

ARTS & BUSINESS COUNCIL OF CHICAGO

PROJECT EVALUATION

IMPACT: Inclusion of Multicultural Perspectives in
Art, Culture and Theatre
(2007 TO 2009)

Submitted by

Cheryl Yuen
Cultural Development/
Arts Management Consultant
July 30, 2009

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	i
Introduction	1
Section 1: IMPACT: History and Development	3
Section 2: Candidate Perceptions of IMPACT	7
Section 3: Organizational Perceptions of IMPACT	10
Section 4: Recommendations from Evaluation Participants	15
Section 5: General Findings and Observations	17
Section 6: Success Factors and Recommendations for Actions	21
Appendices	
A: IMPACT Evaluation Participants	24
B: IMPACT Steering Committee	25
C: Chicago Area Major Cultural Institutions with Annual Budgets Over \$5 Million	26
D: IMPACT Candidates	27
E: IMPACT Implementation Timeline	28
F: IMPACT Organizational Participants: Summary of Board Diversity 2007-2009	30

Board diversity is a marathon, not a sprint.

- IMPACT placed candidate

IMPACT Project Evaluation: Executive Summary

The question of how to meaningfully include diverse perspectives in the board rooms of Chicago nonprofit major arts and cultural institutions has been a long-time concern in the community. No more clearly was this articulated than in the April 2004 Crain's article by Jerry Mullman: *Arts boards in white period*. Crain's analysis hailed the expected election of Lester Coney as the Goodman Theatre's new chairman, making him the first African-American to lead one of the city's largest cultural institution boards, while at the same time observed the mostly monochromatic make-up of the majority of Chicago's most prestigious arts groups. Several reasons were stated for the shortfall: the difficulty in finding minority directors with both the passion for a given institution's programming and the means to raise or contribute expected sums of financial support.

The IMPACT (Inclusion of Multicultural Perspectives in Arts, Culture and Theatre) Project is a direct response to this lack of diverse ethnic representation in the leadership of Chicago's major cultural institutions. It grew out of recognition by members of the Chicago area funding community that increasing board diversity is a complex issue that needed to be addressed in a comprehensive manner. Launched in 2006 by the Arts & Business Council of Chicago (A&BC) with lead support from The Joyce Foundation and subsequent support from Boeing Corporation and The Chicago Community Trust, IMPACT was conceived as a three year pilot project designed to increase the diversity of the boards of Chicago's largest cultural institutions. The intent was to create a resource that would help organizations find qualified ethnically diverse individuals for their boards.

The project concludes its third year in August of 2009. In the fall of 2008, the A&BC engaged cultural development/arts management consultant, Cheryl Yuen, to conduct an evaluation of the IMPACT Project. The purpose of the evaluation was to provide a qualitative assessment of the project – both its processes and outcomes – and identify possible next steps after the conclusion of the initial three years. The specific evaluation goals focused on:

- The effectiveness of the project design to advance the overall goal to increase diversity of boards at major cultural and arts organizations in the Chicago area, including recommendations for improvement and/or expansion of the initiative;
- The impact on the capacity of potential diverse candidates to be thoroughly prepared, appropriately placed, and fully engaged to serve on the boards of major cultural institutions;
- The impact on major institution perspectives and practices in recruitment, orientation, engagement, and retention of diverse board members through project involvement;
- Documentation of observations from both participating institutions and potential candidates on progress, challenges and successes in expanding diversity on major institution boards.

The assessment was conducted between October 2008 and May 2009. In addition to review of written materials, information was gathered through phone and in-person interviews with 32

key project participants, including A&BC staff and project advisors, funders, Russell Reynolds staff, the project Steering Committee members, representatives from institutions on the project roster, and potential board candidates.

Findings

1. The project design for IMPACT facilitated the desired outcome to identify and appropriately place previously “untapped” executives of color on the boards of major cultural institutions. It broke the perception that there are not additional qualified and committed diverse individuals who might be engaged on major cultural institution boards beyond the usual suspects. The key project components that contributed to success are:
 - The use of an executive search firm;
 - A&BC’s role as broker and “match maker” in partnership with the search firm; and
 - The self-selected group of participating organizations that demonstrated commitment to diversity.
2. There was a high level of satisfaction with the IMPACT process expressed by the candidates – placed and non-placed. It opened a door of access, facilitated thoughtful decision making, and prepared them for board service with the major institutions.
3. The participating organizations were generally appreciative of IMPACT’s availability as a resource to their diversification efforts and those receiving placements expressed high satisfaction with both the process and candidates.
4. Overall, the percent of diversity on the boards of the 14 participating agencies over the three years remained about the same – six organizations made gains, six lost members and two remained the same. For those receiving placements, IMPACT helped individual organizations maintain or increase their ethnic representation.
5. Despite IMPACT’s considerable accomplishments, the evaluation pointed to a number of shortcomings and missed opportunities that prevented it from fully meeting expectations and goals. Of greatest significance was the relatively small and homogeneous pool of potential candidates who advanced beyond the initial screening conducted by Russell Reynolds Associates. Other shortcomings include:
 - Limited proactive activity with participating institutions that might have influenced board diversity practices and perspectives;
 - Lost momentum due to lags in the vetting process, the varied length of time for completing placements, the lack of a critical mass, the inevitable difficulty in engaging busy people, and the economic climate.
 - Although an experienced, knowledgeable and well connected circle of individuals has been involved with IMPACT, as a group they were underutilized.

