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As a woman of color and as a woman I was taught—no matter what, you need to be self-sufficient and resourceful. I have had to take initiative and do what I need to do to take care of myself. This is the thinking I bring to whatever job I am in and in particular, this line of work. In terms of my career path and its trajectory, I was taught—knowledge is power.

Focus Group Participant

INTRODUCTION

A lthough there are many points of entry into the field of violence against women—from survivor to the newly minted college graduate—the common thread running through most individuals who enter the field is a sincere commitment and passion to ending sexual and domestic violence in their communities, states, in the U.S. and globally.

Over the last four decades and since the late 1960s, the issues of sexual assault, domestic violence and stalking have increasingly become recognized as a chronic social problem with far-reaching consequences for women, families and communities. Between 1974 and 2000, women working in local communities established nearly 2,000 shelters, emergency hotlines and other services to support survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking.

In addition to the creation of direct service programs, violence against women advocates also mobilized to create state-level coalitions and pass federal legislation to protect victims of violence.

A prime example of the power of mobilizing to effect positive social change is the passage of the Violence Against Women Act in 1994. The Act catapulted the issue of violence against women into the mainstream like no efforts before it had. In fact, the landmark legislation marked a turning point for addressing domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking in the United States. It not only allocated funding for violence prevention efforts, but also outlined legal and judicial consequences for perpetrators and institutionalized many local- and state-level programs. Since its initial passage, the legislation has been reautho-

ized twice and more than three billion dollars have been pumped into local communities and states to address domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking.

While the field has experienced tremendous growth and there is recognition of violence against women as a systemic social problem, very few resources have been dedicated to ensuring that the field is diverse and representative in terms of its leadership.

This report focuses on understanding the leadership challenges and opportunities for advancement of underrepresented groups within the field of violence against women in four states: Virginia, Minnesota, New Jersey and Vermont. It is a pre-assessment study of the Women of Color Network of the Pennsylvania Coalition against Domestic Violence, established to increase the representation of individuals from underrepresented groups within anti-violence organizations and to build the leadership skills and capacity of women of color, LGBTQ individuals, deaf and hard of hearing, individuals with disabilities and Native women to lead within the field and in their communities.

By the year 2050, ethnic and racial minorities will comprise a majority of the nation’s population. As such, it is imperative that nonprofit organizations, including those focused on sexual assault, domestic violence and stalking, begin to lay the foundation to build strong leaders who will be prepared to manage, lead and sustain anti-violence organizations.

1 Stalking was not in the 1994 version of the Violence Against Women Act. It was added in the reauthorization bill in 2000.
In this study, we analyzed both quantitative and qualitative data from focus groups and a field survey conducted in four states from February 2011 through July 2011. Information gathered from the survey and focus groups will be used to develop a leadership academy for members of underrepresented groups and measure progress toward increasing the representation of women of color, LGBTQ individuals, deaf and hard of hearing, individuals with disabilities and Native women in leadership positions in anti-violence organizations in the states of Virginia, Minnesota, New Jersey and Vermont over five years.

There are very few studies focused on understanding the leadership of women of color, LGBTQ individuals, deaf and hard of hearing, individuals with disabilities and Native women within the field of violence against women. In many instances, it is assumed that the leadership challenges faced by these groups are monolithic and similar across geographic location, age and other related factors. However, research shows that the leadership and work experiences of individuals and groups vary based upon their social location, racial and ethnic background, educational attainment levels, entry point into the field or profession, sexual orientation or gender identity, ability, age and a host of other factors. In fact, the intersections of any of the aforementioned markers can compound or exacerbate the experiences of discrimination or lack of mobility within the field of violence against women for underrepresented individuals or groups.

Our findings suggest:

As individuals from underrepresented groups advance within the field of violence against women, they are more likely to experience isolation or feel disconnected from their peers, colleagues or the communities they serve.

- Along the career spectrum, from volunteer to executive director, individuals from underrepresented groups are clustered at the entry-to mid-level positions within anti-violence organizations in the four states.

- Among focus groups participants, 90 percent identified as a survivor of violence ranging from domestic violence to sexual abuse/violence to witnessing violence in the home as a child/adolescent.
• For Executive directors and advocates, over 80 percent identified personal experience as the primary motivator for entering the field of violence against women.

• Close to 60 percent of organizations surveyed reported having a statement of principles uplifting values of diversity and inclusion, but less than 10 percent reported holding regular trainings or ongoing learning opportunities for staff on issues related to diversity or inclusion.

• Of the executive directors surveyed, 45 percent have been employed at their organization for 10 years or more and close to one-third report serving in their current position for 10 years or more.

• Approximately 81 percent of the executive directors surveyed identified as white non-Hispanic and fewer than 20 percent identified as African-American (8 percent), Latino (5 percent), Asian Pacific Islander (1 percent) or Native American (2 percent).

• Seventy-four percent of advocates and 86 percent of executive directors surveyed had completed either a bachelor’s degree or graduate degree. Among Latinos and African-Americans surveyed, 36 percent and 40 percent, respectively, had completed a bachelor’s degree compared to 49 percent of white respondents.

• Across educational levels, white women were the only group who reported holding the position of executive director with only a high school diploma or its equivalent.

• Nearly one-third of organizations reported having an operating budget of $1 million or more and half reported operating budgets between $300,000 and $1 million.

• Sixty-two percent of organizations reported having less than 20 staff members. Thirteen out of 90 programs reported having at least one program director who identified as a member of an underrepresented racial or ethnic group.

• Of the organizations surveyed, only four reported having a transgendered or gender-non-conforming person as a staff member. No organization reported having an executive director/CEO who identified as transgender or gender non-conforming.

• Sixty-one percent of the organizations surveyed with less than 20 employees had an individual who identified as having a disability. However, only one organization reported having an individual with a disability as the executive director/CEO.

• In small to medium size anti-violence organizations, individuals from underrepresented groups are more likely to be employed in low-level or mid-level manager positions regardless of the length of time in the field. Nearly 67 percent of coordinators or program specialists of color between the ages of 46-55 have been in the field of violence against women between 10-15 years.

• Of all identified positions within anti-violence organizations, advocates and case managers were more likely to earn less than $45,000 at 79 percent, followed by executive assistants (54 percent) and coordinator/specialist (53 percent). Less than two percent of individuals within these positions earned $60,000 or more.

• Seventy-three percent of advocates of color trust their direct supervisor to act in their best interest and 50 percent feel supported by their organization. Close to 70 percent of advocates report feeling appreciated or valued by their organization.

• Eighty-six percent of advocates of color report feeling prepared to fulfill the duties and responsibilities of their position and 93 percent indicated that they knew who to speak to in their organization if they experienced problems or issues related to their job duties or responsibilities.

Our findings confirm the great need to develop and support the leadership of women of color, LGBTQ individuals, deaf and hard of hearing, individuals with disabilities and Native women in order to build more diverse and inclusive anti-violence organizations.

The lack of attention to the development of a diverse leadership bench or pipeline of talented leaders within the field and within organizations will not only undermine organizations, but also the guiding principles of fairness, equality and justice of the movement to end violence against women, children and families.
From February 2011-June 2011, the Women of Color Policy Network at New York University’s Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service conducted 11 focus groups in five states with advocates and practitioners working in the field of violence against women. States include Wisconsin, Minnesota, Virginia, New Jersey and Vermont. Each focus group consisted of 5-12 advocates recruited through an open process with the assistance of designated project leads who are employed in anti-violence organizations within each state.

In addition to focus groups, the Women of Color Policy Network, NYU Wagner designed a field survey that was disseminated to the field in July 2011. Overall, 190 advocates and 90 executive directors in the states of Minnesota, Virginia, New Jersey and Vermont completed the survey. Organizations surveyed included anti-violence organizations that are members of a statewide coalition.
The anti-violence movement in the United States is intimately linked to the US women’s and feminist movements. Both movements, organized primarily, but not exclusively by white women, sought to advance women’s equality and rights by advocating for civil and legal protections for women extending to the protection and prosecution of domestic and sexual violence/abuse. During this period, based on feminist principles and ideals, many domestic violence shelters, programs, rape crisis centers and hotlines were birthed.

The model used both within the women’s movement and within the anti-violence movement insisted that the root causes of violence against women and women’s unequal treatment in society was patriarchy and sexism. As such, remedies to address violence against women were narrow and based on a gendered understanding of violence without regard for the impact of race, ethnicity, ability or other markers of difference.

With few exceptions, in the very beginning of the movement most of the leadership of the shelter programs and organizations were white non-Hispanic women. The normative (ideal or what should be) leadership models adopted by these organizations tended to be based on feminist principles of equality, fairness and non-hierarchy.

Structurally, over the last thirty years, there have been very few shifts in the leadership within the anti-violence movement and within organizations. Overwhelmingly, leadership in top positions has remained mostly white, and the analysis and framing of the issue of violence against women as a gender issue has remained intact.

Because of the way the anti-violence movement and organizations have been structured and models to address the issue institutionalized, it is very difficult for issues of culture, race, ethnicity, ability and other related issues have been seen as issues equally impactful in terms of root causes of violence against women.

Connectedly, because women of color, native women, LGBTQ, individuals with disabilities and others from underrepresented groups were not equally represented at decision-making tables and in leadership positions in the early anti-violence movements; their absence in top leadership positions is still an issue.
FRAMING THE EXPERIENCES OF UNDERREPRESENTED GROUPS IN THE FIELD OF VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN: THE PYRAMIDIC LADDER AND INVISIBLE CEILING

For women of color and other underrepresented groups working in the field of violence against women, the career ladder is often pyramidic, meaning that the bottom of the ladder is wider than the top. As individuals climb the ladder, it narrows and there is increased isolation and less diversity.

While most individuals in any career can expect to enter at the bottom of the ladder, there is also the expectation that over time the individual will move up or reach the top of her field. Within the anti-violence movement and organizations, individuals from underrepresented groups are often overrepresented and clustered at the bottom of the career ladder and underrepresented in senior-level positions.

The ladder as a metaphor for the experiences of underrepresented groups within the field of violence against women implies that there are rungs or positional levels within the field. The five levels identified for the purposes of this study include: (1) Volunteer or Intern; (2) Advocate or Coordinator; (3) Manager or Specialist; (4) Director; and (5) Executive Director. Each positional level requires a specific set of soft and hard skills, knowledge or expertise.

Manager or Specialist

At the manager or specialist level, individuals may have reporting and management responsibilities. In small to mid-size anti-violence organizations, manager from underrepresented groups may be responsible for all programming related to underserved populations, feel obligated to work around the clock to meet the needs of communities or continue to provide direct services to victims or survivors of violence.

In terms of skill development at the manager or specialist level, there is a need for intensive hard skills training or education beyond the training offered at beginning of an individual’s entry into the field. Skills needed to excel in this position include, but are not limited to, fundraising and grant management, program management and development, and staff supervision.

For many managers or specialists, it is at this level that they begin to experience a gap between the position and authority to manage or execute a program. The contradictions between organizational philosophy and practice also become more apparent and personal at this level.

As a result, many workers may start to raise questions, challenge or push back against perceived discrimination within organizations or within the field. They may also start to feel “burned out” or disillusioned by the work or the field.

Volunteer or Intern

Most individuals who enter the anti-violence field enter as a volunteer or intern. Further, many who choose to volunteer report having a personal or intimate experience with violence. They may also be survivors or victims of violence. Close to 90 percent of the individuals who participated in focus groups reported being survivors of violence ranging from domestic violence to sexual abuse/violence to witnesses of violence in the home as a child or adolescent.

The volunteer or intern position is often unpaid and where individuals begin to feel validated, empowered or learn language to apply to their experiences.

With regard to skill development, most domestic violence, sexual assault or stalking programs provide intensive training for volunteers. At this level, many individuals build their foundation and understanding of violence against women, the history of the anti-violence movement and the opportunities available to them as an intern or volunteer within the organization.
Advocate or Coordinator

The advocate or coordinator position is a critical position within many anti-violence organizations. Individuals in this role are often on the frontlines and provide direct support or services to victims or survivors. Further, many advocates or coordinators work around the clock to provide on-going support. In this position, many advocates or coordinators report trauma related to hearing the stories and experiences of the victims and survivors they support.

The advocate or coordinator position may be paid or unpaid. As a paid or institutionalized position within the organization, wages are often low. It is also not uncommon for the position to be part-time or a hybrid of paid and unpaid work. In our survey of four states, 1 in 4 advocates report earnings of $25,000 or less.

Additionally, at this level many individuals begin to understand the organizational culture or the culture of the field. They may begin to see the contradictions between the philosophy of the organization and its practices. Advocates may also begin to understand the “politics” of the movement or organization, but have difficulty negotiating or avoiding them.

