latino(a) communities.

After the baseline information was gathered and reported to the committee, three goals from each section were selected and presented to Agency X's Program Directors. At the Directors' meeting the goals were reviewed and prioritized. After presenting the

goals to the Directors, they were presented to the Personnel Committee of Board of Directors, then to the Executive Committee, and finally to the full Board which gave approval. The plan was then published in an internal agency paper and submitted to the United Way for its approval.

#### The Un-doing Racism/Inclusiveness Plan Developed

The baseline information provided the structure for Agency X's Inclusiveness Plan. According to an internal agency document, a five year plan was developed that articulated goals created for each area of the Inclusiveness Tool (See Appendix H for a complete description of the plan, and results). For example, staff throughout the agency and at all levels were required to attend the un-doing racism training conducted by the People's Institute. The agency as a whole created plans to recruit and retain people of color and develop partnerships in culturally specific communities. They were to create a system to measure cultural competence (on performance appraisals, and job descriptions), and to conduct exit interviews, that addressed the agency's efforts at un-doing racism. Finally, all programs in Agency X were to ensure the program participants reflected the racial and cultural characteristics of the program service area, and additionally, to develop the means to evaluate programs utilizing feedback from program participants and people of color.

#### Role of Stakeholders in Developing the Plan

Stakeholders who participated in focus groups reported learning about this process in several different ways. Some were informed directly by the Executive Director and/or

President of the agency, while others were informed at an all staff meeting where the Executive Director informed them of the process and required training. Others, that were hired after this process began, learned about it during their initial interview or formal orientation to the agency. Others were informed at separate center staff meetings, or by memo informing them of their scheduled training time.

The initial reactions from staff to this process fell into one of three categories: excited and/or relieved, skeptical, or suspicious. Staff of color at all levels in Agency X reported mixed initial reactions to this process. Some reported feeling relieved or excited that the agency was addressing racism, while others reported being skeptical about the extent to which the agency would address the issue of racism, or that it was risky for people of color to bring up concerns or issues publicly out of fear of retaliation. The following reviews the roles the various stakeholders played in developing the Inclusiveness Plan.

#### Role of the Board of Directors in Developing the Plan

The board member interviewed stated that there was no board role in developing the Un-doing Racism Plan. He stated that The Executive Director and President of the agency brought the plan to the executive committee where it was presented for minor changes. Written documentation indicates that the chair of the board did restructure the board and created two committee that are directly involved with this process. The first committee is the "Inclusiveness Committee" which is comprised of members from the Affirmative Action Committee in addition to board members. The second committee is

the "New Member Orientation Committee" which has the charge (among other things) of meeting the inclusiveness goal of board composition and recruitment.

#### Role of Administrators in Developing the Plan

Both the Executive Director and the President played a role in developing the Undoing Racism/Inclusiveness Plan. Stakeholders at all levels of this agency reported that the Executive Director introduced the idea of un-doing racism to the agency after attending the training by the People's Institute. The Executive Director had an additional role in the development of the plan through her involvement in the Inclusiveness Committee gathering baseline information. It was also reported by agency staff that she announced the Agency's commitment to this process at an agency wide staff meeting and during some of the participant's orientation to the agency. The President was involved in the development of the governance and management pieces of the plan, specifically in gaining board and management approval. Additionally, he provided agency sanction for participating in the field test, and for the agency's efforts in undoing racism.

#### Role of the Program Directors in Developing the Plan

It was reported earlier that the role of the Program Directors in developing the Undoing Racism/Inclusiveness Plan was to review the goals that were established by the Inclusiveness Committee. It was described as a process that was not open for input or design from this group, but instead to obtain their reaction to something currently in progress.

#### Staff's Role in Developing the Plan

The participants of the focus groups did not report having any involvement in the actual development of the agency's Un-doing Racism/Inclusiveness Plan. Almost all participants had attended the training by the People's Institute, which was reported as an important part of this process, and in general a good training experience. Some participants (predominantly Caucasian) reported feeling shamed or less valued within the agency as a result (will be reviewed more under the lessons learned section). Most reported being involved in creating center specific goals, which will be reviewed in the following section.

While the Inclusiveness Committee was responsible for developing the Inclusiveness Plan that was submitted to the United Way. This committee is comprised of board members, administration and management. People at those levels within the agency therefore participated in the plan's development. Because this committee lacks representation from personnel at the staff level, they were not able to formally participate in the plan's development. Cummings et al (as cited in Mohrman et al., 1989) state that the most impactful change occurs when people from all levels participate. They caution that lack of representation may undermine the desired change during the implementation phase (1989).

#### How the Un-doing Racism/Inclusiveness Plan was Implemented

##### Stakeholders Role in Implementing the Un-doing Racism/Inclusiveness Plan

Each of the five areas in the Un-doing Racism/Inclusiveness Plan included a section on who was responsible for overseeing its implementation (stakeholder responsible

listed in the un-doing racism inclusiveness plan). All stakeholders interviewed in this research described some role in implementing this plan. Some people of color, interviewed in this process, reported addressing racism on an individual and institutional level prior to the start of this initiative. Many expressed frustration which they attributed to a lack of support for doing so. Others reported having attempted to address racism in program services without success as well.

#### Board's Role in Implementing

As previously reported, the Chair of Agency X's Board of Directors, restructured some of the committee's in response to the Inclusiveness Plan. Additionally, the board Inclusiveness Committee (previously the Affirmative Action Committee) is currently developing a definition of "racism" for board adoption. The board is also responsible for developing agency strategies and behavioral changes resulting from the approved definition of racism.

#### Administrator's Role in Implementing

According to the President of Agency X, his most important role in the implementation of this process was to provide "top leadership sanction." Specifically, he is responsible for overseeing the Board (governance) goals of the inclusiveness plans. The Executive Director is responsible for overseeing the implementation of goals within all of the five sections of the plan.

### Program Director's Role in Implementing

All programs at Agency X created un-doing racism goals which were overseen by the individual Program Directors. The Program Directors review the plan once a month in the "Directors meeting" and report on progress made toward reaching the goals. Undoing racism has become an agenda on the Program Directors meeting and the goals of the plan are reviewed quarterly.