6. One of the IMPACT Project's greatest values is the visibility that it brought to the issue of board diversification for and with major cultural and arts institutions in the Chicago area. The mere presence of IMPACT and the successes it has experienced has begun a process of opening up the dialogue and reframing the conversation in a proactive light. In and out of IMPACT participation, it has served as incentive for major cultural institutions to validate and redouble their efforts in board as well as overall diversification activity.

Recommendations for Action

As IMPACT comes to the conclusion of its third year, there are no plans or funding in place for its continuation at the Arts & Business Council. However, in the short run, it would be valuable to identify an organization or individual that might serve as an interim connection point for interested individuals and institutions so that the full influence of what IMPACT began might be realized. In this light, the following recommendations for action might be considered in the future as ways that this work might be continued and augmented.

1. Conduct research to better ascertain the barriers and motivations of executives of color to serve on the boards of major cultural institutions in order to expand the pool of new and qualified individuals, particularly the perceptions of Latinos and Asians. Incorporate research into development of additional strategies for recruitment.
2. Mobilize those with direct experience in IMPACT as ambassadors, spokespersons and recruiters for the project.
3. Work with major cultural institution representatives to identify and implement ongoing opportunities for sharing and learning around diversity and increasing the capacity for meaningful inclusion of diverse perspectives within their institutions.
4. Continue to monitor the diversity levels in the composition of major cultural institution boards annually. Specifically do follow-up with the IMPACT institutions and candidates concerning retention and consider conducting additional research into this area.
5. In light of A&BC's current strategic planning, reassess whether and what role, responsibility and scope of activity might be appropriately aligned with A&BC's mission, vision and directions related to IMPACT. Explore how what has been learned through this three year experience might inform ongoing A&BC programs, particularly in expanding the pipeline of individuals of color interested in serving on arts and cultural boards.
6. Develop the message and an accompanying communication plan that will provide ongoing visibility for project successes and acknowledgement of IMPACT supporters and participants.

Over the past three years, IMPACT has been a significant player in the sea change of activity around the diversification of major cultural institution boards. It has demonstrated that there is a pool of qualified and talented candidates of color that are not currently engaged with major institution boards and are willing and able to serve fully. As important, IMPACT has provided a critical link to these individuals for interested major cultural institutions, advancing their efforts to build organizational climates that value and embrace diverse perspectives as essential to meaningfully serving their communities and realizing their missions.

INTRODUCTION

The IMPACT (Inclusion of Multicultural Perspectives in Art, Culture and Theatre) Project is a three year initiative of the Arts & Business Council of Chicago (A&BC) designed to increase the diversity of Chicago's largest arts and cultural organizations throughout the metropolitan area. To maintain its vibrancy as a community rich in varied cultural offerings, major cultural institutions need to seek expanded inclusion of diverse populations in their programming and leadership. Board diversity is recognized as a critical component of a successful cultural institution adding new vitality, increasing relevance, and providing the advantage of "first perspective" as institutions strive to deepen their connections with the broader community, particularly communities of color.

Begun officially in 2006, IMPACT is concluding its third year in August of 2009. In the fall of 2008, the Arts & Business Council engaged cultural development/arts management consultant, Cheryl Yuen, to conduct an evaluation of the IMPACT Project. The purpose of the evaluation was to provide a qualitative assessment of the project – both its processes and outcomes – and identify possible next steps after the conclusion of the initial three years. The specific evaluation goals focused on:

- The effectiveness of the project design to advance the overall goal to increase diversity of boards at major cultural and arts organizations in the Chicago area, including recommendations for improvement and/or expansion of the initiative;
- The impact on the capacity of potential diverse candidates to be thoroughly prepared, appropriately placed, and fully engaged to serve on the boards of major cultural institutions;
- The impact on major institution perspectives and practices in recruitment, orientation, engagement, and retention of diverse board members through project involvement;
- Documentation of observations from both participating institutions and potential candidates on progress, challenges and successes in expanding diversity on major institution boards.

The assessment was conducted between October 2008 and May 2009. Assessment activity included review of project documentation – grant proposals and requests, minutes from Steering Committee and focus group meetings, organizational profiles, introductory material, and quantitative data. The bulk of the information gathered for this assessment was through phone and in-person interviews with 32 key project participants, beginning with key project implementers – A&BC staff and project advisors, funders, Russell Reynolds staff, and Steering Committee members. These were followed by conversations with IMPACT Project participants – representatives from institutions receiving a project placement and also those expressing interest in participating in the project, and potential candidates who may or may not have placed with an institution. A complete list of evaluation participants is in Appendix A. Institutional representatives were primarily staff members and included organizational CEOs, as well as designated staff liaisons to board development/nominating committees. The evaluator

extends grateful appreciation to all interviewees and particularly Mignon McPherson Nance, Project Manager, for their assistance with the evaluation.