In terms of the skills necessary to succeed in this position, the ability to connect with or empathize with victims and survivors, resourcefulness and a willingness to do what it takes to ensure that victims receive the support and services they need are critical. While these soft skills are necessary, individuals within this position may not develop the hard skills necessary to advance in their careers.
Director

For many small to mid-size anti-violence organizations, the director is often a senior-level position and a part of the decision-making or leadership team within the institution. In our survey in four states, very few individuals from underrepresented groups held the title or position of director. Less than 10 percent of program or deputy directors surveyed identified as a person of color.

Directors of color or from underrepresented groups often report feelings of isolation or tokenization. They also report feeling as though they have to represent the voices of all members from underrepresented groups within their organization.

At this level, there is a significant amount of internal conflict and some individuals report feeling disconnected from their communities or the direct service work that initially brought them into the field. They also fear that behaving counter to organizational expectations or stepping out of the box will jeopardize their position or authority within the field or organization.

In addition to the hard skills, education and direct experience required at this level, there is also a deep need to develop a set of soft skills related to negotiating the organizational culture or field and networking in order to successfully move up the career ladder.

Executive Director

Most individuals from underrepresented groups enter the field of violence against women at the bottom of the career ladder and few ever reach the top of the profession. As individuals climb the ladder, it narrows and there tend to be fewer women of color or individuals from underrepresented represented in the position of executive director within organizations.

Less than 18 percent of executive directors of anti-violence organizations surveyed identified as a member of a racial or ethnic minority group. Eighty-two percent of executive directors identified as white non-Hispanic.

In addition to the skills required of directors, the position of executive director requires hard skills related to fundraising and development and organizational strategic planning. The skill set necessary to succeed in this position is acquired over years of being in the field and moving up through the ranks and it also includes the cultivation of strong mentors and Aspiring Allies to help negotiate the politics of the movement or organization.
THE INVISIBLE CEILING

For individuals from underrepresented groups, there is an invisible ceiling in terms of advancement and mobility within the field of violence against women. Unlike common metaphors such as the glass or concrete ceiling, the ceiling faced by these groups appears non-existent until women or individuals attempt to break through it or seek to advance within their profession or field.

Connectedly, in our research of individuals from underrepresented groups in four states working within the anti-violence field, many never advance beyond the manager level and most are clustered at the entry level of the field as coordinators or advocates, regardless of the number of years of experience within the field.

Ninety-one percent of people of color surveyed held management or lower positions within anti-violence organizations and only nine percent held director-level positions. Specifically, 41 percent were advocates or case managers, 25 percent of those surveyed held the position of coordinator or specialist, 9.5 percent were executive assistants or administrative staff and only 15.6 percent were managers or supervisors.

Forty percent of coordinators have been in their position for more than 10 years and 1 out of 10 advocates have been in their position for 10 or more years. Within the management level position, 20 percent report having been in their position for 10 or more years.

The history and culture of the field of violence against women premised on feminist values of equality of opportunity and access, shared fate and common goals, as well as an understanding of gender oppression and discrimination, work to maintain and perpetuate the invisible ceiling that often limits access and the upward mobility of women of color, LGBTQ individuals, deaf and hard of hearing individuals, native women, individuals with disabilities and others within the field of violence against women.

As a result, failure to break through the invisible ceiling is often seen as an individual failing or choice rather than a structural or institutional problem within the field or profession.
Most individuals from underrepresented groups enter the field of violence against women at the bottom of the career ladder and few ever reach the top of the profession. As individuals climb the ladder, it narrows and there tend to be fewer women of color or individuals from underrepresented in the position of executive director within organizations.

**Skill Development:** In addition to the skills required of directors, the position of executive director requires hard skills related to fundraising and development and organizational strategic planning. The skill set necessary to succeed in this position is acquired over years of being in the field and moving up through the ranks and it also includes the cultivation of strong mentors and allies to help negotiate the politics of the movement or organization.

For many small to mid-size anti-violence organizations, the director is often a senior-level position and a part of the decision-making or leadership team within the institution. In our survey in four states, very few individuals from underrepresented groups held the title or position of director.

**Skill Development:** In addition to the hard skills, education and direct experience required at this level, there is also a deep need to develop a set of soft skills related to negotiating the organizational culture or field and networking in order to successfully move up the career ladder.

For individuals from underrepresented groups, there is an invisible ceiling in terms of advancement and mobility within the anti-violence field. Unlike common metaphors such as the glass or concrete ceiling, the ceiling faced by these groups appears non-existent until women or individuals attempt to break through it or seek to advance within their profession or field. Failure to break through the invisible ceiling is often seen as an individual failing or choice rather than a structural or institutional problem within the field or profession.

At the manager level, individuals may have reporting and management responsibilities. In small to mid-size anti-violence organizations, manager from underrepresented groups may be responsible for all programming related to underrepresented populations. Feel obligated to work around the clock to meet the needs of communities or continue to provide direct services to victims or survivors of violence.

**Skill Development:** In terms of skill development at the manager level, there is a need for intensive hard skills training or education beyond the training offered at beginning of an individual’s entry into the field. Skills needed to excel in this position include, but are not limited to, fundraising and grant management, program management and development, and staff supervision.

The advocate or coordinator position is a critical position within many anti-violence organizations. Individuals in this role are often on the frontlines and provide direct support or services to victims or survivors. Further, many advocates or coordinators work around the clock to provide on-going support. In this position, many advocates or coordinators report trauma related to hearing the stories and experiences of the victims and survivors they support.

**Skill Development:** In terms of the skills necessary to succeed in this position, the ability to connect with or empathize with victims and survivors, resourcefulness and a willingness to do what it takes to ensure that victims receive the support and services they need are critical. While these soft skills are necessary, individuals within this position may not develop the hard skills necessary to advance in their careers.

Most individuals who enter the anti-violence field enter as a volunteer or intern. The volunteer or intern position is often unpaid and where individuals begin to feel validated, empowered or learn language for their experiences.

**Skill Development:** With regard to skill development, most domestic violence, sexual assault or stalking programs provide intensive training for volunteers. At this level, many individuals build their foundation and understanding of violence against women, the history of the anti-violence movement and the opportunities available to them as an intern or volunteer within the organization.
MOBILITY WITHIN THE FIELD

Regardless of the length of time spent working in the field of violence against women, there is very little opportunity for positional advancement for individuals from underrepresented groups. Instead, they are more likely to move laterally as opposed to upward within the field. The best and most plausible explanation for the lack of mobility within the profession is the fact there are very few vacancies in top leadership positions within anti-violence organizations.

Of the executive directors surveyed, 45 percent have been employed at their organization for 10 years or more, and close to one-third report serving in their current position for 10 years or more.

In small to medium size anti-violence organizations, individuals from underrepresented groups are more likely to be employed in low-level or mid-level manager positions regardless of the length of time working in the field.

For example, 66.7 percent of coordinators or program specialists of color between the ages of 46-55 have been in the field of violence against women between 10-15 years. 50 percent of advocates or case managers of color also report being in the field for 10 or more years. Of people of color employed as advocates between the ages of 36-45, 12.5 percent have been in the field for 10-15 years.

Relatedly, some focus groups participants spoke openly about the lack of mobility or the fear of not being able to find a new position if they left their current organization or position. Because many advocates or individuals grow into a position or the position is created based on the skill set of the individual, once she leaves it may be difficult to obtain a new position.

It is important to note that participants who held a college or advanced degree were more likely to express confidence in their ability to secure another position within or outside of the field of violence against women.

In order to diversify leadership in top positions and on the Board of Directors within the anti-violence field, organizations, funders and other key stakeholders will have to come together to develop a collaborative strategic affirmative plan to support existing and emerging leaders.

“I think I could definitely go but I think a lot of it has to do with the letters after my name, more than anything else.”

“I do worry about that. Hopefully, my next job will be retirement, but it does occur to me that this is a very narrowly focused field and that the things that I’m involved in might not be relevant in other agencies, social service agencies. I don’t have a clinical degree, so I wouldn’t be able to sell myself so easily to a counseling agency or something like that; even though I certainly have all the background and skills for something like that.”

“I guess because of my experience, I have broad experience in the social services field and I have degrees and I have letters; and I’m bilingual. And so, I have confidence that I can find another position.”
There are 181 domestic violence or sexual assault programs in Vermont, New Jersey, Minnesota and Virginia. Each program provides programming and services to a diverse constituency based on the needs and demographics of local communities.

Half of the programs in these states participated in the Women of Color Network leadership survey. The goals of these surveys were to better understand the composition of state-level and local domestic violence and sexual assault programs; benchmark diversity efforts within programs related to staff, the board of directors and caucuses, and assess the institutional and structural barriers to leadership for underrepresented groups and individuals.

**BASIC DEMOGRAPHICS**

More than 60 percent of organizations surveyed in the four states identified as dual programs focused on both sexual and domestic violence. Twenty-nine percent focused only on domestic violence and two percent focused on sexual violence or assault.

![Figure 1. Organizational Focus](image)

**OPERATING BUDGETS**

Fifty percent of organizations surveyed reported general operating budgets between $300,000-$1 million and nearly one-third reported annual general operating budgets of $1 million dollars or more.

![Figure 2. Annual Operating Budgets](image)
CONSTITUENTS SERVED

Many anti-violence organizations have a broad constituency in terms of race, gender and ethnic diversity. Ninety-three percent of the organizations surveyed identified women as their primary constituency. Ninety percent also report serving children and youth, followed by families (70 percent) and LGBTQ individuals (79 percent). A little more than two-thirds of organizations report serving adult male victims of violence and only 10 percent of programs report serving adult male perpetrators of violence.

Race and Ethnicity

In terms of race and ethnicity, close to one-third of organizations surveyed reported that over 50 percent of their constituency was a member of a racial or ethnic minority group.

Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, or Queer (LGBTQ)

Although domestic violence or abuse occurs within same-sex relationships at rates equal to heterosexual relationships\(^4\), two-thirds of executive directors surveyed in the four states indicate that less than 5 percent of individuals served identified as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, transgender or gender non-conforming. Thirty-three percent of executive directors reported serving more than 5 percent of LGBTQ individuals.
Individuals with Disabilities and Deaf or Hard of Hearing

With regard to individuals with disabilities, 50 percent of executive directors surveyed identified that less than 10 percent of the constituents served have a disability and nearly one-third of organizations surveyed reported that 10-20 percent of their constituents have a disability. Ninety-three percent of organizations surveyed reported that less than 5 percent of constituents served are deaf or hard of hearing.

Refugees or Immigrants

Twenty percent of organizations surveyed reported that refugees or immigrants make up more than 30 percent of the constituents served and 64 percent of organizations reported serving less than 10 percent of this population.

Age

In terms of constituency served, nearly 60 percent of organizations surveyed reported that 40-60 percent of individuals served are under the age of 35. Nearly two-thirds of organizations reported that less than 20 percent of the individuals served are over the age of 55.

Most individuals served by anti-violence organizations are under the age of 35.

STAFF DEMOGRAPHICS IN ANTI-VIOLENCE ORGANIZATIONS

For anti-violence organizations, employing a diverse and representative staff is essential to providing culturally competent and relevant services to an increasingly diverse constituency. Diversity not only impacts the quality of services delivered to communities, but informs the organizational culture of the institution as well.

Nearly two-thirds of organizations surveyed have 10 or fewer full-time employees and less than 15 percent report over 20 full-time staff. Organizations with less than 10 employees are twice as likely to rely on part-time support. Organizations that report more than 10 staff members are least likely to have part-time staff.
Salary and Compensation By Position

Within the nonprofit sector, salary and compensation is based on a number of factors including size of the organization, geographic location and experience, among other factors. In 2011, the median executive director salary is $92,250. In organizations with budgets less than $1 million, the median salary is $75,000.\(^5\)

Approximately 40 percent of executive directors surveyed in the four states earned an annual salary of more than $60,000 and of that number 18 percent report a salary of $80,000 or more. Less than 21 percent report annual earnings of less than $45,000. For executive directors who reported earnings under $45,000, 50 percent worked in organizations with budgets between $150,001-$300,000.

It is important to note that there is very little correlation between salary and organizational budget for Executive directors in the four states. For executive directors who reported earnings between $60,001-$80,000, 16.7 percent worked in organizations with budgets between $150,001-$300,000 and 20 percent of executive directors earning more than $80,000 per year reported organizational budgets between $300,000-$500,000.

Individuals in low to mid-level positions within organizations were likely to earn less than $45,000 regardless of organizational budget. Of all identified positions, advocates and case managers were more likely to make less than $45,000 (79 percent), followed by executive assistants (54 percent) and coordinator/specialist (53 percent). Less than two percent of individuals within these positions earned $60,000 or more.

In terms of organizational budget, 20 percent of advocates earning less than $45,000 worked in organizations with budgets between $1 million and $2 million and an equal number worked in organizations with budgets between $300,000-$500,000. For those making between $45,001-$60,000, all were employed at organizations with budgets over $3 million.