### Staff's Role in Implementing

The amount of involvement of staff in implementing the Un-doing Racism/Inclusiveness Plan varied by center. Some staff reported their only involvement with this process was attending the required training, or were informed at staff meetings that "these were the action plans...this is what we're going to do". Other participants reported having discussions in their staff meetings about what this meant for their center, and how they were going to address racism in their program. Those discussions usually resulted in specific un-doing racism goals. Some staff reported taking the process further, into their unit or work group, where they committed to discussing the issue of race and how it affects them personally and professionally. Several people reported forming groups outside of work to ensure the process did not stop after training (other groups were reportedly formed and comprised of people who were dissatisfied with the process, and were described as "bitch sessions"). One participant reported creating new multi-cultural curriculums. Another participant reported creating a contract, outlining a policy against discrimination, that outside vendors were required to sign. One focus group described

replicating the People's Institute training within that center, so all of the staff could participate as a team. Some center meetings discussed the need to contract with people of color, culturally specific services and job sites that were inclusive.



## CHAPTER V: FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, AND CONCLUSION

### Result of Plan: Scope of Change

According to an internal agency document, which reported progress on the Inclusiveness Plan, Agency X has either achieved or made significant progress in the goals it had established. Pertaining to Governance, 19 of the 25 board members have attended the training conducted by the People's Institute as well as additional training for the board by a local consultant. Additionally, four of the five new board members are people of color and the board as a whole conduct small group discussions as a means of gathering information about the various cultures represented.

Pertaining to Business and Administration, Agency X has changed banks to one that has demonstrated commitment to working with local communities. The agency has also purchased culturally specific art work for all of its programs centers.

Regarding Human Resources, Agency X is currently working to define "cultural competence" and has added a section on performance appraisals to evaluate personnel progress and/or achievement in this area. Agency X has also promoted and recruited a majority of people of color and asks employees to evaluate the agency's progress in this area during exit interviews.

Regarding Programming, 32 out of the 35 programs in Agency X reported no discrepancy between census data (1990) and program participation. Additionally all of the programs have begun to get input from program participants in program planning, implementation and priority setting.

Pertaining to Community Partnerships, many new linkages with culturally specific

groups and organizations have been established which includes providing technical assistance through fundraising activities. Additionally, many cultural events have been planned or have occurred in the individual programs and in the theater. (See Appendix H for a complete list of changes that resulted from this process)

### Perceptions of Change by Stakeholder

All stakeholders interviewed identified changes that resulted from this process. The most commonly articulated change was the ability to discuss racism in the agency. It was reported as being talked about with regularity at staff meetings and informally among co-workers. Also identified was the perception that since this process, program services now better reflect the needs of the "consumers" (program participants). Stakeholders at all levels reported a change in the physical appearance of program centers, usually by the addition of art work, thus creating a more welcoming environment. Finally, stakeholders at all levels reported an increase in the number of people of color hired, with an emphasis in hiring from the community where the program is located.

The following reviews the perception of changes that have resulted from this process, as described by stakeholders who participated in focus groups. This discussion focuses primarily on progress that was made towards un-doing racism and becoming more inclusive, and reflects only the perceptions of the people that participated in the study.

### Board Perception of Change

The board member interviewed, discussed the board specific goals that were accomplished (listed above). Additionally, he stated that the board has recruited diverse

members and that Agency X as a whole has also recruited more diverse staff. From the board's perspective, it was reported that this process provided the agency with something to focus on that says diversity is important. The nominating committee now must try to recruit members other than black and/or white (e.g., Latino, Native America Asian).

#### Administration

The President of Agency X also reviewed the changes resulting from the Un-doing Racism/Inclusiveness Plan (reviewed above). In addition, he discussed the following changes in the agency:

- Number of staff of color went up (est 30% to 50%)
- Physical appearance of programs changed by adding culturally specific art work.
- Switched Insurance agents to one of color.
- Switched Banks to one with a Community Reinvestment Act rating of outstanding.
- 78% of promotions were people of color.
- Undoing racism is on the agenda of all program director's meetings.

The Executive Director described change resulting from this process that affected the norms of the organization. Specifically, she stated that all staff that work for agency X, or will work for Agency X, are [will be] informed about the agency's commitment to un-doing racism. She also indicated that the agency makes a conscious effort to contract services from businesses owned by people of color , or from people of color.

#### Inclusiveness Committee (former Affirmative Action Committee)

The members of this committee interviewed stated, that the agency now discusses race and issues of racism regularly, and is consciously working with other agency's to

address the issue of race and culture. Also changed is the increased number of people hired from the communities the programs are located in. The agency now hires more people of color, which results in more participants of color, and ultimately programs that better reflect the needs of the participants and the community. Finally, the committee members stated that this process has caused it to be more deliberate in ways it has always wanted to be, for example hiring more people of color, job descriptions that require cultural competency, and questions asked in interviews.

### Program Directors

The Program Directors interviewed, also talked about the consciousness of the agency being raised in the area of racism. One person stated that you can discuss racism in a variety of ways without getting the initial resistance or negative reaction. Additionally the ratio of staff of color to clients has increased. The result of this is a more relevant and authentic way of working with the clients. Also program services are more culturally relevant, and often holidays and traditions from a variety of cultures are celebrated. Finally, art work in the agency reflects people from many cultures, and a mission was established for a cultural arts program to become a medium of expression for marginalized groups.

### Staff

Staff participating in the focus groups were aware of many changes resulting from this process. The extent of changes focus group participants were aware of varied by center. One change, that staff in all focus groups were aware of, was an increased number of people of color hired by Agency X. Most staff reported the raising of consciousness

pertaining to racism, and the ability to have it discussed more openly. Some staff articulated specific goals that were created and accomplished at their center, while others discussed ways in which this process has affected the programming. Other staff reported feeling less valued (as European Americans) and at times felt shamed. See Appendix G for a complete list of staff responses.

## Lessons to be Learned from the Process

### What Worked/Facilitated Progress

There were several factors named by focus group participants that helped to facilitate progress. Because the stakeholders in this study played differing roles in the development and implementation of this process, their responses varied based on position.

#### Staff Commitment and Attitude

"Must go layer by layer to address this, especially with the bias people have towards consumers."

"Where people are at with their racism affects the way they deal with consumers...they separate them as others, and don't know how to talk or act."

"... you have to want to do this, not just go through the motions." (focus group participants)

This researcher noted the most obvious factor contributing to the progress of this process was staff commitment and attitude. While focus group participants discussed at great length the resistance of people at levels within the organization, they also discussed or reflected on people within the agency that were deeply committed to the process of undoing racism. It should be noted that, for some people, the commitment reflected or reported in the focus groups were built upon in this process, but did not result from it.