The list of IMPACT participating organizations is notable for both the organizations included but also the organizations not included. Among those choosing not to participate were Chicago's largest and most publicly recognized institutions – the Art Institute of Chicago, Chicago Lyric Opera, Chicago Symphony Orchestra, Steppenwolf Theatre Company, Museum of Contemporary Art, Joffrey Ballet, and Ravinia Festival. As non-participants they were not included in the evaluation process, as this evaluation was focused on IMPACT's direct influence on board diversification. However, it should be noted that among this group, there is evidence of active engagement with board diversification over the past three years, as well as in many other aspects of organizational activity. It is possible that the mere presence of IMPACT provided some encouragement for these efforts. In any case, documentation and sharing of their efforts along with those of organizations participating in IMPACT might be included in the Project's future plans.

The report is divided into six sections. Section 1 provides a background and the history of the IMPACT Project and a chronology of activities that describe its evolution and project design. Sections 2 and 3 summarize comments and feedback from candidates and organizations about their experiences with IMPACT over the past two years. Section 4 is a laundry list of recommendations from evaluation participants that might serve to improve IMPACT's effectiveness and reach. Section 5 looks at the contributors and detractors to IMPACT development. The final section provides observed success factors and recommendations for actions as the IMPACT Project transitions from its initial three years of support.

Section 1: IMPACT: HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT

The question of how to meaningfully include diverse perspectives in the board rooms of Chicago nonprofit arts and cultural institutions has been a long-time concern in the community. No more clearly was this articulated than in the April 2004 Crain's article by Jerry Mullman: *Arts boards in white period*. Crain's analysis hailed the expected election of Lester Coney as the Goodman Theatre's new chairman, making him the first African-American to lead one of the city's largest cultural institution boards, while at the same time observed the mostly monochromatic make-up of the majority of Chicago most prestigious arts groups. Several reasons were stated for the shortfall: the difficulty in finding minority directors with both the passion for a given institution's programming and the means to raise or contribute expected sums of financial support.

The IMPACT (Inclusion of Multicultural Perspectives in Arts, Culture and Theatre) Project is a direct response to this lack of diverse ethnic representation in the leadership of Chicago's major cultural institutions. It grew out of recognition by members of the Chicago area funding community that increasing board diversity is a complex issue that needed to be addressed in a comprehensive manner. Launched in 2006 with lead support from The Joyce Foundation and subsequent support from Boeing Corporation and The Chicago Community Trust, it was conceived as a three year pilot project designed to increase the diversity of the boards of Chicago's largest cultural institutions. The intent was to create a resource that would help organizations find qualified ethnically diverse individuals for their boards.

With an established board development program, *On Board*, the Arts & Business Council of Chicago was approached to develop and implement the project. The *On Board* program, developed in 1998, addresses the perennial need for new, informed and diverse individuals with business expertise to serve on the boards of arts organizations – primarily small and mid-sized organizations. Just over the past three years, this program has placed 163 individuals, 16% of which are of color. Based on this work, it was initially thought that an expansion of *On Board* might effectively meet the needs of these larger institutions. However, closer examination of major cultural institution board cultures, established practices, and expectations, revealed that this group of organizations required a different experience level than was normally attracted to *On Board* and consequently, a different project approach and design.

With planning support from The Chicago Community Trust and The Joyce Foundation, the Arts & Business Council assembled a steering committee of diverse leaders in the arts, business, philanthropic and civic communities to oversee and guide the project's development. See Appendix B for the list of its members. In addition it held two focus group meetings with board and staff leadership attended by 27 qualifying major institutions to assess their interest, needs, expectations, and willingness to participate.

With input from the Steering Committee, major institution representatives, and project advisors, it was determined that the IMPACT Project should focus on three areas: identifying

board candidates of color; orienting potential candidates; and assisting cultural institutions with effective board diversity. The resulting project design and strategies were based on the following assumptions:

- There is a pool of qualified individuals of color in the community who have not yet been engaged in service on the boards of Chicago area major cultural institutions;
- Institutional self-selection to participate in the project demonstrates commitment to increase board diversity;
- Working with executive search firms is the most effective way to identify and recruit high-level candidates of color for the boards of prominent arts institutions;
- Conducting individual interviews with candidates identifies their interests and capacity, thereby helping them focus on institutions for which they are best suited and fostering the introduction;
- Holding orientation sessions for candidates better prepares them for their role as board member and will increase long term commitment to board service;
- Once placed, candidates will be able to broaden the networks of these institutions at multiple levels so that diversity is further embedded within Chicago area cultural organizations.