Advocates

Within the anti-violence organizations surveyed, individuals from underrepresented groups, specifically racial and ethnic minority women were more likely to be employed as advocates. Ninety-seven percent of advocates employed in organizations with budgets over $300,000 earn less than $45,000 per year. Less than three percent of advocates earned more than $45,000 but less than $60,000.

Coordinators/Specialists

Similarly, in organizations with annual operating budgets of more than $300,000, 76 percent of coordinators or specialists reported earning less than $45,000.
Managers/Supervisors

As workers climb the career ladder within the field of violence against women, earnings increase slightly. Fifty-eight percent of managers or supervisors report earnings under $45,000 and nearly 40 percent earn between $45,000-60,000. Only three percent of managers in the survey reported earnings over $60,000.

Program Directors

Individuals from underrepresented groups comprise less than 10 percent of reported directors in the survey. Approximately 40 percent of directors within anti-violence organizations with annual budgets over $300,000 reported salaries between $45,001-$60,000 and close to half (45 percent) reported salaries under $45,000.

Executive Directors

Within the Executive Director position, there is more distribution within salary categories. Only 17 percent of executive directors make under $45,000, over 40 percent make between $45,001-$60,000, 26 percent make between $60,001-$80,000, and nearly 20 percent make over $80,000.

To better understand the composition of staff in anti-violence organizations within the four states, executive directors with more than 20 employees answered a series of questions related to race, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation and gender identity of staff.

Compared to smaller nonprofit organizations, organizations with more than 20 employees tend to have more opportunities to fill open positions with individuals from underrepresented groups, including senior-level positions.

Anti-violence organizations surveyed were more likely to hire individuals from underrepresented groups in low-to-mid-level management positions. Of organizations with 20 or more employees, only one organization reported an individual from a racial or ethnic group in the position of executive director or deputy director. No organization surveyed had more than one individual from an underrepresented group in a senior-level position. However, in lower level or administrative positions, organizations tended to employ one or more individuals from an underrepresented group.

Figure 8. Women of Color in Positions across Organizations with More than 20 Employees
With regard to gender identity or expression, only one organization reported employing a transgendered person.

![Figure 9. Percentage of Organizations Reporting Transgender Individuals in Positions across Organizations with More than 20 Employees](image)

Similar to other groups, the number of individuals employed within anti-violence organizations in the four states with a disability was low. Only 5 organizations out of 90 surveyed reported more than one employee who identified as having a disability. In all of the organizations surveyed, no individual with a disability was employed in a senior-level position.

Related to age, only two organizations reported having an executive director under the age of 35. The majority of individuals employed in organizations under the age of 35 were employed in entry-to mid-level management positions.

### DIVERSITY IN ORGANIZATIONS WITH LESS THAN 20 EMPLOYEES

Organizations with less than 20 employees tend to have less flexibility in hiring and promotion. Individuals employed at smaller organizations are more likely to have expansive job duties and responsibilities and remain within their position for longer periods of time compared to larger organizations.

In anti-violence organizations within the four states, individuals under the age of 35 or who identify as gay, lesbian or bi-sexual are underrepresented in senior-level positions. Similarly, individuals over the age of 55 are underrepresented in senior-level positions within organizations.

Individuals between the ages of 36-55 are more likely to hold the position of executive director within organizations with less than 50 employees, but are less likely to hold other senior level positions, such as deputy director or program director.
HIRING PRACTICES WITHIN ORGANIZATIONS

In many small to mid-size nonprofit organizations, funding is often the primary driver of hiring decisions. Of the organizations surveyed, programmatic need and funding were equal considerations in hiring practices at 35 percent and 33 percent respectively. Only 24 percent reported organizational need as an influence on hiring practices.

With regard to hiring practices related to individuals from underrepresented groups, within the last year women of color and individuals under the age of 35 were more likely to be hired. Nearly 10 percent of executive directors reported hiring 5 or more individuals under the age of 35 within the last year and 5 percent reported hiring 5 or more racial or ethnic minorities.

Ninety-four percent of organizations reported hiring a deaf or hard of hearing person within the last year and 97 percent reported hiring 1 or less individuals over the age of 55 within the last year.

Hiring practices related to LGBTQ individuals, refugee and immigrants are the same. 97 percent of executive directors surveyed reported that one or less persons were hired from within those groups within the last year.
POSITION BY RACE

Forty-one percent of individuals of color employed at anti-violence organizations within the four states held the position of advocate or case manager and 25 percent were employed as coordinators or program specialists. Latino women were more likely to be employed as an advocate or case manager than any other position within anti-violence organizations. Fifteen percent of managers or supervisors of the organizations surveyed belonged to a racial or ethnic minority group.

Less than 10 percent of advocates of color surveyed report holding the position of director within their organization.

RECRUITMENT CHALLENGES

Advocates in the four states surveyed identified geographic location, low pay compared to other fields and the lack of attention paid to recruitment and retention of members from underrepresented groups within their organizations as challenges faced by their institution in terms of attracting racial and ethnic minorities, LGBTQ individuals, Native women, individuals with disabilities or others.

Of the state-level programs in Virginia, Vermont, New Jersey and Minnesota, only a handful are in urban cities where there is likely to be higher levels of diversity in terms of race, ethnicity, sexual or gender identity or other markers of difference.

TRAINING AND ONGOING LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES

Providing training and ongoing learning opportunities for staff within anti-violence organizations works to ensure victims and survivors receive culturally competent and sensitive services and that staff are informed of emerging trends and developments within the field.

Nearly 90 percent of executive directors surveyed reported that the organization provided training on issues related to underrepresented populations including cultural competency. Among all groups and topics, training on issues related to Native women and Aspiring Allies were least likely to be provided by organizations at 57 percent and 52 percent, respectively.

While nearly 90 percent of executive directors reported providing training and ongoing learning opportunities, the frequency of the trainings varied, with one-third of organizations reporting providing training only as needed. Only 10 percent of organizations surveyed reported holding trainings monthly or twice per year. Trainings related to Native women or individuals with disabilities were least likely to occur within organizations surveyed. Advocates who answered a similar question regarding training and ongoing training within organizations reported that trainings happen on an as-needed basis.

All of the executive directors surveyed reported that the organization allows staff to attend outside training or conferences on topics of interest or related to their job duties or responsibilities. Ninety-seven percent of executive directors surveyed also reported that the organization covered the cost of outside training.
PROGRAMS AND INITIATIVES

Approximately half of all executive directors surveyed reported offering programs and initiatives related to people of color, individuals with disabilities or cultural competency. Roughly one-third of respondents indicated that their organizations offered programs or initiatives related to LGBTQ individuals, Native women, Aspiring Allies and racism. When asked if the programs or initiatives related to these groups were institutionalized within organizations, however, less than 20 percent answered affirmatively, with close to 60 percent non-responsive.

CAUCUSES, TASK FORCES OR ADVISORY COMMITTEES

To better support individuals from underrepresented groups, many anti-violence organizations have established caucuses, task forces or advisory committees designed to support individuals from underrepresented groups, as well as provide institutional support to organizations.

Caucuses dedicated to issues impacting racial and ethnic minorities and LGBTQ individuals were the most commonly reported by organizations. Over 60 percent of respondents reported task forces or caucuses related to these groups. The second most commonly reported task forces or advisory committees were on immigrant populations and cultural competency, with over 40 percent of individuals reporting committees related to these particular issues.

Task forces or committees dedicated to individuals with disabilities, Native women, allies and racism, were least likely to exist within anti-violence organizations in the four states surveyed.

Eighty-one percent of advocates surveyed indicated that their organization supported attendance or involvement in identity or issue-based caucuses within the organization or state. Seventy-seven percent also attended regular task force or committee meetings.

Those who indicated that they were not authorized to attend caucus or advisory committee meetings by their organization reported budget constraints, schedule conflicts and lack of time as reasons for not participating in identity or issue-based caucuses in the organization or in the state.
UPSETTING THE APPLE CART: DIFFICULT CONVERSATIONS WITHIN ORGANIZATIONS

It is often the case that conversations related to race, sexual identity, gender expression ability or other markers of difference are charged, filled with emotion or personal investments within social change organizations. Most times, conversations or trainings occur as a result of an incident or a problem.

In terms of creating a safe and supportive environment for employees, organizations should create opportunities for training and ongoing learning on topics related to cultural diversity and underrepresented groups for all staff members.

In our surveys, 55 percent of advocates and 77 percent of executive directors agreed that discussions of race and ethnicity occur frequently within organizations while 25 percent of advocates surveyed reported that these discussions happen infrequently within their organization. Only 10 percent of executive directors felt that these discussions happen infrequently.

Executive directors were more likely to agree that employees are equipped to handle racially charged or difficult work situations (69 percent) compared to 48 percent of advocates of color. Thirty-one percent of advocates of color surveyed reported that employees within their organization were not equipped to handle racially charged or difficult work situations.

In terms of integration of issues of race and ethnicity into programs and initiatives within organizations, 40 percent of advocates and 70 percent of executive directors agreed that these issues were successfully incorporated into the organization. Twenty-two percent of advocates and ten percent of executive directors reported that issues of race and ethnicity were not successfully integrated into their organization.
Similarly, discussion on issues related to sexual orientation and gender identity were more likely to occur within anti-violence organizations in the four states surveyed. Close to 65 percent of executive directors and 50 percent of advocates say that issues related to sexual orientation and gender are integrated into their programs and initiatives.

With regard to discussions related to ability and disabilities, close to 50 percent of advocates and 60 percent of executive directors surveyed report that discussions occur frequently.
This section of the report focuses on the executive directors of anti-violence organizations in Vermont, Virginia, Minnesota and New Jersey.

Across the country, diversity in top positions within the anti-violence field has been an ongoing challenge. Similar to many fields within the nonprofit sector, our findings confirm individuals from underrepresented groups are grossly underrepresented as heads of organizations within the anti-violence field. Less than 20 percent of executive directors within anti-violence organizations in the four states are members of an underrepresented group.
RACIAL AND ETHNIC BACKGROUND

Of the anti-violence organizations surveyed in four states, approximately 87 percent of executive directors identified as white, fewer than five percent identified as Latino, roughly four percent identified as African American, two percent identified as Asian, Pacific Islander and two percent as Native American.

AGE

There is a direct correlation with age and senior-level positions within most nonprofit organizations. Within the organizations surveyed, individuals under the age of 35 tend to be employed in junior or mid-level management positions. Nearly 40 percent of executive directors surveyed were between 46-55 years old and 29 percent reported being 56 or older.

GENDER IDENTITY

The top leadership positions within the anti-violence movement in four states are more likely to be held by women. In terms of gender identity or expression, only one executive director surveyed identified as a male.
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

Sixty percent of executive directors reported completion of a graduate degree and one-third held a bachelor’s degree. About four percent of the respondents had only completed high school or its equivalent.

All of the Asian, Pacific Islander, Latino, African American, and Native individuals surveyed in the role of executive director reported having a graduate degree, compared to 56 percent of White non-Hispanic executive directors. Nearly 30 percent of those who identified as Black, African American had completed a Bachelor’s Degree (28.6 percent), while 43 percent had completed a Graduate Degree. For those who identified as Latino, 25 percent had completed a bachelor’s degree and 50 percent had completed a graduate degree.

![Figure 21. Executive Directors/ Educational Attainment](image)

Among those surveyed, white non-Hispanic women were the only group to hold the position of executive director with a High school diploma or its equivalent, some college or an associate’s degree.

ENTRY TO THE FIELD

As with most individuals working within the field of violence against women, personal experience is the primary motivator for choosing to enter the field. Forty-five percent indicated personal experience as their reason for entering the field. Close to 30 percent indicated a personal experience of a friend or family member as the catalyst for entering the anti-violence field.

![Figure 22. Executive Directors, Entry Point](image)
LENGTH OF TIME IN THE FIELD

More than 30 percent of executive directors reported being in the field of violence against women for more than 20 years and a significant number, 35 percent, report being in the field between 10 to 20 years.

LENGTH OF TIME WITH YOUR ORGANIZATION AND IN YOUR POSITION

Our research confirms the belief held by many anti-violence advocates and leadership experts that there is very little turnover or transition in top positions within organizations.

Nearly 30 percent of executive directors of anti-violence organizations in the four states surveyed reported holding the position for 10 years or more, and 20 percent indicate that they plan to remain in their current role for 10 years or more. Relatedly, 20 percent of respondents report being employed at their current organization between 10-15 years.

PRIMARY WAY BECAME EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND TITLE OF LAST POSITION

The most frequent path to the executive director position within organizations for those surveyed was by replying to a job posting (46 percent), followed by working at the organization in a different capacity (18 percent). Seventeen percent reported being asked to apply for the position by a colleague or member of the board of directors.

In terms of the last position held, 20 percent of executive directors identified their last roles as CEO and a near equal amount identified their prior role as program director (15 percent).
STAFF RELATIONSHIPS

In addition to ensuring the programmatic and financial solvency of the organization, executive directors are charged with ensuring that staff are highly productive and feel supported in the workplace.