This process seemed to build on their existing capacities. As Gardenswartz et al (1989) discussed, when changing organizations to become more diverse, it is not always necessary to recreate the entire system, existing capacities should be recognized and built upon.

Focus group participants in Agency X reported many informal groups forming to examine the issue of racism and how it plays out both personally and in the workplace. Other groups were formed to ensure the process did not stop with training, but continued throughout the agency. Also many people of color, who described attempting to address racism in programs prior to this project, continued to do so at the training by the People's Institute, during staff meetings, and individually with more sanction and legitimacy.

#### Training by the Peoples Institute

"you don't get a chance to change things until your mind is aware".

"The training was excellent, it allowed us to address these things in our center...you couldn't work here with out addressing race... we work with too many different people."

"The training challenges where people are at. This may help people to decide if they still want to be in social work". (focus group participants)

One common factor in facilitating progress that was identified across all stakeholders was the training conducted by the People's Institute. Because people at all levels of the organization attended the same training, it may have played a role in affecting the agency's culture by providing uniform language and concepts for staff to discuss racism. Stakeholders (who participated in focus groups or interviews) used similar language and concepts to describe racism both personally and organizationally, and some described learning about these concepts at the training. For example, racism was

described during the course of the focus group as "prejudice plus power", and something that (using that definition) people of color were not capable of being. Additionally, multiple stakeholders discussed the notion that all "White people are racist because they have membership in the power structure". One stakeholder reported that the training "opened a lot of eyes" and another reported it keeping the focus on racism and not other forms of oppression or "isms". As Cummings et al (as cited in Mohrman et al., 1989) deep change involves feelings, values, behavior and the culture of the organization. The training was reported as an agency strategy that ultimately added to the inclusiveness plan, but also appears to have been vital in creating "deep change." At the very least, this training was given credit for raising people's consciousness about racism.

### Leadership

"It is absolutely critical that top agency leadership buy in to this process. Someone with power and clout need to get behind it."

"The initial drive and seriousness this effort was given moved us towards progress."

"People were mad about the training being mandatory... but if it were left to staff to sign up, I don't think they would have gone." (focus group participants)

Also identified (though not by all stakeholders) as facilitating progress, was the administrative leadership and sanctioning of this process. It is this researcher's opinion that the leadership and commitment, particularly on the part of the Executive Director, was instrumental in the development, implementation and progress made in this process. The Executive Director and President's articulation of the agency's commitment to this process, through both all staff and individual meetings, provided the vision, standards, focus and direction that Boleman and Deal (1991) describe as necessary for "good

leadership" in organizational efforts. One participant stated that in the beginning the strategy was clearly mandated. She reported the philosophy being " if you don't like what were doing you may work for another agency." Also, important is that this process could not have begun and would not have been implemented without the allocation of staff time and financial resources.

#### Inclusiveness Tool

"Assessing the program composition with in the community context was important"  
"The organizational audit helped us to understand where we were. It is not always where you think you are." (focus group participants)

Stakeholders who played a role in the development of the Un-doing Racism/Inclusiveness Plan claimed the Inclusiveness Tool provided focus and guidance for beginning this process. One participant stated that the tool mapped out different areas to work on, and without it, some very important areas such as business and administration, and community partnerships would have been overlooked. The format of the tool also was identified as providing structure to questions and surveys used in gathering baseline information. Dividing the tool into sections and having a team work on them also helped to facilitate progress because of the many perspectives.

#### What Impeded Progress

Stakeholders discussed with candor impediments to this process. Some impediments were also listed as facilitators of progress. Where this occurs, this researcher will refer to the literature for clarification. Identified impediments included the process for developing the plan, leadership, accountability, staff reaction and resistance, lack of



consistency between centers and directors, and terminology.

#### Development of Plan

"The Agency did not give staff many opportunities to be empowered in this process. Instead took the information and passed it in a hierarchical manner." (focus group participant)

The fact that the plan was developed primarily from the "top" of the organization, was identified as an impediment. Focus group participants often stated that the plan was "handed to them" or remembered it being passed around in meetings. The developmental process of the plan was not perceived as open to input for goals or strategies, and was discussed as a "missed opportunity" for staff. Cummings, et al. (as cited in Mohrman, et al., 1989) state that when change is going to affect the organization as a whole, it is best to have the involvement of all possible stakeholders in its development and implementation. They state that this is important because the change affects people's behavior at all levels. They have the power to support or undermine the change process.

Another impediment, pertaining to the development of the plan, relates to the collection of baseline data. One focus group participant, who participated in the data collection stated that they did not spend a lot of time researching the baseline information, but rather, they went with what they could get. While they believed the information was meaningful and useful, it was indicated that more effort could have been added.

#### Leadership

While the leadership of this process was identified as a factor that facilitated progress, it was also named by focus group participants as an impediment. While the

articulation of the vision and commitment of the agency were reported as important, lack of guidance pertaining to resistance and implementation were reported as impediments. Stakeholders stated they needed clarification of how the details of the plan were to be implemented and enforced. Additionally, support for how to deal with resistance, frustration and the diversion to other forms of oppression that arose from this process were reported.

Nadler and Tushman (as cited in Mohrman et al., 1989) state that leaders must make sure people throughout the organization behave in a way that facilitates change. They must structure behavior, control measurement systems, and monitor and assess behavior. Boleman and Deal (1991) indicate that leaders must be a source of help in times of confusion, uncertainty and threatening situations. They must help employees to see possibilities and discover resources.

### Accountability

Related to leadership is the issue of accountability. Stakeholders at all levels, discussed the need for more accountability. Response and follow through was reported to vary from Centers to Center. One participant reported that when it started you didn't know who would get on the bandwagon. Some programs took it serious, others did not. More uniformity and a system of checks and balances between centers were expressed as a need. Some focus group participants stated that not all centers gave the same effort which was attributed to the amount of information or the way in which information was disseminated in the different Centers. One participant stated that Center Directors must be held accountable, "if you have center directors not accountable to the plan, I guarantee

you their staff aren't accountable either." Additionally, information about this process was disseminated throughout the agency differently. Some staff were informed via memos, others during meetings. The way in which they received the information seemed to impact their reaction (discussed further below) which indicates the need for a uniform plan of dissemination.