Primary components of the project design included:

- Engaging an executive search firm experienced in recruiting diverse individuals for positions in Chicago's business community to assist with identification and vetting of candidates;
- Through a "high touch" approach, providing interested and qualified individuals with specific information about the Chicago cultural community, governance practices, and participating organizations, as well as ongoing support;
- Requiring information from participating organizations about themselves and their board culture, needs and expectations that would allow potential candidates and the A&BC to make appropriate matches;
- Obliging participating institutions to seriously consider any candidates that were vetted and recommended through the IMPACT process for their governing board.

Key in the implementation of IMPACT has been a multi-layered team of professionals. Clare Muñana, principal with Ancora Associates and consultant and board member for many Chicago cultural and educational organizations, was engaged as project advisor. Mignon McPherson Nance was hired to serve as the project manager, overseeing day-to-day activity, in partnership with Joan Gunzberg, executive director of A&BC, and her successor, Peter Kuntz. A&BC negotiated a pro bono agreement with Charles A. Tribbett III at Russell Reynolds Associates, a global executive search firm, through calendar year 2008. Lyndon Taylor from Russell Reynolds has worked closely with the A&BC team to identify and qualify candidates and provided A&BC with profiles of candidates recommended for IMPACT Project participation.

The specific goal of the initial three years of the project was to increase the diversity of boards at Chicago's largest cultural institutions with the placement of 10 to 14 candidates for board

service. Focusing on institutions with annual budgets of over \$5 million, initially 29 organizations were invited to participate in this pilot project in early 2007. See Appendix C for a list of Chicago area cultural organizations meeting this threshold. It was hoped that between five to seven organizations would step forward to participate, which would provide a varied, yet focused pool of organizations to assist. For this core group, IMPACT would seek candidates that specifically addressed their needs and then expand the pool of organizations. However, 13 accepted the invitation. While this reaffirmed the need for the project and provided a wider selection of organizations for the candidates, it altered the anticipated approach and lengthened the time required to move forward. The 13 organizations included: Chicago Architecture Foundation, Adler Planetarium, John G. Shedd Aquarium, Chicago Zoological Society, Lincoln Park Zoo, Chicago Botanic Garden, Kohl Children's Museum, Chicago Children's Museum, Goodman Theatre, Chicago Shakespeare Theater, Merit School of Music, Museum of Science and Industry, and Music Institute of Chicago. [Note: Hubbard Street Dance Chicago was added to the roster in 2008.] Representatives from each organization met with A&BC staff to ensure that A&BC had complete understanding of what each needed and required of their board members. A&BC staff prepared a profile with an organizational overview and summary of individual institutional board processes (including service expectations – time and financial) and board culture. This profile accompanied a packet of additional information and literature about each institution that could be given to prospective board members.

During the summer of 2007, Russell Reynolds Associates began the task of identifying individuals that might have interest in the IMPACT Project. Using a combined list of prospects assembled by A&BC and Russell Reynolds Associates as a starting point, it was pared and prioritized. Over the ensuing year and a half, Lyndon Taylor interviewed 26 interested parties, including individuals from this initial list plus additional names submitted from other sources. The primary focus of Russell Reynolds' work was to introduce the concept of board service for a major cultural institution and assess individual suitability for the project. Criteria used to determine appropriateness for IMPACT included: level of interest, sense of cultural institutions, past links or engagement with cultural institutions, work involvement /commitments, sense of civic engagement, and involvement with other nonprofit organizations. Of these, eighteen individuals advanced to the next stage in the recruitment process. This group is composed of 14 African-Americans, three Latinos and one Native American.

In September 2007, A&BC staff began meeting individually with this group of candidates. These meetings were more specifically focused. A&BC introduced candidates to the cultural community and specific board service options and helped them match their personal and professional interests with roster organizations. Each candidate was provided specific information about identified organizations and a resource manual that provided an overview of both the Chicago cultural and arts community and board governance practices. Serving as broker and connector, once candidates prioritized their list of potential organizations, A&BC made organizational introductions.

Once the connection was made, recruitment was the responsibility of the selected institution(s). As every institution had different recruitment processes and timeline, the length

of time between the initial meeting with A&BC/institution and election to a board varied from three months to almost a year, averaging about six months. Most recruitment processes included opportunities to experience the work of the institution, as well as meet with staff and board development and/or board leadership. The first individual elected to a board was in March of 2008. All candidates interested in joining a board after participating in organizational recruitment processes were elected for service. Through the end of May 2009, eight individuals had been elected to six institution boards, shy of the original project goal of 10 to 14 placements. Of the remaining ten who have not yet been placed on a board, many had changes in their professional or personal lives that have influenced their capacity to fully serve on a major institution board and chose not to proceed. Many are hopeful to re-engage when circumstances allow their full participation.