Eighty-four percent of executive directors surveyed believed that their employees trust them to act in their best interest. Only two percent of those surveyed disagreed with the statement. When asked a similar question related to employees of color, only 68 percent answered affirmatively.

When advocates of color were asked about their working relationship with their direct supervisor, close to 70 percent of the respondents did not trust their supervisor to act in their best interest.

In terms of providing constructive or honest feedback to employees, 94 percent of executive directors agreed that they were able to provide feedback to employees. A smaller percentage of executive directors (87 percent) reported that they felt comfortable providing constructive or honest feedback to employees of color.

Eighty-four percent of executive directors surveyed believed that employees from underrepresented groups felt valued. None of the executive directors disagreed with the statement that “employees from underrepresented groups in my organization feel valued.” When advocates of color were asked a similar question, nearly one in five did not feel valued within the organization.
PREPAREDNESS TO FULFILL DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF POSITION

Seventy-nine percent of Executive directors surveyed believe employees come to the organization prepared to fulfill the duties and responsibilities of the position and 90 percent believe employees learn the skills they need for the position on the job.

COMMUNICATING DIFFICULTY WITH A TASK

Eighty-two percent of executive directors believe employees are comfortable communicating their difficulty with a task or project to their direct supervisor. A slightly lower number of advocates agreed with the statement at 69 percent and nearly 10 percent reported that they did not feel comfortable communicating difficulty with a task or project with their direct supervisor.
This section focuses on advocates working in anti-violence programs in four states: New Jersey, Virginia, Minnesota and Vermont. Using data collected from the focus groups and a field survey, this section more fully describes the nearly 80 women who participated in the focus groups and the 190 advocates surveyed between February 2011-August 2011.

The individuals who participated in the study for this project are diverse in terms of racial and ethnic identity, age, income level, position within the field and sexual orientation. In conducting the focus groups and survey, we sought to cast a wide net in order to capture the range of experiences of advocates working in the field of violence against women, barriers to success and opportunities to support these leaders.
WHO ARE THESE WOMEN

Age

Nearly 64 percent of advocates of color surveyed were under the age of 45 and 36 percent were over 46 years old. Only 5 percent of those surveyed were under the age of 24.

Gender

Similar to executive directors working within the anti-violence field, approximately four percent of the advocates of color surveyed identified as female while roughly five percent identified as male, and one percent identified as transgender.

Educational attainment

Perhaps the most interesting result from this analysis is what stems from a closer examination of the position of case manager/advocate: 43 percent of those who identified as working in this position had completed either a bachelor’s degree or a graduate degree.

Advocates of color working within the field of violence against women are likely to hold a bachelor’s or graduate degree. Thirty-seven percent of advocates of color surveyed reported holding a bachelor’s degree and 32 percent report holding a graduate degree or more.

For program directors, 60 percent of advocates of color had completed a bachelor’s degree and 40 percent had completed a graduate degree.

For managers or supervisors, 10 percent had completed a high school degree or its equivalent, 20 percent had completed some college, 20 percent had completed a bachelor’s degree, and 50 percent had completed a graduate degree.

For executive assistants, one-third had completed a high school degree or its equivalent, 50 percent had completed some college, and 17 percent had completed a bachelor’s degree.

For coordinators or specialists, 41 percent had completed a bachelor’s degree and 35 percent had completed a graduate degree.

For advocates or case managers, 52 percent had completed a bachelor’s degree and 15 percent had completed a graduate degree.
EMPLOYMENT ROLES AND POSITIONS

Employment Status

Eighty percent of advocates of color surveyed reported full-time employment and only 11 percent reported part-time status. Only three percent of respondents identified as a volunteers, independent activist or seasonal employee. A mere one percent of those surveyed indicated they were a board member of an anti-violence organization.

Income

Most advocates, 72 percent of those surveyed, reported annual earnings between $25,000-50,000. Thirteen percent of advocates indicated that they earned between $50,001-$75,000. No respondent of color reported annual earnings over $75,000. White non-Hispanic advocates surveyed were more likely to report earnings over $75,000 compared to advocates of color.
ORGANIZATIONAL POSITION BY RACE AND ETHNICITY

Thirty-seven percent of individuals of color employed at anti-violence organizations within the four states held the position of advocate or case manager and 23 percent were employed as coordinators or program specialists. Latino and black women were more likely to be employed as an advocate or case manager than any other position within anti-violence organizations. Fourteen percent of managers or supervisors of the organizations surveyed belonged to a racial or ethnic minority group.

Less than 10 percent of advocates of color surveyed report holding the position of director within their organization.

Deputy and Program Directors

Although there were very few advocates from underrepresented groups who reported holding the position of deputy director within the four states, of those who did, the annual reported salary was between $25,001-$50,000. White-non-Hispanics who held the position of deputy director within anti-violence organizations reported earnings of at least $25,000 more than advocates from underrepresented groups in the same position. In the program director position within organizations, 80 percent of program directors of color reported annual earnings between $50,001-$75,000.

Managers and Supervisors

Ninety percent of managers and supervisors from underrepresented groups reported annual earnings between $25,001-$50,000 compared to 70 percent of white non-Hispanic advocates in the four states. Additionally, only 10 percent of managers or supervisors of color made between $50,001-$75,000, compared to 30 percent of white advocates.

Executive Assistants

Within anti-violence organizations, individuals from underrepresented groups were more likely to hold support staff positions such as administrative or executive assistant. Fifty percent of advocates of color who were employed as executive assistants made between $10,001-$25,000, no white respondents fell into this income category. 100 percent of the white respondents employed as executive assistants had an annual income between $25,001-$50,000.

Coordinators, Specialists and Advocates

Eighty-seven percent of individuals from underrepresented groups in the role of coordinator or specialist within anti-violence organizations reported annual incomes between $25,001-$50,000. A smaller portion of advocates, 13 percent, reported making between $50,001-$75,000.
Four percent of individuals in the advocate position within organizations reported annual earnings between $10,000 and $25,000. The majority of advocates surveyed, 78 percent, reported earning between $25,000-$50,000 annually.

**ENTRY POINT TO THE WORK**

The entry point to the work is critically important in terms of understanding the motivation and reasons behind choosing to work in the anti-violence field for underrepresented groups. It helps to provide context in terms of why individuals might choose to stay in the profession despite discrimination, lack of opportunities for advancement or other barriers to success.

Intimate or personal experience of violence is a major factor in choosing to enter the field of violence against women for underrepresented groups. Many advocates of color identified their personal experience of sexual or domestic violence as a primary reason for entering the field, as well as a need to educate their communities about the issues.

Close to 90 percent of the individuals who participated in the focus groups conducted in four states are survivors of violence, ranging from domestic violence to sexual abuse/violence to witnesses of violence in the home as a child/adolescent.

Similar results were found in the survey of advocates in the states. Personal experience is the primary motivator for entering the field of violence against women. For the advocates surveyed, 41.3 percent reported a personal experience as their reason for entering the field and 34 percent identified the personal experience of family or friends as their primary motivator.

In a similar study of women of color executive directors and mid-level managers, 61 percent of those surveyed indicated intimate, first-hand experience with a social justice issue or discrimination as the most common entry point to the field or profession.8

“I’m also a—I don’t want to say victim—I’m an overcomer, and I think that this work has been my life’s work and my ministry also, personally for myself.”

“I am a survivor. And I think it’s very important for me, for my work because I have a experiences and I can encourage the clients to do something different than I did.”

---

Figure 33. Advocates, Entry Point
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**LENGTH OF TIME IN THE FIELD OF VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN**

In terms of career trajectory and mobility, length of time is often correlated with position and status within a given field or profession. In the field survey, 30 percent of advocates of color report working in the field less than 3 years. Of those, 45 percent are under the age of 45. Fifteen percent of advocates of color have worked in the field between 10-15 years and 9 percent have worked in the field for 21 or more years.

**COMMITMENT AND PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY TO THE FIELD AND COMMUNITY**

Individuals from underrepresented groups also tend to feel an overwhelming commitment and personal responsibility to the field of violence against women and the community. This investment in the field and in the community can be attributed to at least two factors:

1. The belief that there is a lack of information or understanding about the issue of violence against women within her culture or community and a need to fill that knowledge gap.

2. The belief that ‘If I don’t do it, no one will.” Because individuals from underrepresented groups are often the few within a given community or state working on the issue who may understand the intersections of culture and violence, they may feel an additional weight or responsibility to communities or the field to play this role of bridge builder or connector.

“I know in my own family, I carry a specific weight because I come from a long line of survivors.”

“Even if you have the paper, you still jump higher because you’ve got to be superwoman. You have to put this “S” on and fly around, to even be accepted.”
EXPERIENCE WITHIN THE FIELD OF VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

This section of the report highlights the experience of advocates from underrepresented groups within the field of violence against women. It discusses in detail the challenges and barriers to career advancement as well as the opportunities to support these leaders.

Isolation within the field and within communities

Isolation experienced by individuals from underrepresented groups within the field of violence against women, within organizations and in their communities was a reoccurring theme in focus groups and in the leadership survey.

Along the career spectrum, individuals from underrepresented groups are clustered at the entry to mid-level manager levels. As they continue to climb the ladder and or advance within the organization or the field there are very few mentors, success models and others who look like them in top leadership positions.

Many focus group participants spoke candidly about being the only or one of only a handful of women of color, LGBTQ individuals or persons with disability within the field of violence against women and within anti-violence organizations in their state.

For individuals from underrepresented groups, the feelings of isolation within organizations or the field may make it difficult to voice concerns when a perceived incident of discrimination occurs. Individuals may feel as if they are jeopardizing their position or may fear backlash from colleagues or others.

Next, within the field of violence against women and within states, there are very few individuals from underrepresented groups working together on projects and issues on a regular basis. Individual advocates and practitioners also tend to be spread across the state or disconnected from one another.

Opportunities to connect or to build networks are rare and most often occur as a result of a coalitions or taskforces or special projects. There are very few formal or institutionalized networking opportunities that are not time limited or rely on individuals to use time outside of work hours to coordinate.

Similarly, focus group participants also reported feelings of isolation working within their communities on issues related to violence against women. Many communities, there is a taboo against speaking about domestic violence, sexual assault or sexual abuse. In addition to working to overcome these taboos, advocates may also be face with negative stereotypes or perceptions about their communities from organizations or the field, which may exacerbate the feelings of isolation.

“Not only do you not get support from people who are outside of the community of color, people of color. But you also have to fight within your own community. And so, when you have odds like that it’s very hard to not only, be an agent of change. And continue with that passion of helping the people that you’re supposed to be serving.”

“What I noticed too, is the pattern has been—when women of color are hired into leadership positions, I feel because of the lack of support and because we are so separated from each other; and we don’t know each other exists. By the time I find out someone exists, they’ve quit their job and moved on to a different position.”
Approach to the work

Individuals from underrepresented groups such as women of color, LGBTQ individuals, individuals with disabilities and Native women often approach the work and the field of violence and against women through the lens and perspective of their lived experiences. The framing of the issues, the reasons why violence or abuse occurs, and the remedies/strategies to end violence or abuse are often rooted in their social location, background and culture.

Within the field of violence against women and organizations, an approach rooted in culture or that is outside of traditional approaches to addressing or solving the problem of violence against women can limit the effectiveness of advocates from underrepresented groups, increase feelings of isolation and influence their ability to advance professionally.

Many of the participants in the focus groups also spoke at length about having to play the role of cultural translator between their organizations and their communities. They also believed they had to justify or explain their approach to the work if it differed significantly or called on an additional set of resources than what was traditionally considered necessary to address a problem.

“But I think even when you try to do things differently in an organization, that the impact of the rest of the world outside your building still exists.”

“I think that the challenges that I want to talk about are the challenges that are related to doing the work, in the way that I would like to do the work. The way you relate to different communities is not necessarily the traditional way that people are used to folks going out and doing the work. When you meet the real people and you get to know the people and you see what the work is, that is needed to be done—you can see that it’s a real need.”

“You have to understand the culture. Their approach is going to be totally different. At the beginning, that was a challenge that I had to face in terms of the mentality about the culture.”

“Why is it that these women and their ideas and the things they’re trying to do are being met with such resistance?”

**STRUCTURAL AND INSTITUTIONAL DISCRIMINATION**

The lack of individuals from underrepresented groups in key leadership positions within the field of violence against women and within anti-violence organizations is influenced by myriad factors. These factors include institutional and structural discrimination, lack of access to formal networks and training opportunities and few opportunities to learn new hard and soft skills to advance within the field.

Unlike blatant laws of yesteryear that condone discrimination based on race or other markers of difference, institutional and structural discrimination is a bit harder to pinpoint or address within organizations or institutions because discriminatory practices or behaviors are not written down and may have become institutionalized (a part of the culture) over time.