### Staff Reaction and Resistance

"I was skeptical whether organizationally it would or could be pulled off...when white people talk about racism it can be a set up to get people of color to speak and then roust them out if they didn't like what was said"

"Are we going to up-lift one culture and denigrate another? The message is that we must be tolerant of those who don't have and not tolerant of those who have." (focus group participants)

Focus group participants in all levels of the organization reported different reactions to this process. These reactions are listed under impediments because they pertain to people's negative feelings about this process, which must be heard and dealt with before progress can be made. Whether the reactions are legitimate or accurate is not this researcher's intent; rather it is the reported perspectives of stakeholders that will in some way affect the progress that is made in this process.

The reaction to this process varied. Some staff wanted to include all forms of oppression. People of color (and some European American people) did not trust that the agency would follow through, or were concerned about how far the agency would take it. Others were resentful about being labeled a racist, and it was indicated that some informal "groups" formed by people who resisted this process.

Some focus group participants reported European American people feeling

defensive and resistant. Some indicated the way in which they were informed about this process contributed to that resistance. Some participants indicated that they knew the training was required because of the United Way, and wished it had come from their agency instead. Other participants reported learning about the process after receiving a memo indicating when they should attend "un-doing racism" training. They stated that it would have been more helpful if the goals of the training and why they were going through training were indicated, but the way it was presented was insulting. Others disagreed with the premise that all white people were racist. "You can't say every white person is a member of the power structure...I may have benefited from the power structure...but if this is the only focus, it makes it harder to move forward." Other European American participants reported feeling like a "win-loose" situation was created whereby people of color were supported and valued for their thoughts and opinions, but European Americans were not; the result of this process is "going the other way", indicating a bias against European Americans.

Others reported being overwhelmed by the process; that it was life altering. Some participants reported that people were afraid of being labeled racist, or were damaged from being labeled as such. Others reported concern that they would not be able to meet the expectations of the plan and as a result would be considered racist. Others indicated feeling frustrated because what you do is never adequate, there's no safe way to do it and make everyone happy. This process is very risky in that it frees people up to talk about race issues while at the same time brings out a lot of pent up anger; its a painful process that some people ultimately lost their jobs over. Gardenswartz et al. (1989) states the

reason this type of change is so painful is because the homeostasis of the organization is being altered. He recommends employees be guided through this process in order to understand the "big picture" and the benefits to the organization and employees that will result.

#### Lack of Trust in Agency Commitment

The following comments came predominantly from African American participants. The statements reflect the risk and effect of this type of change on people of color.

Many participants indicated being skeptical or having concern about the agency's level of commitment to this process. Additionally, concern was expressed about whether the agency would follow through. Some reported being resistant to the un-doing racism piece, because they believed it may do more harm than good; that issues would be stirred up and then not dealt with.

Others expressed concern that this would be a "numbers game" only to have more people of color present in the agency, and nothing would be done about program services, or to promote people of color within the agency. One focus group participant indicated that while changes have been made there are still few people of color in positions of power and authority in the organization (discussed further in Limitations).

Some staff of color expressed the difficulty of this process, especially in the beginning. Many reported feeling targeted in meetings and looked upon as an adversary. Others reported being encouraged to "speak up", but felt sanctioned as being "negative" when they said things the program or people in the program did not want to hear. Additionally some reported not feeling listened to, which must happen if racism is to truly

be un-done.

### Terminology

Identified as another impediment to progress was the terminology about this process. Some referred to it as the "Inclusiveness Plan", others referred to it as "Un-doing Racism". It should be noted that some of the confusion may have in fact been caused by this researcher. When introducing this research project at many staff meetings, this researcher referred to the process as "the inclusiveness process". Many focus group participants were aware that the agency had embarked on an Un-doing Racism process, but were unaware of the Inclusiveness plan. With this in mind, the following is an account of stakeholder identified impediments pertaining to the terminology in this process.

Some participants discussed the clarity of "un-doing racism" and the ambiguity of "inclusiveness". The latter was described by some as "watering down" the agency's efforts to un-do racism, by adding other (more readily acceptable) forms of oppression. Some reported a lack of clear articulation about what un-doing racism was. It became inclusiveness, multi-culturalism, diversity and then the issue of race became watered down. The perception was that the name was changed to appease the "special interest groups" that emerged from this process and asked for tangible changes. As a result the commitment to un-doing racism diminished.

Others criticized the use of the term "inclusiveness" when other forms of oppressed groups were not included. Others added that the focus was narrow...un-doing racism connotes just race; inclusiveness connotes all different types of oppressed groups.

Theoretically and practically you should be able to address all forms of oppression.

Finally, using the term "racist" was identified (predominantly by European American participants) as having a negative connotation that created an initial and immediate reaction. The goal should be to uplift everyone, and accept all people as equals.

#### Limitations of the Plan

"Un-doing racism is revolutionary; the United States as a country has not undone racism or acknowledged it. The agency and people in the agency must be willing to be revolutionary in order to make change."

"You can't un-do racism...its in the heart and mind...its so big it might be genetic"  
(focus group participants)

The following is a discussion on the limitations of this process. Specifically, it refers to work yet to be done, or areas not covered in the Un-doing Racism/Inclusiveness process, as identified by focus group participants. Limitations to this process pertain to the effects on racism, scope of change accomplished, and the need for continued efforts.

#### Limited Affect on Racism

Stakeholders at all levels indicated that the organization as a whole is more diverse, but state it can not be credited with un-doing racism. One participant stated that the Inclusiveness Plan was basically an affirmative action plan that was aimed at increasing the numbers of people of color in different areas of the agency. He stated that "nothing was done to eliminate racism; it's a numbers game; it's not an impediment, it's just a recharacterization of what we've been doing since the 1960's." Other stakeholders indicated that in order to un-do racism the administration would need to acknowledge that

they may not have all the answers in this process, and entrust it to people of color.

Conversely, other stakeholders indicated that there were not any area's the Agency had not addressed, that you can educate people and give them ideas but you can not make them change. A "can of worms" was said to be opened, with the problems still being there. Further, they stated that staff had been given the tools and its now its up to them, each person will have to develop at a different pace. Finally, stakeholders indicated that people (at all levels) are very good at portraying themselves in favorable ways, and expressed a need for further sanctions.

### Scope of Change

Participants in one focus group indicated that the hierarchical structure had not changed, which was evidenced by the majority of supervisors and administrators being white. Further indicated was the hiring of people from the community but lack of promotions of this group.

Other stakeholders indicated a lack of people of color in power positions, and a lack of trust in the people of color that are in positions of power. One participant questioned the ability of people of color to "move in different directions or to push different agendas".