Throughout the recruitment process, A&BC staff maintained close contact with candidates to monitor progress and provide ongoing support. Specifically for candidates, it offered one session on the legal implications of board service and one special IMPACT Project reception with the Steering Committee and A&BC board members prior to an A&BC public workshop. Additionally, candidates were invited to attend ongoing regularly scheduled A&BC workshops open to the broader community.

Section 2: CANDIDATE PERCEPTIONS OF IMPACT

IMPACT opens the circle of available individuals that might be interested in serving, but had no access point...[I] wouldn't be on this board without IMPACT.

[It is] easy for institutions to say they've done it to take [themselves] out from under the microscope...but there is a difference between saying it and actually meaning it.

- Comments from IMPACT placed candidates

The evaluation included interviews with eight of the nine placed candidates, as well as two of the ten candidates who proceeded into the second stage of the process, but have not or chose not to stand for board consideration. Phone interviews were conducted March to May 2009. Interview questions probed candidate background and board experience, impressions of and motivations to participate in IMPACT, the recruitment experience, board service preparedness and observations, and recommendations for the future. At that point, the longest standing board member had served for about a year.

Candidate profile overview

The ten individuals interviewed included nine African-Americans and one Native American, three women and seven men. This group included entrepreneurs, consultants, and corporate executives; professional expertise included finance, technology, accounting, and marketing. Many had advanced degrees primarily in business. Most had board experience, primarily with civic, fraternal, educational or social service organizations. One or two had served on the boards of smaller cultural institutions; one had experience with major cultural institution committees. They range in age from 35 to 47; a number of them have elementary or secondary age children, who were cited as motivating factors in their board service decision making process. They reside in communities throughout the Chicago metro region.

A majority of the candidates had a direct connection to Lyndon Taylor at Russell Reynolds. One was referred by Clare Muñana and two others were referred by other candidates.

Motivation to participate

The most commonly expressed motivation for participation was personal interest and passion. Most had either a long-time interest in the arts or had family members who were deeply involved on a participatory basis. Other motivations included having an opportunity to impact young people, strong connections with childhood memories, commitment to Chicago, and a desire to expand civic involvement and presence. One person saw participation as an opportunity to balance his desire to give back to the community with relevance to his family. Another wanted a volunteer experience that was different and more diverse than had been experienced in the past. Looking for ways that she could look at her civic work "with a fresh

eye” and interest in a larger more complex board experience was the motivation of another. A new person to the Chicago looked at participation as a good way to become acquainted with the community, connect and build new networks. Viewing her participation as a two way-street, one person wanted to both expand and share her network and contacts. Another observed that IMPACT provided a significant intersection of normally separate social activity: “minorities don’t have easy opportunity to get connected; they go to different churches, engage in different streams of activity and social networks.”

Importance of IMPACT

IMPACT was cited as important from a number of different perspectives. It was seen as creating a framework that articulates the need to reach out and breaks down the tendency to consider the same people, by opening the circle of available qualified individuals with acquaintance of board service options with cultural institutions. One interviewee felt that it was a visible sign of doing something differently and that it needs to be done; she expressed that “it says that business leaders feel we need to do this and that diversity of thought is important.” She also felt that with peer pressure within the business community, IMPACT could be expanded. Another said that IMPACT “gives minorities a chance to be on boards...this seems to be a sincere commitment to serve the minority community rather than just say that there are increased numbers.” Still other candidates felt that without IMPACT they would not have been noticed and seriously considered as board potentials. Another said that it accelerated her election to a board, as although she had the interest, she did not have the time to cultivate the necessary connections to be on the radar of organizations that she was interested in serving.

IMPACT experience

Feedback from candidates about their IMPACT experience was highly positive. Appreciated was the attentiveness of A&BC staff, particularly Mignon McPherson Nance – cited as a key project asset – and the “high touch” relationship that was characterized with ongoing communication and support. Generally, candidates felt that they had received thorough information from A&BC about the different organizations, particularly concerning expectations and financial contributions. This was particularly important with those in the corporate sector. Having complete information helped them carefully weigh options and recognize which to eliminate, steering them to the most appropriate matches. The resource manual was cited as very useful in setting a macro context for their board work and the workshop on legal implications was mentioned as helpful. One person appreciated the availability of knowing about the other training that was offered; he felt that it kept the issue of training in one’s mind.

Recruitment experience and observations

All the candidates were positive about the recruitment process they experienced with the individual cultural institutions. People valued the transparency in the process. Openness and accessibility of board and staff was good and all felt welcomed. One candidate said that she

listened to the language used and found that “unconscious biases weren’t there in how they spoke” which showed her that the organization was receptive, open and valued diverse perspectives. One person cited that when he met with the organization’s CEO for the first time, the CEO was aware of and prepared to discuss the concerns he had about possible board service. Another appreciated the multiple opportunities to meet with board members, particularly lunch with the board president as part of the recruitment process. For a couple candidates the timing of election came as a little surprise as they were not aware of the timeline for that part of the process. A couple candidates commented on how much they appreciated seeing other members of color on the board, but that it was not a critical decision making factor.