As such, members from underrepresented groups may feel as if they have very limited options in terms of addressing perceived discrimination or bias within organizations. Acts of institutional or structural discrimination can manifest themselves in the form of a perceived double standard or lack of trust to carry out duties and responsibilities of a position; overreliance on the ideal or normative (what should be) of an organizational culture rather than the everyday practices or norms; and disregard for cultural practices, norms or beliefs, among others.
“I think sometimes, there are things that are very blatant and they are very clear and then there are things that aren’t. And this is for any oppressed group, I think—sometimes you don’t know if something is going on or not.”

THE DOUBLE STANDARD

Participants in focus groups also noted a double standard, a set of rules permitting greater opportunity to some individuals while limiting the opportunities for others, within organizations or the field. Specifically, they voiced concerns over the perceived lack of criteria for promotion or advancement within organizations. Several respondents reported being told by supervisors that a position required a specific skill set or degree and in the hiring process the position would be offered to an individual who did not possess those skills or qualifications.

“And then, even though I had been educated in some of the best schools and went to graduate school, when I came in for my interview I was asked to write another Letter of Intent there, at the school. Because they didn’t think that I composed what I did initially.”

“You have to have mega-credentials and others can be directors with [none]...some have no degrees.”

“We’re all feminists working to end violence against women.”

The founding feminist principles of the anti-violence movement rooted in normative ideals of equality and fairness have in some ways served as a barrier to addressing issues of racism, homophobia, ableism and other forms of discrimination within the field of violence against women.

It’s the notion that “we’re all in the same boat” as women or that racism or other forms of discrimination cannot exist in a field dedicated to ending sexism or violence against women that has served as a barrier to identifying and addressing the difficulties underrepresented groups face within the field of violence against women or when attempting to advance or exercise leadership within organizations. For individuals from underrepresented groups, naming or raising the issue of discrimination or differential treatment can often feel like a burden or betrayal.

OUR BODIES, BUT NOT OUR VOICES

While there have been strides within the field or organizations to hire or include individuals from underrepresented groups, participants of the focus groups spoke of several instances of being invited to the decision-making table or being given a title or position without any real power or authority.

Several participants also spoke candidly about feeling like a token or check mark on a list in order to fill a quota or to give the appearance of diversity externally without a clear commitment to changing the organizational or institutional culture to ensure that individuals feel included as equal partners.

“The titles get assigned and you have the impression that you have the power, certain power to make some decisions. But in the end, the power goes to one specific person. And I believe it is institutionalized. I believe that there are a lot of people that really have intentions to really be diverse, but for some reason it doesn’t happen. Yeah, and I have experienced it.”

“Moving fast in leadership, in some organizations, you think that you have the power of being able to say—I’m sorry, but we need to look at certain things in a different way. And they are very happy to present you in the community. But at the end, when you go back to the organization, it is not being taken seriously.”
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND MOBILITY

Sustained professional development and opportunities to sharpen hard skills are critical to the career advancement and mobility of underrepresented groups within the field of violence against women.

The opportunities provided to focus groups participants to receive ongoing professional development, sharpen core competencies and learn new hard skills varied or were inconsistent. Most of the reported training received by focus group participants related to their jobs tended to consist of general information on the issues related to violence against women at the beginning of their tenure (40-hour training) within an organization.

“You really have to be comfortable working autonomously; really be comfortable with hitting the floor and just running. Because there is no like, acclimation period at the agency, which is a huge challenge. So basically, you are pretty much learning on your own, researching on your own. We do have supervision and whatnot—but you really just have to have those skills when you join us, for the work to just start to go. Because the acclimation period is like—zero.”

“And I’m really concerned about people that go for their first 40 hours and think they know something; because that first 40 hours is just your hello. You need to be prepared to go beyond it.”

Focus group participants also spoke about professional development opportunities to develop or enhance existing skills, but few opportunities to learn new hard skills or broaden a skill set. Participants noted too few resources to attend trainings or having to justify how a desired training would fit into their current work rather than work that they aspire to do in the future.

Participants also lamented the lack of mentors or formal support networks to advance their work and identify opportunities for advancement. Within the field of violence against women and within organizations, there are very few members of underrepresented groups within leadership positions and those who may hold positions of leadership often have competing demands or are under tremendous strain.

“I mean the mentors that are out there are awesome. And I’ve been very blessed in the mentors that I’ve had, but it is definitely, like my mentors have to work so much harder because they are mentoring so many more people than their white counterparts are, because there aren’t as many. And so, they are sort of, beyond strung out because they are mentoring so many people, on top of having to do their work. You’re just having to work a lot harder. And so, and once you get there, it’s kind of like—okay, you have your mentor. But are there any colleagues around that can sort of show you the ropes?”
SKILL DEVELOPMENT AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Over 40 percent of advocates surveyed identified program management and development along with grant and professional writing as areas of desired development. Thirty percent of advocates also identified time management and organization as a priority for skill development. Forty-three percent of respondents identified networking and relationship building as skills they would like to develop to advance in their career.

Advocates were least likely to prioritize career planning or fundraising, as areas of desired skill development at 24 percent and 28 percent, respectively.

Although advocates indicated a desire or need for ongoing training, very few intended to seek out programs or training opportunities within the next year. Only one-third who identified program management or development as a desired area of development planned on seeking training within the next year.

When broken down by age, fewer than 10 percent of people 24 and under reported a desire for training in any of the topics with the exception of career planning and mapping.

Of all respondents, advocates of color between the ages of 25-35 were most likely to report wanting to receive ongoing training. Time management and organization (54 percent) and by career planning (53 percent) were top areas of desired development for this age group. Forty-seven percent individuals indicated the need for communications & social media training and 43 percent indicated grant writing as an area of desired development.

Advocates of color between the ages of 25-35 were also more likely than other age groups to indicate that they would be seeking out opportunities for training within the next year.

For advocates of color between the ages of 36-45, thirty-two percent identified program management and development as a desired area of development, followed closely by networking and relationship building (27 percent), fundraising and development (26 percent) and grant writing (26 percent).

Advocates of color between the ages of 46-55 were most interested in networking and relationship building (18 percent), professional writing (17 percent), communications and social media (17 percent) and time management and organization (17 percent).

For people over the age of 55, the types of training they reported desiring included coalition building (20 percent), professional writing (20 percent), grant writing (17 percent), and fundraising and development (17 percent). This group was least interested in time management & organization (4 percent), career planning (5 percent) and communications and social media (6 percent).
Advocates of color are optimistic in terms of opportunities for advancement within their organization. Forty-five percent of the advocates surveyed believed that their opportunities for advancement or promotion within their organization were either very good or somewhat good. Slightly less than 30 percent of those surveyed believed opportunities for advancement were unlikely within their organization.

Opportunities for ongoing training and professional development

Similar to findings regarding opportunities for advancement within their organizations, the perception among advocates of color of the opportunities for professional development or on-going training were also high. Nearly 75 percent of those surveyed believed that their organizations provide opportunities for ongoing training and professional development. A mere 9 percent of those surveyed believed there were few opportunities for ongoing training or professional development.

Respondents who indicated that they faced barriers to developing their leadership skills were asked to describe these challenges. The most commonly cited obstacle to skill development was funding followed by the lack of time to attend trainings. The last, but perhaps most significant, barrier cited by advocates was the lack of support or encouragement from senior leadership within the organization.
Issues surrounding race and ethnicity were also identified as challenges to accessing professional development or ongoing training.

In organizations where there are few opportunities for performance evaluation, ongoing feedback or having policies in place for promotion or advancement, individuals from underrepresented groups are likely to search for answers to explain stagnation or lack of advancement within the organization. In the absence of objective criteria or performance feedback, the lack of advancement is likely to become personalized.

In addition to race, many respondents indicated that there were very few opportunities to advance within the organizations because of size and the length of time other employees in senior-level positions had been at the organization.

As indicated previously, there is very little turnover in senior level positions within anti-violence organizations. Nearly one-third of Executive directors surveyed had been in their positions for more than 10 years and nearly 20 percent project they will continue to serve as the Executive Director of their current organization for another 10 years or more.

**RELATIONSHIP TO DIRECT SUPERVISOR AND ORGANIZATION**

Seventy-one percent of advocates of color in the survey trust their direct supervisor to act in their best interest and 62 percent feel supported by their organization. Close to 70 percent of advocates report feeling appreciated or valued by their organization. Two-thirds of individuals surveyed also reported that they were comfortable communicating their difficulties to their direct supervisor.

While the above findings are affirming, there is a sizable percentage of employees from underrepresented groups who are struggling within anti-violence organizations in the states. Nearly 17 percent of advocates of color report they do not trust their supervisor to act in their best interest or feel supported by their organization.

Lastly, 50 percent of advocates believe that all opinions are equally valued within the organization compared to 88 percent of executive directors. Twenty-three percent of advocates of color did not believe that all opinions were valued equally within the organization.

**RELATIONSHIP TO COLLEAGUES**

70 percent of advocates of color survey reported solid working relationships with white women or men within their organizations. Only 11 percent reported that relationships were strained or non-existent with white non-Hispanic women or men within their organization. Another 20 percent reported neutral feelings regarding their working relationship with white female colleagues or men.

![Figure 40. Advocates’ Perceptions of their Working Relationship with White Women or Men within their Organization](image)
PREPAREDNESS AND JOB PERFORMANCE

Eighty-six percent of advocates of color report feeling prepared to fulfill the duties and responsibilities of their current position and only 4 percent of those surveyed believed they were unprepared. Eighty-nine percent indicated that they knew who to speak to in their organization if they experienced problems or issues related to the job duties and responsibilities.

Ninety-three percent of advocates of color are confident that they are able to meet the demands of the position and an equal number indicated that they are satisfied with their job performance.
Aspiring Allies are individuals who identify as white, male, heterosexual, without disability, hearing, non-immigrant or are otherwise a part of a group considered the majority, mainstream or a part of the dominant culture. For example, white non-Hispanic women working in the anti-violence field alongside people of color to address structural and institutional discrimination would be considered aspiring allies.

In our six-month study, we conducted a focus group with aspiring allies to better understand their experiences working in the anti-violence field and how they individually and collectively have been able to support racial and ethnic minority women and others from underrepresented groups in their organizations.

**WHITE PRIVILEGE**

The recognition of privilege and access to opportunities and resources as result of membership in the dominant culture was a major theme for participants of the aspiring allies focus group. Individuals spoke candidly and honestly about the role of white privilege within their organizations and how many of them struggled with being able to speak to their colleagues about issues related to race, privilege or oppression.

Many aspiring allies who participated in the focus group acknowledged their privilege based on their race, but most were unsure how to apply that knowledge and understanding to their work and within their organization.

“I think one of the barriers that I personally have struggled with, and I think a number of the organizations that I’ve worked professionally in, and personally in—is that it’s really easy to live with your privilege in most parts of the state and not be challenged on it.”

“But then, also, another challenge that I’ve had in being an Aspring Ally . . . is figuring out how to get everybody on board...a lot of the white folks I’m working with . . . it becomes really painful to even dive into the places that like—yeah, but to really do this means recognizing that pain, and acknowledging white privilege.”
WORKING WITH MEMBERS OF UNDERREPRESENTED GROUPS

Participants of the Aspiring Allies groups spoke candidly about their organization’s struggle with integrating members of underrepresented groups within the institution. Many also spoke about not feeling comfortable speaking up on the behalf of individuals who are being mistreated or discriminated against in the organization because of the fear of backlash.

Connectedly, participants also talked about the weight of being the only white identified person within the organization willing to take on issues related to race, oppression and discrimination and how difficult it is to challenge or question the organizational culture or practices.

A related theme that emerged related to working with members of underrepresented groups is that individuals who identify as Aspiring Allies are often the trusted confidants of individuals from underrepresented groups who experience discrimination and mistreatment within organizations.

“In none of the organizations that I’ve worked for have had a high level of competence, maybe, in recruiting and creating work environments that were sustainable for women of color.”

“I think that . . . women of color, in particular, people of color and men I’d say, just feel like there’s no, it’s not a welcoming place. That we haven’t made a space for you here yet.”

In addition to a thorough understanding of institutional and structural discrimination and oppression, Aspiring Allies need concrete skills, techniques and tools to enable them to support members of underrepresented groups within organizations and in the broader community.
Lesbian, Gay, Bisexuals, Transgendered and Queer (LGBTQ) individuals working in the field of violence against women are diverse in terms of race, class, sexual orientation and gender identity. The intersections of the aforementioned markers of difference work to inform the experiences of individuals working with the field including opportunities for advancement or promotion.

Similar to other advocates working in the field of violence against women, LGBTQ individuals report entering the field because of personal experience and a deep commitment to ending violence against women and children.

The leadership challenges faced by LGBTQ individuals in the field of violence against women include discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity and the questioning of personal motivations for actions or behaviors.