Other participants expressed the need for this process to go further, indicating it is not enough to go through one training, and recommended further trainings to provide direction about where to go from here. One suggestion was to have the various centers connecting more and relaying information about what they are doing in this process, in order to learn and broaden the scope of change.



Still others discussed the issue of affecting other systems. Participants in one focus group discussed a lack of control in who participates in their programs because participants are referred from outside agencies. Some participants indicated a need for the training to "be taken to the larger systems"

### Other Lessons

"This is an ongoing process; its not finished when its over for the United Way or when all staff have gone to training."

"As society grows and becomes more colorful we have to learn how to get along and respect each other...this agency is doing good because I feel comfortable where ever I go."

"We were all created equal...underneath the blood is the same...I'm a person just like you...respect me and I'll respect you."

(focus group participants)

Participants at all levels in the agency indicated several lessons that could be learned from this process, that are important for other agencies going through an Undoing Racism/Inclusiveness process. The following is a review of these lessons.

Stakeholders discussed the need to understand from the beginning that it is a very difficult process, and must acknowledge the existence of racism and their own responsibility for the problem. People participating in a process such as this must understand the pervasiveness of racism, and understand how it plays out in insidious forms. Stakeholders must recognize the need to address racism and understand the benefits from doing so. One stakeholder recommended "recognize and understand that this is not pretty...and let it happen anyway." Several stakeholders discussed the need for European American people to recognize the need to do the most work, and to realize the

effects a process like this has on people of color. Another stakeholder indicated people must "be courageous and have the courage to stand behind their convictions".

Other stakeholders discussed the need to communicate with all levels of the Agency about all steps in the process. Specifically, communication to provide background and context, guidance, and direction. Also, stakeholders discussed the importance of follow through, not letting the process end after training, when the initial passion dies out.

### Theory Comparison

The extent of change Agency X experienced occurred at the levels Nadler and Tushman (as cited in Mohrman et al., 1989) identified as individual (through training and incentives), team (work groups, group development), organizational (policies) and trans-organizational (between outside organizations). The process the Agency X went through can be compared to Gardenswartz and Rowe's (1993) recommendations for moving organizations towards diversity. Agency X made a solid commitment to this process and allocated an extensive amount of staff time and financial resources. It should be noted that Gardenswartz and Rowe indicate training being important but not sufficient by itself. This may be an important implication for Agency X, as some staff that participated in focus groups were aware only of the training in this process. Other staff asked for "more" other than training.

Next Gardenswartz et al. (1993) discussed the need for commitment and leadership from the "top". As discussed previously leaders must also be willing to guide and direct through the process, and set clear expectations about the scope and extent of

the change required. These were areas stakeholders at all levels requested or indicated the need of.

Organizations must recognize the effort involved and expect discomfort according to Gardenswartz et al. (1993). As mentioned in the lessons learned section of this research, this issue was confirmed by many stakeholders who indicated the "pain" involved in a process like this.

Finally, these authors discuss building on existing capacities and recognizing there will be no "end" in itself. The capacities of Agency X that can be built upon is the passion and commitment to this process on the part of staff at all levels in their organization. Their passion can be built and capitalized upon, and should be rewarded so others will be encouraged.

Pertaining to the issue of leadership, there were discrepancies reported about the mandatory nature of the training provided by the People's Institute. The literature seems support making this training mandatory as a means of setting articulating clear expectations.

### Implications of the Research

There are many factors that may affect the validity of this research. Among them are the number and scope of staff that participated in the focus groups or interviews. While staff from all Centers were represented in this sample, staff from all programs were not. This research is only the reflection of the people who participated. Staff that did not participate or were from other programs may have had a very different perspective.

Also, time may have affected the results of this study. This process initially began in 1992, staff may not have remembered chronological steps or information that was passed on to them since that time. Additionally, new staff (that were represented in this sample) may have relayed their perceptions about the process, which were not controlled for in this study.

Finally, the terminology used in this process may affect the validity. This researcher initially used the term "inclusiveness plan", which was not what this process was uniformly referred to. Many stakeholders were familiar only with "un-doing racism" which may have caused confusion in the process.

#### Implications for Social Work

This research provides information for social workers and/or social work agencies attempting to address the issue of racism. What can be learned from this process is reflected in the lessons learned from focus group participants. Agencies must be willing to commit to the scope and effort involved in this process, and must be willing to allocate time and financial resources to see it through. Social workers must own their own participation and adherence to racist ideologies and practices, and must educate themselves about how these play out in policies and services delivered. Additionally, Social Workers must study the history of the profession, and learn from the differential treatment and exclusionary practices that continue to happen today.

#### Concluding Statements

This research has documented the need for social service agencies to work

towards un-doing racism. It has outlined a process one agency took to address this issue and reviewed what can be learned from their example. It has also described the enormous amount of time, energy and financial resources needed to adequately respond the task at hand. This research documented many accomplishments from Agency X's process as well as the limitations and impediments. It is this researcher's hope that the accomplishments documented can serve as a review of existing capacities from which to build, and an acknowledgement of the limitations for future use.

One focus group participant discussed un-doing racism as a "revolutionary thing", something the United States as a Country has not done. As social workers it is our obligation to address racism, ultimately at a societal level. Before this can happen, however, we must address it on a personal and organizational level thereby acknowledging our participation and adherence to such practices, and ultimately serve as examples.

## APPENDIX A

### Agency X Focus Group Facilitator Protocol

1. Welcome participants, thank them for coming, introduce myself, review explain purpose of this group:

- I am gathering information for my Master's Thesis on what the process of implementing an inclusiveness plan looks like in a large, urban, multi-purpose agency.
- I am interested in learning about this process from the perspective of management, staff members and the inclusiveness committee,
- Information from this group will not identify individuals, or record names, Ask that group members hold what they hear in group confidential.

2. Review Statement of Confidentiality and ask that consent forms be returned. (will bring extra's in case they are forgotten).

- ▶ Confidentiality cannot be guaranteed. Only reveal that which you are comfortable discussing.
- Participation is completely voluntary
- Participants can discontinue activity or refuse to answer any questions at any time without affecting your relationship with Augsburg College or Agency X.
- All information will be kept private in a locked file cabinet in my home.

3. Ground Rules for Focus Group

- Ask that each participant be respectful of one another.
- Feel free to speak with candor and to disagree with one another ideas respectfully.
- There are no right or wrong answers and we are not interested in reaching group consensus, all opinions, beliefs and ideas are welcome.
- Interested in your opinions and getting varied divergent ideas.