Becoming engaged as a board member

All the candidates appeared to become engaged with the organization quickly. Most were serving or had agreed to serve on at least one committee of their choice at the time of the interview. Many had participated in either individual or group orientations. A recently elected board member was mentioned in an organizational interview as publicly representing the board at a special event; another had been asked to participate in a Martin Luther King Day discussion with staff around outreach to diverse communities. The one interviewee who felt that she was being underutilized at the time of the interview had already taken responsibility for having a conversation with the organization’s CEO to discuss ways she could be a more effective board member. Another candidate who had been dormant in his participation for a few months because of shifts in his professional workload acknowledged and regretted his absence but was ready to fully re-engage.

Non-placed candidate perceptions

Two individuals who went through the initial IMPACT recruitment were also interviewed. They echoed much of what the placed candidates had expressed about their motivation to participate, IMPACT and its process. Both were very interested in participating, but decided not to commit to board service due to shifts in workload and financial considerations related to the depressed economy. Both remain interested and want to be engaged when their circumstances are more favorable.

Section 3: ORGANIZATIONAL PERCEPTIONS OF IMPACT

[With IMPACT] institutions and candidates don't have to navigate the unknown, which creates barriers to participation.

- Comment from a participating organization

The evaluation included interviews with representatives from the six cultural organizations receiving board placements between March 2007 and May 2009 – Adler Planetarium, Chicago Architecture Foundation, Hubbard Street Dance Chicago, Lincoln Park Zoo, Chicago Zoological Society, and Merit School of Music – and five organizations – Kohl Children's Museum, Chicago Children's Museum, Museum of Science and Industry, Chicago Shakespeare Theater and Chicago Botanic Garden – that were included on the IMPACT roster, but did not gain a new board member through IMPACT. Three organizations had two individuals join their boards through IMPACT – Adler, Hubbard Street and Chicago Architecture Foundation; the remaining four had single additions. All organizations on the IMPACT roster were offered an opportunity to participate in the evaluation; three chose not to be included. Their non-participation cannot be viewed as a lack of interest in board diversification, as they have shown attention and progress in this arena. Phone and in-person interviews were conducted between March and July of 2009. Interviews focused on existing board development and diversification efforts and practices, IMPACT experiences, candidate preparedness, retention, and recommendations for the future.

Organizational Profile Overview

The organizations included in the evaluation represent a diversity of missions, disciplines, budget sizes and geographic areas. A number described their commitment to diversity as “part of its DNA.” A common denominator of the group appears to be active engagement in organizational transition on a variety of levels. Many were in the midst of change processes spurred by new strategic plans, board redefinition and transition, and recent diversity related work and plans. A number expressed a renewed focus on inclusion of the broader Chicago community in their activity, which they saw impacting programming, partnerships, support, as well as board and staff make-up. In the case of one organization, it was shifting its board composition from a focus on predominately industry related individuals to those representing a variety of community sectors. Concern around diversification on the board level included not only ethnic/racial diversity, but gender and age. Additionally, people of color already on their boards were playing prominent roles as the chair of the board, and chair and members of the board development or nominating committees.

Motivation for participation in IMPACT

Motivations for participation in IMPACT varied from “God-sent at just the right time” to “fundors want it... it helps create a better society.” Organizations recognized that with a more diverse board, they could better serve and reach diverse communities and have richer and

more balanced conversations and decision making on the board level. Connection with “real world” perspectives, particularly around audience/guest experiences was viewed as an important plus, as well as building greater relevance with and to the community. For many, diversity was synonymous with their renewed attention to Chicago.

IMPACT was of particular interest to organizations for a variety of reasons. These included: alignment with organizational priorities and public focused interests, its business-like approach, and as another resource for identifying potential board members. Participation in IMPACT was seen as “showing that it practices what it preaches” and a demonstration to funders that an organization wanted to improve its profile. One interviewee attended one of the early meetings and was attracted to it through that experience, while another simply felt that it was an important initiative with which to be involved.

Diversity efforts

Organizations were asked about their current and past efforts in board development, and in particular activities to diversify their boards. Most had not ventured too far beyond the usual scope of board development channels for identifying potential members. For a number of groups, board diversification efforts were aligned with organization wide diversity efforts – formal and informal – which included staffing, educational programming, artistic focus, and audience development. Most had staff leadership with strong commitment to furthering board diversification.

Representatives mentioned a number of strategies that had been explored or tried. Among these are:

- Engaging a firm that specialized in this area – [Note: this was not pursued because it was cost prohibitive];
- Diversity training conducted by a consultant of color with the board – [Note: this seemed to raise sensitivity but didn’t result in greater board composition diversity];
- Sponsoring a diversity networking evening; a list of business leaders of color was invited by the organization’s board membership chair to an event hosted by its African-American members;
- Using the Chicago United list of people of color interested in board service as a resource;
- Ongoing discussions with corporate community relations people about the organization’s need for diverse representation on the board.