**HOMOPHOBIA**

In the focus groups and in surveys, homophobia (discrimination based on perceived or real sexual orientation) was a major barrier faced by LGBTQ individuals working in the anti-violence field. Individuals interviewed believed there was a different set of rules and level of awareness for them that included an acute level of cautiousness around relationships with colleagues as well as clients.

“When I first started my career, I did get accused of having a relationship with someone, which was so ridiculous and funny because the person is probably very homophobic. Just because we were seen together. And I think that it has made me feel that I need to be more careful about perception of what I’m doing with other people that I work with. Because when people see two women that they think are lesbians together, they right away make this assumption that you’re having a relationship.”

Relatedly, the homophobia also interfered with their ability to exercise leadership and manage subordinates. Individuals interviewed reported that their decisions were often second-guessed or motives called into question.

“I submitted a record of conversation with an employee and she requested a meeting with the executive director. She said she did not feel safe meeting with me alone, although [we] hadn’t had any difficulty previous to that. In the meeting, she suggested that I had a personal relationship with another colleague which is I was listening to this other staff person and doing a Record of Conversation. That was particularly upsetting. And there was no pushback. My executive director, who I think is generally pretty supportive, didn’t call her on it or anything else . . .”
**TRANSPHOBIA**

Less than one percent of individuals surveyed working within anti-violence organizations identified as transgendered or gender non-conforming. While there have been attempts to address the issues and concerns of lesbian and bisexual survivors of violence and to make organizations more inclusive, issues of gender identity have not been addressed or incorporated by many anti-violence organizations.

The reluctance of anti-violence organizations to engage in discussions about gender identity or to incorporate the broad range of gender expression into programs and into leadership creates an unsupportive or unsafe environment for transgendered or gender non-conforming individuals. As one participant states:

“But what I do find that we struggle with, is that even though we are LGBTQ-inclusive and we have staff, the majority of staff identifies as LGBTQ—there is still tension around certain identities; especially around folks that identify as transgender. And so, in many ways I witness transphobia happening in the space, and a lot of assumptions around gender expression. And I say “transphobia”—not just specifically talking about trans people, but anyone that may be gender non-conforming. And how that looks in the space that I work in . . . ”

**APPROACHES TO THE WORK**

A reoccurring theme with LGBTQ individuals working in the anti-violence field was the idea that bringing up the need to create programs or initiatives for LGBTQ survivors of violence was seen by some as pushing an agenda based on their own gender identity or sexual orientation. As a result of the perception, they received pushback or were denied leadership opportunities.

“When an LGBTQ plan was presented the plan to the board, they didn’t understand why staff would pick that community. The feeling was—“Oh, well, now we have a lesbian on staff, so she’s going to push that agenda.” When in fact, it actually came from other staff, which is mostly, which is all self-identified non-LGBTQ women. So it was really interesting, trying to talk to leadership about the fact that this is a population that we ARE seeing, and we’re not serving them particularly well; and we’re not doing enough outreach. And trying to get them to understand that piece as a whole but as an individual LGBTQ staffperson’s agenda.”

“I know that sometimes leaders within the organization that do identify as LBGT have had kind of some issues, trying to start projects or programs for the LGBT community. Because people might feel . . . and it’s not necessarily just within the organization, but trying to reach out for whatever support is needed . . . have felt like they’re just doing it to further the interest in their own group and things like that. Instead of just seeing it as what’s right or what’s really needed for the entire community. And I’m sure that goes for other groups as well, but I’ve specifically seen it here, with trying to start LGBT programs.”

Immigrant women advocates have been critical to bridging the gap between immigration and violence against women and working to ensure that victims of violence regardless of citizenship status feel safe and have options. Advocates are often charged with creating culturally sensitive programs within organizations, liaising with immigration officials and law enforcement, and working with victims or survivors to get back on track.
IMMIGRANT WOMEN

For immigrant women advocates, the most commonly reported entry to the field was personal experience, but many advocates reported the inability to find a job in their “home” profession because of citizenship status. Language was also a significant barrier for immigrant women advocates working in the field of violence against women.

PERSONAL - ENTRY POINT

Compared to the members of the other focus groups, immigrant women advocates were more likely to report that their entry to the field related to their inability to find job opportunities in their “original” field due to their immigrant status. In many cases, the advocate’s bilingual status was seen as a value-add for organizations working with the rising immigrant population in communities.

“Basically, I started in this field because I had to change what I was doing before in my country, because when I moved to the United States, when I arrived here I couldn’t find a job that was in my field. So I started to see around, what was the need and what was my strong abilities. And at this point, in this country, my strong ability was to speak my language.”

BARRIERS TO ADVANCEMENT WITHIN THE FIELD

While many immigrant advocates were hired, in part, for their ability to effectively reach communities previously served by organizations, many participants report feeling as though they had very little power or authority within organizations. Participant frequently cited language and educational barriers as key factors for not advancing within their organizations or the field. Similar to other focus group participants, the immigrant women also expressed a number of concerns related to working in the field.
**ISOLATION WITHIN THE FIELD**

Immigrant women also report feelings isolated within organizations and the antiviolence field. The experiences of immigrant women are unique. The intersections of class, ethnicity, citizenship status, and language place immigrant women advocates in a category different from U.S. born women of color.

“...when you’re a woman of color and an immigrant. And your obstacles or your challenges in your leadership role is with other women of color. Because they have an issue with an immigrant woman being in a leadership role. So that’s challenging, when other women of color don’t support immigrant women in leadership roles...”

“For me, as an immigrant woman. Because I’m fighting the same issues with you, as a woman of color. But when we talk leadership, if an immigrant woman is in a leadership position, she is not fully supported, merely because of her background or where she’s from. So those sorts of challenges...for me, are hurtful.”

**SYMBOLIC REPRESENTATION**

A core theme that emerged from focus groups participants is symbolic representation or being asked to represent the interest of immigrant survivors at meetings, but not being given a leadership or decision making role at meetings or within organizations. Participants also expressed concern with the lack of commitment from their organizations to be included as real partners with real decision-making power.

“As far as leadership with immigrant women—I see very few actual women, immigrant women in positions of leadership. I see a lot with titles, but titles doesn’t reflect actual leadership. So I don’t see a lot of immigrant women across in our field, with leadership decision making, upper level positions. I do see a lot of titles being thrown around, that represent somebody in leadership. But still yet, in all, decisions really go back to the real leaders. So I do see a lot of perceived leadership, but not actual leadership positions of immigrant women in our field, in our state.”

“I have felt, also in some organizations that I have worked for, as an exotic toy. Yeah, you are exotic. You have an accent; you speak other language. And they are very happy to present you in the community. But at the end, when you go back to the organization, it is not being taken seriously.”
LANGUAGE AND EDUCATIONAL BARRIERS

As previously discussed, perceived or real language ability or educational attainment is a significant barrier for advancement for immigrant women working within the anti-violence field. Many advocates report feeling as though their educational credentials were scrutinized and their English language skills questioned.

An additional concern related to language is how it impacts those receiving services and how differential treatment as a result of being an ESL victim/survivor can impact the services received. One focus group participant spoke about this situation and how she addresses it with her employees:

“I don’t know if it’s an assumption that if you’re an immigrant, or if English is not your primary language, that your education is lower. It’s an automatic thing…You have to prove your level of education and almost like, to show the diploma from your country, that I have a degree.”

“And I’m like, I said that… and how, when you said it—yeah, good idea! But I just said the same thing. Maybe my accent was a little different, but I said the same thing. And it does bother me as I am thinking —am I here? Do I matter?”
Movements for change, movements to make us well, to create healthy societies—whether Tribal or American—are grounded in healing, are grounded in honest. Voices of our stories as Indigenous women and the complexity of our situation….opens parts of the mind and spirit to a healing.

Winona LaDuke in *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide*

To better understand the experiences of Native American women working in the anti-violence movement, we conducted two focus groups in Minnesota. The leadership challenges articulated by Tribal women working in the anti-violence movement is highly influenced by the sovereignty of Tribes in the US, colonization and genocide, and the cultural norms and values of Tribal communities.

**CULTURAL CONFLICTS WITHIN THE ANTI-VIOLENCE FIELD**

A significant barrier to success and support for Native American women working the field of anti-violence expressed by respondents is the lack of respect for Native tradition and culture within organizations. Many advocates felt as if they were “walking in two worlds” or had to reconcile their values and beliefs with those of mainstream anti-violence organizations.

“But if we’re going to walk in two worlds, that’s that part of the education [formal education] that is important. But we still have to stay true to our core values as Indian people. And our Tribal values and our connection to our ancestors and all the teachings they set forth for us. And that was trying to be stripped from us. So that’s guided my work, and even working in mainstream organizations or being a token in some organizations. Or being marginalized in some organizations. It don’t matter because I have nothing left to lose.”

“What I’m talking about, when we’re walking into two worlds, is—how is it we walk in spite of all the white oppression; all the systems that have been constructed, and still be proud of who we are, as native people? And of our ancestors and the teachings that they passed down to the best of their abilities?”

The perceived or real cultural conflicts within organizations or the field can make it difficult for Native American women to advance within the field because their strategies and approaches to addressing sexual and domestic violence may differ from the strategies employed by organizations. Respondents also reported feeling isolated or marginalized as well.

“They put out these policies in a one-size-fits manner that they don’t address the people of color and Native people experience every day of their lives; we live and breathe this, every day of our lives. We can’t get off that loophole. We can’t change the color of our skin or change who we are, as Tribal people. We can’t ever change that.”

“Our needs are different, coming out of the gate. And I think it has to have that cultural component for us, a reflection of self, a reflection of values—that circular conversation, that circular decision making process, period. It has to be there, otherwise it doesn’t work.”
The issue of sovereignty, the relationship between Tribal nations and the US government was also raised by participants as a distinguishing factor for Native American advocates working within the anti-violence movement. Sovereignty directly impacts the policies, remedies and strategies to address sexual and domestic violence within Tribal communities.

The anti-violence movement and organizations have not paid solid attention to the impact of sovereignty on organizations as well as advocates working within the field. For Native American advocates, they must negotiate two systems with very little support or understanding from the field.

“As I have done the work and as I have evolved and grown and understood the impact of policy on Tribal communities, I just think it’s absolutely critical that we address it. And especially in terms of developing leadership within the Native American community. And the thing that I wish more people understood is—because of our sovereignty as Tribal nations, we are the only oppressed and marginalized group that has that unique status of government-to-government relationships, with the Tribes and U.S. Government. And at that level, I mean, we know on a state and local Tribal levels, how challenging it can be to change policy. As Tribal nations, we are looking at policy on a federal level, which adds a huge layer of challenge for us. And it certainly impacts safety for our native women and children.”
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Across the country, individuals from underrepresented groups face significant challenges to advancing in their careers in the anti-violence field. The intersections of race, class, gender and other markers of difference can impact mobility within the field, wages, and the feelings of support or isolation within anti-violence organizations by advocates and practitioners.

This report confirms the great need to develop and support the leadership of women of color, LGBTQ individuals with disabilities and Native women in order to build a more diverse and inclusive anti-violence field.

Organizations, institutions and advocates in the field should be intentional in the development of programs and initiatives to increase the representation of underrepresented groups in leadership positions, identify supports systems and advocates and move to address persistent structural and institutional barriers to mobility for groups and individuals.

RECOMMENDATIONS

For the Field

Leaders, key stakeholders and Funders of the field of anti-violence should work to uncover and address the structural and institutional barriers to mobility and success for members of underrepresented groups within organizations and within the field. Specifically, leaders, funders and key stakeholders should work to identify disparate patterns in resources allocation and promotion within organizations; leverage opportunities for collaboration among leaders and organizations; create uniform criteria and guidelines for promotion and positions that can be used by organizations to hire and promote.

For Aspiring Allies

Aspiring Allies are critical in terms of building support for the diversification of the field of anti-violence and helping to support members from underrepresented groups as they take up leadership. Specifically, Aspiring Allies should support leaders by identifying their role in maintaining systems, structures and hierarchies within the field of anti-violence movement through on-going training and participation in national, state, local efforts and build more inclusive organizations.

For Leaders for Underrepresented Groups

Our study confirms that there are many paths to leadership within the anti-violence, many of which are not institutionalized or out of the box. On-going support from peers and seasoned leaders within and outside of organizations is key to advancing within the field of anti-violence for leaders from underrepresented groups. It is also important that leaders have opportunities along their career trajectory to gain new hard skills and take on new responsibilities within their organization and in communities.