4. Moderators Role. Explain the following briefly:

- Moderator will ask questions, keep track of time to get through all the issues we want to cover.
- Moderator will also try to be sure everyone is heard and time distributed evenly.

### **Chronological Steps**

6. How did you first learn that Agency X was beginning an Inclusiveness process?

7. What was your initial reaction to this information?

8. What were the steps as you recall in this process?

9. Describe your role in developing this plan.

10. Describe your role in implementing this plan.

11. What about this process did you think was useful or important?

12. What about this process did you not think was useful or important?

13. What changes were initiated through this process?

14. On the whole, what do you see as the benefits of going through this process?

15. On the whole, what do you see as the limitations of going through this process?

### **REFLECTION AND WRAP UP**

16. This group has brought up insightful and important information. If there were one

final thing you could say about this process in closing, what would that be?

**Final steps for facilitator:**

- ▶ Thank all for participation, turn off recorder.
- ▶ Be alert to “post interview” discussion and observations
- ▶ Fill out debrief form as soon as possible.



APPENDIX B

Agency X  
Focus Group Debrief Template

**DATE OF THE GROUP:**  
**GROUP DEMOGRAPHICS:**

**NUMBER IN GROUP:**

**STAKEHOLDERS REPRESENTED:**

\_\_\_\_\_ INCLUSIVENESS COMMITTEE

\_\_\_\_\_ STAFF

\_\_\_\_\_ MANAGEMENT

**CHRONOLOGICAL STEPS IDENTIFIED:**

Question #'s 6 & 8

**ROLE IN CREATING PLAN:**

Question # 9

**ROLE IN IMPLEMENTING PLAN:**

Question # 10

**REACTIONS TO PLAN**

Question # 7

**WHAT WORKED/FACILITATED PROGRESS**

Question # 11

**WHAT IMPEDED PROGRESS:**

Question # 12

**WHAT CHANGED AS A RESULT**

Question # 13

**OTHER REACTIONS;**

Question #'s 14 & 15

**FINAL REACTIONS**

Question # 16

**MEMORABLE QUOTES:**

APPENDIX C  
Letter of Intent

April 24, 1995

Dear Agency X Staff:

**WHO:** My name is Megan Toal. I am a graduate student at Augsburg College in the Master's of Social Work program. As part of my graduate work, I am conducting a case study at Pillsbury Neighborhood Services regarding the implementation of an inclusiveness plan, based on your agency's participation in the United Way's Inclusiveness through Un-doing Racism project. Pillsbury Neighborhood Services was selected because of its location (in Minneapolis), size, and the diversity of services offered.

**WHAT:** People working for Agency X invited to participate in this case study, by participating in a focus group on the process of implementing an inclusiveness plan. The focus group will last no longer than an hour and a half, and will be offered during staff time.

**WHY:** The purpose of this study is to develop an in-depth picture of what the process of implementing a plan for inclusiveness looks like, and what can be learned. Specifically, I am interested in the chronological steps, the effects on the organization as a whole, and what can be learned from this process. Information from this group will not identify individuals, or record names.

**BENEFITS:** This case study will be beneficial to your agency by providing information about what was and was not useful in this process, in addition to what worked and what did not work. The information from this study will be useful to other organizations who can learn from Agency X's experience as they make attempts to become more inclusive.

Your participation in this focus group is completely voluntary. If you choose not to participate it will not adversely affect your relationship with Agency X or Augsburg College. I will be attending your staff meeting on Tuesday May 2 to ask for volunteers. If you have any questions regarding this process or myself feel free to contact me at 824-0724, or my thesis advisor Sharon Patten, Ph.D. at 330-1723.

Thank you for your time and consideration.  
Sincerely,

Megan Toal

APPENDIX D  
Follow-up Letter

Month, Day Year

Staff Person,  
Agency X  
Address  
Minneapolis, Mn 55404-4062

Dear Staff Person:

Thank you for agreeing to meet with me to discuss the process of implementing the United Way Inclusiveness project on Day, Month Date, Year. The meeting will be held between Time at Place.

In addition to myself, you will be meeting with other Agency X staff from your program. I will ask you to discuss you experience in the inclusiveness project, initiated by your agency last year, and in conjunction with the United Way's Inclusiveness through Undoing Racism project.

I will ask the following types of questions:

1. What did the process of implementing an inclusiveness plan look like in your agency?
2. What were the chronological steps in this process as you recall.
3. What factors facilitated progress? What impeded progress?
4. To what extent was your agency able to integrate this process into the rest of your organizational activities?
5. What changes have you noticed since the inception of this process?

I appreciate the time and effort that you and your agency are contributing to this process. Your contribution will provide important information about implementing an inclusiveness plan and will be both relevant and useful to all agencies that work to become inclusive. If you have any questions, please call Megan Toal at 824-0724.

Sincerely,  
Megan Toal  
MSW Student

APPENDIX E  
Letter of Consent  
Case Study of the Process of Implementing an Inclusiveness Plan  
Consent Form

Dear Agency X Staff:

You are invited to participate in a case study of the process of implementing the United Way inclusiveness project. I am conducting this study as part of my master's thesis at Augsburg College.

Agency X was selected because of its location (in Minneapolis), size, and diversity of services offered. I ask that you read this form in its entirety, and ask any questions you may have before deciding to participate in this study.

Background Information

The purpose of this study is to develop an in-depth picture of what the process of implementing a plan for inclusiveness looks like. Specifically, I am interested in the chronological steps, the effects on the organization as a whole, and what can be learned from this process.

Your Role

If you agree to be in this study I will ask you to participate in a focus group and/or an individual interview. The focus group or interview is designed to review the process of how the agency's inclusiveness plan was developed and implemented. It will last between one to two hours, and will occur during regular staff time.

Agency X's Role

There are no direct benefits you or Agency X will receive for participating in this study. Agency X will receive no compensation for being in this study. In the event that participation causes distress or discomfort, individuals will have the right to discontinue at any time or refuse to answer any questions they do not feel comfortable discussing.

Risks

Confidentiality in a focus group can not be guaranteed. In any sort of report I might publish, I will not include any information that will make it possible to identify you.

Records

The records of this study will be kept private. Research records will be kept in a locked file; I will be the only person having access to them.

Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with the College or Agency X. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without affecting those relationships.

The researcher conducting this study is Megan Toal. You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later you may contact me at 374-3980. If you have questions about me you may contact: Sharon Patten, Ph.D. (thesis advisor) at 330-1723.