Among the practices used that appear to have the most effective results are:

- Regularly reminding the nominating/board development committee of progress toward composition goals;
- Having people of color on the nominating/board development committee;
- Working closely with diverse board members to identify and approach potential new members one on one;

- Ensuring that board and staff working closely on recruitment have a similar mind-set;
- Learning from other large cultural institutions that have been successful in their diversification efforts;
- Visible commitment of a board chair that understands and can articulate why diversity is important; this was particularly effective with a chair who was a person of color.

Additionally, one organization had looked at The Chicago Community Trust's program related to building greater diversity in mid to senior staff positions as a possible model for its board diversity work. Another was working with a local university on the development of a pilot board apprenticeship program. The intent of the program was to cultivate new board leadership, particularly with individuals of color. The program would provide training for a select group of individuals, while involving each directly in board activity.

Barriers and challenges to diversification

The greatest and most often expressed barrier to diversification was that the "same names emerge that are on every other board"; as a result "everyone is after them" and they are spread too thin. Uncovering and making connections with untapped and qualified individuals was described as being a "scavenger hunt." Even when lists of interested people of color existed, such as that kept by Chicago United, being able to identify individuals that might have interests aligned with organizational mission was not an easy task. An upshot to this inability to identify new names was a fall back to the usual practices: the "board recruits who it knows which is often folks just like them."

"How do we make ourselves more attractive to diverse individuals?" was another expressed challenge. One representative mentioned the frustration of his minority board members in recruiting others when they could not point to or "see themselves in the artistic work on stage." Others described the challenge of attracting diverse individuals as a struggle on not only the board level, but in staff recruitment, as well. In discussing this barrier in relation to artistic staff making choices about new artistic personnel, one interviewee observed that there was an "intellectual willingness but also a feeling that it ties my hands."

One organizational representative talked about the "tokenism" factor being a barrier. "It is not enough to just be at the table, but members must live up to established expectations and step up to the plate. If it doesn't happen, a person loses credibility and becomes perceived as a 'token'". He described a particular member of color who had joined the board with the potential to become a strong leader but as the result of his lack of performance on multiple levels had "made himself a token" in the eyes of his board colleagues.

The question of the financial commitment expected of board service surfaced throughout the interviews. Comments provide no clear answer to this question. One organization had experienced it being a barrier to attracting Latino candidates in particular. Another stated that it is a deterrent generally, but it comes up most often as an issue with an ethnically diverse candidate. The idea of a multi-tiered give/get system has been considered by a number of

institutions but none had actually moved to implement one. However, there remains an underlying assumption that it is either wealth or diversity, and organizations continue to struggle to find the balance.

A final challenge facing organizations in their board diversity efforts is having adequate time to actively work on it and keep it a priority among all the other demands on the organization, particularly during the current economic climate.

IMPACT experience

Organizational expectations of IMPACT were generally modest. Most hoped for at least one viable candidate of color for their board. One group wrote participation in IMPACT into its strategic plan and anticipated that it would raise new names for its consideration. The project was characterized as “match-making vs. arranged marriage”. Although there was some concern about the preparedness of the candidates at the start, the due diligence demonstrated by A&BC in collecting pertinent organizational information put fears to rest. At the same time, participants recognized that if a candidate was referred, it had an obligation to seriously consider his or her candidacy. There was concern expressed by one organization that if a recommended individual doesn’t fit, then what? Although there was broad agreement that IMPACT was a viable model for furthering board diversity, one interviewee did express concern about its “one size fits all” approach. It was pointed out that there are vast differences within large institutions in relation to scope, expectations, and governance structures and practices, and individual needs that might necessitate greater individual customization. However, A&BC was lauded for its capacity to keep the process moving and for establishing strong working relationships with institutions.

The most distinct aspects of IMPACT highlighted by interviewees was its arts orientation, third party vetting of potential candidates, link to previously undiscovered individuals, and process that emulated “the way that corporate America does it.” Third party screening was particularly seen as beneficial as potential candidates were well aware of organizational expectations before being formally introduced, creating a transparency to the process. One interviewee observed that it did not have to spend as much time selling the organization, as the candidate had already chosen to consider it. The mere existence of IMPACT was felt to reinforce the notion that diversity enhances board effectiveness and that selection as a participant in IMPACT improves an organization’s profile (especially with funders).

Candidate preparedness

Universally, organizations found candidates to be ready and prepared for board service and excited about participation. Candidates had impressive resumes and one interviewee thought that the “candidates were more senior in their experience than anticipated.” Candidates came with a good knowledge of the organization, as well as being a board member, and asked thoughtful questions. Organizational financial commitment requirements did not appear to be a potential deal breaker with any candidate that joined a board.