There should also be deliberate efforts at creating sustained communities of support for leaders that are culturally sensitive and appropriate so that they have the opportunity to identify common challenges and barriers, build their skill set and capacity in a safe and nurturing environment and think concretely about their career trajectory.
There are a variety of different ways to define or talk about race, class, gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, and other markers of difference. For the purposes of this report, we will employ the definitions below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ability</strong></th>
<th>The quality or state of being able to have or having the power to perform tasks physically, mentally or legally.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>The time of life at which some particular qualification, power, or capacity arises or rests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class</strong></td>
<td>Position in economy with regards to the distribution of wealth and resources, income and poverty, and the distribution of power and authority in the workforce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td>Belonging to or deriving from the cultural, racial, religious, language or beliefs of a particular group of people or country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>Culturally and socially constructed relationships between men and women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nationality</strong></td>
<td>The quality or membership in a particular nation, whether original or acquired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td>Ancestry and selected physical characteristics such as skin color, hair texture and eye shape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td>Biological and anatomical characteristics attributed to male and females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Orientation</strong></td>
<td>Sex of partners in emotional-sexual relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender Identity</strong></td>
<td>Gender identity can be defined as a person’s inner sense of being male or female, usually developed during early childhood as a result of parental rearing practices and societal influences and strengthened during puberty by hormonal changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure V. Transgender Individuals Under the Age of 35 in Positions across Organizations with More than 20 Employees
Figure W. Gender Non-Conforming Individuals Under the Age of 35 in Positions across Organizations with More than 20 Employees

Figure X. Women of Color in Positions across Organizations with Less than 20 Employees
Figure Y. Men of Color in Positions across Organizations with Less than 20 Employees

Figure Z. LGBTQ Females in Positions across Organizations with Less than 20 Employees
Figure AA. Females with Disabilities in Positions across Organizations with Less than 20 Employees

Figure AB. Females Under the Age of 35 in Positions across Organizations with Less than 20 Employees
Figure AC. Males Under the Age of 35 in Positions across Organizations with Less than 20 Employees

Figure AD. People of Color across Positions
Figure AE. Racial and Ethnic Breakdown by Position

Figure AF. Staff can Attend Outside Trainings and the Cost Covered by the Organization
Figure AG. Taskforces, Caucuses and Advisory Committees

Figure AH. Staff can Attend Taskforces, Caucuses and Advisory Committees and They Do Attend
Figure A1. Integration of Issues of Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity into their Programs and Initiatives

Charts for Executive Directors

Figure AJ. Executive Directors, Gender
Figure A. Executive Directors, Length of Time in Field

Figure AK. Executive Directors, Educational Achievement by Race and Ethnicity
Figure AO. Length of Time the Executive Director has been Employed at their Current Organization in any capacity

- 21 years and over: 15
- 16-20 years: 10
- 10-15 years: 19
- 7-9 years: 16
- 4-6 years: 24
- 1-3 years: 12
- Less than 1 year: 5

Figure AP. Executive Director, Title of Last Position

- CEO: 20
- Deputy Director: 5
- Program Director: 14
- Development Director: 9
- Manager/Supervisor: 7
- Coordinator/Specialist: 11
- Advocate: 7
Figure AQ. Employees Feel Valued within the Organization

Figure AR. Employees Learn the Skills They Need for their Position on the Job
Figure AS. Employees are Comfortable Communicating Difficulty with a Task

Charts for Advocates of Color

Figure AT. Advocates, Gender
Figure AU. Distribution of Income for All Deputy Directors, Deputy Directors of Color, and White Deputy Directors

Figure AV. Distribution of Income for All Program Directors, Program Directors of Color, and White Program Directors
Figure AW. Distribution of Income for All Managers, Managers of Color, and White Managers

Figure AX. Distribution of Income for All Executive Assistants, Executive Assistants of Color, and White Executive Assistants
Figure AY. Distribution of Income for All Coordinators, Coordinators of Color, and White Coordinators

Figure AZ. Distribution of Income for All Case Managers, Case Managers of Color, and White Case Managers
Figure BA. Advocates of Color Under the Age of 45, Length of Time in the Field

- 21 years and over: 0
- 16-20 years: 0
- 10-15 years: 14
- 7-9 years: 14
- 4-6 years: 27
- 1-3 years: 31
- Less than one year: 14

Figure BB. Advocates, Perceptions Regarding any Challenges in Accessing Opportunities for Advancement or Promotion within their Organizations

- Yes: 35.8%
- No: 64.2%
Figure BC. Advocates, Perceptions of Opportunities for Professional Development or On-going Training within their Organizations

Figure BD. Advocates, Perceptions Regarding Barriers to Leadership Skill Development within their Organizations
Figure BE. Advocates, Perceptions Regarding Barriers in Accessing Professional Development or On-going Trainings within their Organizations

Yes 26
No 74

Figure BF. Advocates, Trust in Supervisor to Act in their Best Interest

Strongly Agree 40
Agree 13
Neutral 12
Disagree 5
Strongly Disagree 31
Figure BG. Advocates, Perceptions on Level of Support within their Organization

Figure BH. Advocates, Feel Valued and Appreciated within their Organization
Figure BI. Employees Feel Comfortable Communicating their Difficulty with a Task or Project to their Direct Supervisor

Strongly Agree: 18
Agree: 21
Neutral: 0
Disagree: 0
Strongly Disagree: 61

Figure BJ. All Opinions are Equally Valued within my Organization

Strongly Agree: Advocates of Color 19, Executive Directors 35
Agree: Advocates of Color 31, Executive Directors 53
Neutral: Advocates of Color 27, Executive Directors 12
Disagree: Advocates of Color 15, Executive Directors 0
Strongly Disagree: Advocates of Color 0, Executive Directors 0
Figure BK. Advocates, Perceptions Regarding whether they Came to their Organization Prepared to Fulfill the Duties and Responsibilities of their Position

Figure BL. Advocates, Perceptions Regarding Knowing Whom to Talk to When they Need Help with a Task within their Organization
Figure BM. Advocates, Perception Regarding Possessing the Skills and Training Necessary to Succeed in their Current Position
Thank you so much for taking the time to fill out this important survey that will help to guide the design of the Women of Color Network Expanding Leadership Opportunities Project leadership academy for individuals from underrepresented groups. It will also allow us to gain a deeper understanding of the experiences of individuals working in organizations and the field of violence against women more broadly.

It is estimated that the survey will take between 30-45 minutes to complete. The survey is anonymous and your answers to all of the questions will be kept confidential. Please check only one response for each question unless otherwise instructed.

Glossary of Terms:
Underrepresented Groups
People of Color
Sexual Orientation: A pattern of emotional, romantic and/or sexual attractions to men, women, both genders, neither gender or another gender. It also refers to a person’s sense of personal social identity based on those attractions, behaviors expressing them and membership in a community of others who share them.
Gender Identity: How we see ourselves—some of us women, as men, some as a combination of both, or some as neither.
LGBTQ: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender or Queer

Q1. How do you identify your racial and ethnic background:
White, Caucasian, non-Hispanic, non-Latino
Latino, Hispanic
Black, African-American
Asian-Pacific Islander
Arab, Middle Eastern
Native-American
Multi-racial
Other, please specify:______________________________________________________

Q2. What is your age:
24 and under
25-35
36-45
46-55
56 and over

Q3. How do you identify your sex?
Female
Male
Transgender
Gender non-conforming
Other, please specify:______________________________________________________

Q4. Please indicate the highest level of education you completed?
Less than High School
High school, GED or equivalent
Some college or vocational training
Associate’s Degree
Bachelor’s Degree
Graduate Degree

Q5. What state do you work in (Open-ended)?

Q6. Which category best describes your role in your organization?
Volunteer
Independent Consultant
Part-time Employee
Full-time Employee
Seasonal Employee
Independent Activist/Advocate
Intern
Board Member
Other, please specify _____________________________________________________

Q7. Which title best describes your position within the organization?
Executive Director/CEO
Deputy Director
Program Director
Development/Fundraiser Manager or Director
Manager/Supervisor
Executive Assistant/Administrative Staff
Coordinator/Specialist
Advocate/Case Manager
Other, please specify: ______________________________________________________

Q8. How long have you been working in this position at this organization?
Less than a year
1-3 years
4-6 years
7-9 years
10-15 years
16-20 years
21 years and over

Q9. How did you hear about your current position within the organization?
Replied to a job posting/announcement
Leadership transition
Founded the organization
Asked to apply by staff or Board of Directors
Worked in the organization for a number of years in a different position
Was working in the position in an interim capacity
Mentored by someone within or outside of the organization
Served on the Board of Directors
Other, please specify _________________________________________________

Q10. Before serving in your current position, what was the title of your last position?
Executive Director/CEO
Deputy Director
Program Director
Development/Fundraising Manager or Director
Manager/Supervisor
Executive Assistant/Administrative Staff
Coordinator/Specialist
Advocate/Case Manager
Other, please specify _________________________________________________

Q11. How long have you been working in the field of violence against women and families?
Less than a year
1-3 years
4-6 years
7-9 years
10-15 years
16-20 years
21 years or more
Q12. How did you first become involved or interested in the issue of violence against women and families?
Child witness
Survivor
Personal experiences of family or friends
A mentor or person you admired encouraged participation/interest in the work
Attended a program or lecture on the issue
Field of study while in college
Volunteered at community-based or faith-based organization working on the issue
Served on the Board of Director of an organization
Other, please specify _________________________________________________

Q13. Which range best describes your income level?
Under $10,000
$10,001-$25,000
$25,001-$50,000
$50,001-$75,000
$75,001 and over

Q14. In general, how would you describe the opportunities for advancement or promotion in your organization?
Very Good
Somewhat Good
Neither Good nor Bad
Somewhat Bad
Very Bad

Q15. In general, how would you describe the opportunities for pursuing professional development or ongoing training in your organization?
Very Good
Somewhat Good
Neither Good nor Bad
Somewhat Bad
Very Bad

In the following questions, we are interested in your perceptions about the way other people have treated you. Can you tell us if any of the following has ever happened to you?

Q16. Are you facing any barriers in developing your leadership skills within your organization?
Yes
No

Q17. How would you describe the challenges you have faced in developing you leadership skills? (Open-ended question)

Q18. Would you say that these barriers in developing leadership were related to your personal identity?
Yes
No

Q19. Describe the personal identity(ies) that may have been related to the barriers to leadership (ie. race, gender, age, sexual orientation, disability, etc.) (Open-ended question)

Q20. Are you currently facing any barriers in accessing professional development or ongoing training within your organization?
Yes
No

Q21. In general, how would you describe the challenges you have faced in accessing professional development or ongoing training? (Open-ended question)

Q22. Would you say that these barriers to professional development or ongoing training were related to your personal identity?
Yes
No
Q23. Describe the personal identity(ies) that may have been related to barriers to professional development or ongoing training (i.e. race, gender, age, sexual orientation, disability, etc.) (Open-ended question)

Q24. Are you facing any challenges in accessing opportunities for advancement or promotion within your organization?
   Yes
   No

Q25. How would you describe the challenges in accessing opportunities for advancement or promotion within your organization? (Open-ended question)

Q26. Would you say that these challenges in accessing opportunities for advancement or promotion were related to your personal identity?
   Yes
   No

Q27. Describe the personal identity(ies) that may have been related to challenges in accessing opportunities for advancement or promotion (i.e. race, gender, age, sexual orientation, disability, etc.) (Open-ended question)

Q28. Within the last year, have you attended any trainings on issues related to diversity and cultural competency within the field of violence against women?
   Yes
   No

Q29. How many trainings have you attended?
   1
   2-3
   4-5
   6 or more

Q30. Does your organization have a statement regarding diversity and/or inclusion?
   Yes
   No

Q31. Does your organization’s employment and service practices reflect your organization’s statement of diversity and/or inclusion?
   All of the time
   Most of the time
   Some of the time
   Never

Q32. Does the organization hold trainings or provide on-going learning opportunities for staff on issues related to:
   People of Color
   LGBTQ individuals
   Individuals with disabilities
   Tribal women
   Immigrant populations
   Aspiring Allies
   Cultural Competency
   Racism
   Other, please specify: ____________________________________________________________
   No such programs exist

Q33. If yes, how often do trainings occur?
   Monthly
   Bi-annually
   Yearly
   As needed
   Other, please specify: ____________________________________________________________

Q34. Does your state coalition have a caucus, taskforce/advisory committee dedicated to the following categories? Check all that apply:
   People of Color
   LGBTQ individuals
Individuals with disabilities
Tribal women
Immigrant populations
Aspiring Allies
Cultural Competency
Racism
Other, please specify:

____________________________

Other, please specify:

____________________________

None of the above

Q35. Are you authorized to attend any of these caucuses, taskforce/advisory committee meetings offered by your state coalition as part of your work schedule?
Yes
No

Q36. Do you attend?
Yes
No

Q37. Describe why you are not authorized to attend any of these caucuses, taskforce/advisory committee meetings offered by your state coalition as part of your work schedule. (Open-ended question)

Q38. Can you briefly discuss some of your challenges in attracting individuals from underrepresented groups to work at the organization? (Open-ended question)