You will be given a copy of this form to keep for your records.

Statement of consent:

I have read the above information. I have asked questions and have received answers. I consent to participate in the study.

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of Investigator \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

**APPENDIX F**  
**Review of Agency X Center Staff, Community, and Program Participants**  
**that are People of Color**

Center	% of People of Color in the Community	% of People of Color on Staff	% of People of Color who Participate in Programs
A	14%	50%	47%
B	60%	100%	80%
C	55%	76%	92%
D	43%	47%	58%
E	40%	50%	79%
F	31%	53%	78%

## APPENDIX G

### List of Staff Identified Changes that Resulted from the Un-doing Racism/Inclusiveness Process

- We were always doing things to address racism in this center, now it was ok'd by the administration.
- We had always done cultural actives but were now supported for doing it by the agency.
- We celebrate many different cultural holidays
- We don't make decisions about programs directed at particular groups without getting input from that group.
- Staff feel empowered to bring up concerns, pertaining to race and bias in services.
- This is a community center, we are here to facilitate the use of space by the community, it does not belong to us.
- Art work on the wall represents the many cultures in this community.
- People from the community feel welcomed.
- Its now OK to hire race/cultural specific people for positions. If we don't we will have a problem in our center.
- Talk with project sites about race, its in our contract.
- We created culturally specific curriculums.
- Awakened a lot of people's minds...different cultures are out there...everyone is different with their own values that must be respected.
- The agency has become more comfortable racially. People at this center care and listen to each other. People are comfortable. Something must be working because there is an openness.
- Weeded out a lot of racist people and are hiring more people who are willing to work together.
- This was punitive in some ways. Some people were damaged... labeled... put out reputation wise, they were discouraged.
- The issue of racism is more natural for us now... a matter of course. We can joke and know when to stop. Have created a safe environment. It has affected the culture...what used to be a goal now happens.
- Programs are more geared toward the consumer.
- Tension has lowered in the program
- Easier to talk about race, it used to feel uncomfortable when people would get angry about racial issues, it is now more acceptable.
- Until recently...the agency couldn't understand the kids in our programs...they would separate who they are from the kids.
- We are attempting to define the program by the needs in the community not the funder.



- We did outreach in the community to gain participation from other groups.
- There have been meetings about restructuring [this] center where we discuss the strengths, and problems of the community, and what can be done utilizing the strengths and problems.
- We are examining their role as gate keepers; who they are excluding and including for services.
- The plan is reviewed quarterly, a lot of examples were dealt with. Were able to work on racism as a team: made commitment to address and talk about it; with in our team, we would talk about issues.
- Looked at issues of accessibility to all groups in this community: eg.. Language on forms and brochures.
- Performance appraisals were changed and job descriptions were changed. Cultural competence is rated 1-4 (concern about how to rate)
- Books and articles were circulated along with suggested reading lists.
- Some staff felt a sense of relief, don't feel like a set up everytime something happens.

## APPENDIX H

### Inclusiveness Plan and Results

The following is a review of the Inclusiveness Plan that was developed and submitted to the United Way for approval, and the results of the plan to date as indicated on an internal agency document.

#### *Governance*

Pertaining to the governance of the agency, the following goals were established

1. The Board will go through an undoing racism training.  
Results: A new board member went through the Undoing Racism workshop by the People's Institute; 19 of 25 members have been trained.
  - a. The board will formulate three objectives as a result of this training and attain those three objectives.  
Results: Two objectives: . Obtain additional training for the board. Mahmoud El-Kati spoke at our December board meeting. 2. Adopt definition of racism. Principles of undoing racism were shared with all new staff were discussed for adoption at the February Board meeting.
2. The Board will adopt a clearly articulated strategy for recruiting racially and culturally diverse leaders in the communities we serve to become board members.  
Results: Currently, 1/3 of Board must live and/or work in the neighborhoods we serve. No new strategy adopted.
  - a. The Board will maintain its current diverse mix while electing to the Board two Native American people, two Asian people and two Chicano/Latino people.  
Results: Currently 9 of our 28 Board members are People of Color (1 Asian American, 8 African American). 4 of the 5 new Board Members are People of Color.
3. Board members will develop a plan to utilize each other's cultural experiences.  
Results: Inclusiveness Committee and New Board Orientation task force discussed methods of building community among board members so this would happen. Beginning in February, small group discussions were used as a means of gathering information at meetings.
  - a. This plan will be updated annually and implemented annually.  
Results: no progress expected.  
Staff Person Responsible: President of Agency X

#### *Business and Administration*

Pertaining to Business and Administration the following goals were established

1. Agency X will increase by 100% our use of businesses owned by People of Color.  
Results: We currently have four businesses with whom we do business who are owned by People of Color.  
Person Responsible: Executive Director
2. Agency X will ensure that the decor of all community centers reflects the multi-cultural composition of the community.  
Results: Culturally specific art work and pictures of clients have been added to all sites.  
People Responsible: All Program Directors
3. Agency X will seek a banking institution which has an "outstanding record of meeting community credit needs" as assessed by its Community Reinvestment Act Performance Evaluation.  
Results: In January of 1994, Agency X switched to Norwest bank, which has an "outstanding" rating.  
Person Responsible: Executive Director

#### *Human Resources*

The following goals were created to address human resources.

1. Job descriptions/performance appraisals will include an assessment of inclusiveness and cultural competency skills.  
Results: The Board's Inclusiveness committee is working with staff to further define and give examples of "cultural competence".  
Person Responsible: Executive Director
2. We will identify, recruit and retain volunteers of color.  
Results: (Baseline: 30% in 1994) Of the 283 volunteers in the agency during 1st quarter 1995 169 (59%) were People of Color.  
People Responsible: Lead Program Staff
3. We will address the perception that staff of color are not promoted or assigned to positions of leadership and responsibility in the agency.  
Results: In 1994 all promotions in the agency were by People of Color. A total of six people were promoted: 4 African American, 1 Asian/Pacific Islander, 1 Native American.  
Person Responsible: Executive Director
4. Conduct exit interviews which will include questions regarding agency efforts at undoing racism.  
Results: Beginning in April 1994, we began to ask staff leaving the agency to

describe "the agency's progress on undoing racism" on a scale of 1 (unsatisfactory), 3 (satisfactory) to 5 (superior). The average ranking for the 32 people leaving was 3.3.