Q39. Do you have a professional development plan?
Yes
No

Q40. Do you have a work plan for your current position?
Yes
No

Q41. Did you develop it on your own?
Yes
No

Q42. If no, who assisted in developing your work plan? (Open-ended question)

Q43. Do you find the work plan effective in helping to meet your personal and developmental goals?
Yes
No

Q44. I could benefit from training or on-going learning in the following areas (check all that apply):
Program management and development
Grant writing
Fundraising and development
Coalition building
Time-management and organization
Professional writing
Communications and social media
Networking and relationship building
Career planning
Other, please specify: ____________________________________________________________

Q45. Over the next year, I plan to seek training or on-going learning in the following areas (check all that apply):
Program management and development
Grant writing
Fundraising and Development
Coalition building
Time-management and organization
Professional writing
Communications and social media
Networking and relationship building
Career planning
Other, please specify: ____________________________________________________________

Q46. Please answer the following questions using the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussions of race and ethnicity occur frequently within the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues of race and ethnicity are integrated into our programs and initiatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions of sexual orientation and gender identity occur frequently within the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues of sexual orientation and gender identity are integrated into our programs and initiatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions of ability and disabilities occur frequently within the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues of ability and disabilities are integrated into our programs and initiatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are equipped to handle racially charged or difficult work situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a difficult time talking to my direct supervisor about issues related to race, diversity or difference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust my supervisor to act in my best interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel supported within my organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a solid working relationship with white women or men within my organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, employees from underrepresented groups in the organization feel supported.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel valued and appreciated within my organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All opinions are valued equally within my organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I came to the organization prepared to fulfill the duties and responsibilities of the position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am comfortable communicating my difficulty with a task or project within my organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to meet the demands and responsibility of my current position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I possess the skills and training necessary to succeed in my current position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I need help with a task within my organization, I know who to talk to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident with my job performance at my organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you so much for taking the time to fill out this important survey that will help to guide the design of the Women of Color Network’s Expanding Leadership Opportunities Project leadership academy for underrepresented groups. It will also allow us to gain a deeper understanding of the experiences of individuals working in organizations and the field of violence against women more broadly.

It is estimated that the survey will take between 30-45 minutes to complete. The survey is anonymous and your answers to all of the questions will be kept confidential. Please check only one response for each question unless otherwise instructed.

Glossary of Terms:
- Underrepresented Groups
- People of Color
- Sexual Orientation
- Gender Identity
- LGBTQ

EXECUTIVE DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Q1. How do you identify your racial and ethnic background?
- White, Caucasian, non-Hispanic, non-Latino
- Latino, Hispanic
- African-American
- Asian-Pacific Islander
- Native-American
- Multi-racial
- Other, please specify: ____________________________________________

Q2. What is your age?
- 24 and under
- 25-35
- 36-45
- 46-55
- 56 and over

Q3. How do you identify your gender?
- Female
- Male
- Transgender
- Gender non-conforming
- Other, please specify: ____________________________________________

Q4. Please indicate the highest level of education you completed?
- Less than High School
- High school, GED or equivalent
- Associates Degree
- Some college or vocational training
- Bachelor’s Degree
- Graduate Degree

Q5. What state do you work in? (Open-ended question)
Q6. How long have you been an employee of your current organization?
Less than a year
1-3 years
4-6 years
7-9 years
10-15 years
16-20 years
21 years and over

Q7. How long have you served as the Executive Director of your current organization?
Less than a year
1-3 years
4-6 years
7-9 years
10-15 years
16-20 years
21 years and over

Q8. How much longer do you estimate that you will serve as Executive Director of your current organization?
Less than a year
1-3 years
4-6 years
7-9 years
10 years or more

Q9. Which is the primary way you became Executive Director of your current organization?
Replied to a job posting/announcement
Leadership transition
Served on the Board of Directors
Founded the organization
Asked to apply by staff or Board of Directors
Worked in the organization for a number of years in a different position
Was working in the position in an interim capacity
Mentored by someone within or outside of the organization
Other, please specify: ______________________________________________________

Q10. Before serving as Executive Director of your current organization, what was the title of your last position?
Executive Director/CEO
Deputy Director
Program Director
Development/Fundraiser Manager or Director
Manager/Supervisor
Executive Assistant/Administrative Staff
Coordinator/Specialist
Advocate/Case Manager
Other, please specify: ______________________________________________________

Q11. How long have you worked in the field of violence against women and families?
Less than a year
1-3 years
4-6 years
7-9 years
10-15 years
16-20 years
21 years and over

Q12. How did you first become involved or interested in the issue of violence against women and families, please check all that apply?
Child witness
Survivor
Personal experiences of family or friends
A mentor or person you admired encouraged participation/interest in the work
Attended a program or lecture on the issue
Field of study while in college
Volunteered at a community-based or faith-based organization working on the issue
Served on the Board of Directors of an organization
Other, please specify: ______________________________________________________
ORGANIZATION DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Q13. What is the primary focus/issue area of the organization/agency?
Domestic Violence
Sexual Assault
Dual Program: Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault
Other, please specify: ______________________________________________________

Q14. Is the organization a state coalition?
Yes
No

Q15. Does the organization provide direct services (hotline, support group, legal services support or advocacy, shelter services)?
Yes
No

Q16. What is the annual operating budget of the organization (last fiscal year)?
Less than $150,000
150,000-300,000
300,000-500,000
500,000-$1 million
1-2 million
3-5 million
$6 million or more

Q17. Please indicate the demographic/constituency served by your organization (check all that apply):
Women
Children and youth
Families
LGBTQ individuals
Adult male victims
Adult male perpetrators
Other, please specify: ______________________________________________________

Q18. Please indicate the percentage of constituents from each underrepresented group that are served by your organization:
Racial/ethnic minority
LGBTQ identified individuals
Individuals with a disability
Individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing
Individuals who are refugees or immigrants
Individuals under the age of 35
Individuals over the age of 55

Q19. Please indicate the number of personnel for each category by choosing from the dropdown box:
Paid Full-Time Staff
Paid Part-Time Staff
Volunteers
Board of Directors

Q20. Does your organization employ more than 20 staff members?
Yes
No
Q21. Diversity Chart (Please answer based on the current demographics of your organization and the clients you serve):

### Racial and Ethnic Minorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Transgender</th>
<th>Gender Non-Conforming</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>LGBQ Identified</th>
<th>Gender Non-Conforming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Executive Director/CEO
- Deputy Director
- Program Director
- Development/ Fundraiser Manager or Director
- Manager/ Supervisor
- Executive Assistant/ Administrative Staff
- Coordinator/ Specialist
- Advocate/Case Manager
- Clients
- Total

### Individuals with Disability(ies)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Transgender</th>
<th>Gender Non-Conforming</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Under 35</th>
<th>Gender Non-Conforming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Executive Director/CEO
- Deputy Director
- Program Director
- Development/ Fundraiser Manager or Director
- Manager/ Supervisor
- Executive Assistant/ Administrative Staff
- Coordinator/ Specialist
- Advocate/Case Manager
- Clients
- Total
SALARY AND COMPENSATION

Q22. Please indicate the salary range for the following positions within your organization:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>&gt;45,000</th>
<th>45,000-60,000</th>
<th>61,000-80,000</th>
<th>81,000-99,000</th>
<th>100,000+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director/CEO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>&gt;45,000</td>
<td>45,000-60,000</td>
<td>61,000-80,000</td>
<td>81,000-99,000</td>
<td>100,000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>&gt;45,000</td>
<td>45,000-60,000</td>
<td>61,000-80,000</td>
<td>81,000-99,000</td>
<td>100,000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development/Fundraiser Manager</td>
<td>&gt;45,000</td>
<td>45,000-60,000</td>
<td>61,000-80,000</td>
<td>81,000-99,000</td>
<td>100,000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager/Supervisor</td>
<td>&gt;45,000</td>
<td>45,000-60,000</td>
<td>61,000-80,000</td>
<td>81,000-99,000</td>
<td>100,000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Assistant</td>
<td>&gt;45,000</td>
<td>45,000-60,000</td>
<td>61,000-80,000</td>
<td>81,000-99,000</td>
<td>100,000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator/Specialist</td>
<td>&gt;45,000</td>
<td>45,000-60,000</td>
<td>61,000-80,000</td>
<td>81,000-99,000</td>
<td>100,000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate/Case Manager</td>
<td>&gt;45,000</td>
<td>45,000-60,000</td>
<td>61,000-80,000</td>
<td>81,000-99,000</td>
<td>100,000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>&gt;45,000</td>
<td>45,000-60,000</td>
<td>61,000-80,000</td>
<td>81,000-99,000</td>
<td>100,000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>&gt;45,000</td>
<td>45,000-60,000</td>
<td>61,000-80,000</td>
<td>81,000-99,000</td>
<td>100,000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>&gt;45,000</td>
<td>45,000-60,000</td>
<td>61,000-80,000</td>
<td>81,000-99,000</td>
<td>100,000+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

Q23. Does the organization have a statement regarding diversity and/or inclusion?
   Yes
   No

Q24. Does your organization’s employment service practices reflect your organization’s statement of diversity and/or inclusion?
   All of the time
   Most of the time
   Some of the time
   Never

Q25. Does the organization hold staff trainings or provide on-going learning opportunities for staff on issues relating to the following categories?
   People of Color
   LGBTQ individuals
   Individuals with disabilities
   Tribal women
   Immigrant populations
   Aspiring Allies
   Cultural Competency
   Racism
   Other, please specify: ______________________________________________________

Q26. If yes, how often do trainings occur?
   Monthly
   Bi-annually
   Yearly
   As needed
   Other, please specify: ______________________________________________________

Q27. Does the organization cover the cost of staff to attend outside trainings or conferences on cultural competency, difference, inclusion or diversity?
   Yes
   No
Q28. Does the organization permit staff to attend outside trainings or conferences on cultural competency, difference, inclusion or diversity caucuses during normally scheduled work hours?
Yes
No

PROGRAMS, TASKFORCES AND ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Q29. Are there programs within your organization dedicated to the following categories:
People of Color
LGBTQ individuals
Individuals with disabilities
Immigrant populations
Other, please specify:
____________________________
Other, please specify:
____________________________
No such programs exist

Q30. If such program(s) exist within your organization are they institutionalized?
Yes
No

Q31. Can you briefly discuss any challenges you face with establishing or maintaining programming or services within your organization dedicated to underrepresented groups? (Open-ended question)

ORGANIZATIONAL HIRING AND PROMOTION PRACTICES

Q32. In the last year, how many people who identified with the following categories have been hired within your organization?
Please indicate the number of the following categories:
Racial/ethnic minority:
LGBTQ identified individuals:
Individuals with a disability:
Individuals who are deaf or hear of hearing:
Individuals under the age of 35:
Individuals over the age of 55:

Q33. What factor most influences the hiring practices within your organization?
Funding
Program needs
Organizational needs
Individual needs
Other, please specify: ______________________________________________________

Q34. What factor most influences the hiring practices within your organization?
Funding
Program needs
Organization needs
Individual needs
Other, please specify: ________________

Q35. Can you briefly discuss some of your challenges in recruiting and hiring individuals from underrepresented groups to the organization? (Open-ended question)

Q36. Can you briefly discuss some of your challenges in promoting individuals from underrepresented groups within the organization? (Open-ended question)
ORGANIZATIONAL ATTRITION AND RETENTION

Q37. Can you briefly discuss any challenges that the organization might have in retaining individuals from underrepresented groups? (Open-ended question)

Q38. Please answer the following questions using the scale below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussions of race and ethnicity occur frequently within the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues of race and ethnicity are integrated into our programs and initiatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions of sexual orientation and gender identity occur frequently within the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues of sexual orientation and gender identity are integrated into our programs and initiatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions of ability and disabilities occur frequently within the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues of ability and disabilities are integrated into our programs and initiatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident employees are equipped to handle racially charged or difficult work situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a difficult time giving constructive or honest feedback to employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a difficult time giving constructive or honest feedback to employees of color.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees within the organization trust me to act in their best interest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees of color trust me to act in their best interest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, employees from underrepresented groups in the organization feel supported.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, employees from underrepresented groups in the organization feel valued.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All opinions are valued equally within the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees come to the organization prepared to fulfill the duties and responsibilities of the position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees learn the skills they need for their position on the job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees feel comfortable communicating their difficulty with a task or project to their direct supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENDNOTES

i Ann Jones. 2000. Next Time She will be Dead.
ii Statement about Wisconsin
iii Of the 90 surveys, a total of 57 were complete meaning respondents answered all questions.
v Nonprofit research Abridged. Winter 2010-2011. Verify that this is national v. local data
vi There were a significant number of non-responses to this question. It is our belief that rather than respond that no training was provided on a particular issue or topic, respondents opted to decline to answer.
vii Of the 190 advocates surveyed, 80 were members from underrepresented groups
viii WOPCN leadership study