Person Responsible: Executive Director

### *Programming*

The following goals were established to address programming.

1. Staff in each unit of the agency will ensure program participants reflect the racial and cultural characteristics of the community or program service area.

Results: A comparison between 1990 census data for the neighborhoods we served showed there was no discrepancy in all 35 programs except the following: African Americans are under represented in a program at Center E. African Americans are under represented in a program at Center D. Asian Americans are under represented in a program at Center F.

People Responsible: Program Directors

2. Staff in each unit in the agency will decide how their program evaluation will include getting feedback from program participants, especially from participants of color.

Results: Beginning in January, we adopted an "action research as a means of evaluating our programs. Action research has four steps (plan, act, observe and reflect). As part of action research, participants are active collaborators in all aspects of the work from implementation to priority setting. Such participant involvement is key to accomplishing this objective. We will be trained in action research for all of 1995.

People Responsible: Program Directors

- a. These feedback mechanisms will be implemented in each unit in the agency.

Results: In progress

Person Responsible: Executive Director

- b. Annually, each unit in the agency will document how its participant feedback mechanism has increased its responsiveness to participants.

Results: No progress expected

Person Responsible: Executive Director

3. Staff in each unit in the agency will assess the need for culturally specific services.

Results: This is done on a continual basis. In one program the curriculum has been changed; Center E is has identified the need for a homeless shelter for People of Color, Center C staff assessed the need and completed training for staff on battering in the Hmong culture.

People Responsible: Program Directors

a. Having assessed the need, culturally specific services will be implemented where missing.

Results: No progress documented.

People Responsible: Program Directors

### *Community Partnerships*

Goals for community partnerships are described as follows.

1. Agency X will maintain its linkages with Native American and African American communities while strengthening its community linkages with Latinos, Chicanos, Asian/Pacific Islanders through joint programming within communities we serve.

Results: New linkages include Twin City Leadership, Little Earth NELC connection, Center C's Hmong Women Association, collaboration with the dance program and Asian American Renaissance, Center C Golden Eagles collaboration, increases in Latino connections with Latino Americorps participants such as the Center for Global Education. In 1994 Agency X partnered with the People's Institute to train 107 people in un-doing racism.

Person Responsible: Executive Director

2. Agency X will provide technical assistance to communities of color through joint fundraising activities and management.

Results: Hawthorne Area Community Council, Cedar Riverside PAC and Riverside Tenant Association.

People Responsible: Specific Program Directors

3. Agency X will utilize its resources to support social and cultural activities in communities of color by lending support and participation.

Results: Agency X has four cultural events scheduled. The Hittite Empire will be appearing in the Theater.

People Responsible: All Program Directors

4. In programs with four or more full time employees, the disparity between the cultural background of people served and those serving will not be greater than 25%.

Results: As of 12/31/94, a program at Center A remains the only program with such a disparity.

Person Responsible: Executive Director

## REFERENCES

- Abramovitz, M. (1992). Regulating the lives of women. Boston, MA; South End Press.
- Billingsley, A., & Giovannoni, J. (1972). Children of the storm: Black children and American child welfare. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Billingsley, A. (1974). Social science and social welfare: Toward a society for the solution of social problems. Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, 1, 1-12.
- Boleman, L., & Deal, T. (1991). Reframing organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Burgest, D. (1973). Racism in everyday speech and social work jargon. Social Work July.
- Colby, I. (1985). The Freedmen's Bureau: From social welfare to segregation. Phylon, 46, 219-230.
- Diner, S. (1970). Chicago social workers and blacks in the progressive era. Social Service Review, 44, 393-410.
- Franklin, J. (1970). Public welfare in the south during reconstruction era, 1866-80. Social Service Review, 44, 379-391.
- Gardenswartz, L., & Rowe, A. (1993). Managing diversity: A complete desk reference. San Diego, California: Pfeiffer and Company.
- Giddings, P. (1984). When and where I enter. New York; William Morrow and Company.
- Herrick, J. (1978). The perpetuation of institutional racism through ethnic and racial minority content in the curriculum of schools of social work. Journal of Sociology and Social Work, 5, 527-37.
- Hogen, P., & Sau-Fong, S. (1988). Minority children and the child welfare system: An historical perspective. Social Work, 33, 493-498.
- Jackson, P. (1978). Black charity in progressive era Chicago. Social Service Review, 52, 400-17.
- Jenkins, S., Diamond, B., Flanzraich, M., Gibson, J., Hendricks, J., & Marshod, N. (1983). Ethnic differentials in foster care placements. Social Work Research and Abstracts, 19, 41-45.



Kogut, A. (1970). The negro and the charity organization society in the progressive era. Social Service Review, 44, 11-21.

McMahon, A., & Allen-Meares, P. (1992). Is social work racist? Social Work, 37, 533-539.

Minnesota Planning and State Demographers Office. (1993). A Changing Population: The Next 30 Years. St. Paul, MN: McMurry, M.

Mohrman, A., Morhman, S., Ledford, G., Cummings, T., & Lawler, E. (1989). Large scale organizational change. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass Publishers,

Morgan, G. (1986). Images of organization. New Delhi: Sage

Rabinowitz, H. (1974). From exclusion to segregation: Health and welfare services for southern blacks, 1865-1890. Social Service Review, 48, 327-354.

Robyn, D. (1987). What makes a good case. Journal of policy analysis and management, 6, 292-295.

Rubin, A., & Babbie, E. (1993). Research methods for social work (2nd Ed.). Pacific Grove, California: Brooks/Cole .

Seck, E., Finch, W., Mor-Barak, M., & Poverny, L. (1993). Managing a diverse workforce. Social Work, 17, 67-79.

Shyne, A. (1980). Who are the children? A national overview of services Social Work Research and Abstracts, 26-33.

Stehno, S. (1982). Differential treatment of minority children in service systems. Social Work, 27, 39-45.

Swanson, A., & Brown, J. (1981). Racism, supervision and organizational environment. Administration in Social Work, 5, 59-68.

Tratner, W. (1989). From poor law to welfare state. (4th Edition). New York; Free Press.

Weaver, H. (1992). African-Americans and social work: An overview of the ante-bellum through progressive eras. Journal of Multicultural Social Work, 2, 91-101.

Williams T., Rameriz, S., Mayer, S. (1994) Assessing inclusiveness. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Rainbow Research.





Yin, R. K. (1989). Case study research design and methods. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.

Augsburg College  
George Sverdrup Library  
Minneapolis, MN 55454