Candidate retention

To date, all eight placed candidates remain engaged with their chosen institutions, so that difficulty with retention has not yet emerged as relevant for this group. Organizations are working to retain these members in a variety of ways. A primary strategy is assuring that these diverse members (as well as the rest of the board) feel comfortable expressing their opinions and allowing each one to bring their talents and interests to the table. Special efforts to be aware of specific candidate interests is occurring as organizations acknowledge that each individual wears a variety of hats and requires different connection points to become fully engaged. One organization engaged its diverse members in an organization wide conversation about reaching diverse communities. Another heeded a comment by an African American member who expressed his appreciation that he “was no longer the only one.”

IMPACT's influence on organizational practice

There is little evidence of direct impact of the IMPACT on board development practices within participating organizations. However interviewees noted modifications in perceptions related to involvement with the project. One person cited a change in the assumption that “outside people won’t measure up to the usual and that there are lots of folks eager to serve and understand what they do.” Another felt that IMPACT involvement had reassured the board that “there are dynamic and qualified people who want to serve and take responsibility seriously.” For one organization it added momentum to their diversity efforts and gave encouragement to board members leading the nominating process to “keep at it.” There was also recognition expressed that diverse communities want to see themselves in both programming and leadership.

Section 4: RECOMMENDATIONS FROM EVALUATION PARTICIPANTS

The following is a compilation of recommendations and suggestions for improving and augmenting IMPACT offered by evaluation interviewees.

Recruitment

- Enlist help with the identification and recruitment of executives from the following: corporate leadership, leading minority professional organizations, business networks (i.e. Chicago Network, Commercial Club), company diversity councils, thought leaders; share results of the project with them and keep them in the loop
- Continue to network with “connector” organizations such as Chicago United; stay in direct communication around this project; use their established list(s)
- Engage Steering Committee members more aggressively in board recruitment process; ask them for candidate recommendations on a regular basis [this may involve augmenting or reinventing the group]
- Activate the cohort of placed candidates as a Steering Committee and ask them to help develop strategies and priorities for next steps
- Investigate sources for identifying Latino candidates
- Look to the Islamic community as a potential source of candidates
- Concentrate recruitment efforts by focusing on the needs of specific organizations for a short period of time
- Leverage the experiences and testimonials of those who have gone through the IMPACT process; use them as spokespersons
- Leverage the experiences and testimonials of other executives of color who can speak about their experiences on cultural boards
- Hold “rush” parties for IMPACT
- Develop a one page overview/summary of all roster organizations so that candidates can see at a glance expectations and key profile information
- Sponsor a “meet and greet” type event to introduce candidates to the participating organizations
- Consider helping any organization looking to diversify the board
- Articulate the need to reach out for diverse members and position the arts as a compelling field for diverse individuals to want to contribute their time and resources
- Create a listserv of people interested in board service like the one with Chicago United
- Refresh call to service and encourage younger people to get involved
- Try to engage people not employed at maximum time currently in the idea of board service so that they will be prepared to participate when their circumstances improve

Retention

- Continue offering workshop/training opportunities for candidates
- Conduct regular and scheduled ways to connect with other placed individuals, both social and content based ; provide opportunities to share lessons learned and upgrade own toolkits
- Link candidates with a mentor who has experience with another board
- Hold small gatherings for people to talk about their experiences

Overall

- Create brand awareness; use the testimonials of those who have benefited as a way to sell the project
- Gain better understand of the internal processes for recruitment in the largest institutions in order to better serve them through customized processes
- Cultivate the next generation of board leaders through training and placement on major institution auxiliary bodies and committees
- Bring participating organizations together as a body that can work cooperatively to enlist an executive search firm to work with IMPACT or share expenses and responsibilities in sponsoring activities of mutual benefit
- Sponsor strategy sessions among the organizations to explore issues of mutual concern
- Look at the Greater Leadership Chicago model and as a possible home for this project
- Provide opportunities for best practices concerning diversification to be shared among the majors
- Monitor and document retention
- Continue this project as a resource and find an appropriate home for it
- Be proactive in seeking funding
- Provide good public relations for Russell Reynolds Associates
- Augment information on organizational expectations
- Provide assistance to organizations in creating and implementing a diversity plan
- Continue to use an executive search firm
- Enlist the assistance of Janice Fenn, who was a corporate chief diversity officer and wrote *Do You See What I See: A Diversity Tale for Retaining People of Color*
- Explore the question: What is it that makes a specific organization's board the one to be on?
- Ask the groups and candidates for input on how to keep the project going and the importance of being a part of IMPACT
- Celebrate the success of this project

Section 5: GENERAL FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS

From its inception, the IMPACT Project with its intended overall goal to increase the diversity of boards of directors at Chicago's largest cultural institutions has been a tall order and a challenge for the Arts & Business Council. Although it had experience with training and placing individuals on arts and cultural organization boards through *On Board*, the scope of this initiative required a different type of approach and depth of relationships that it had not established in the past. As a cooperative effort, IMPACT was attempting to break new ground, perhaps develop a new model for furthering this type of work. Although, the quantitative goal appeared modest – to place 10 to 14 candidates of color on the boards of Chicago area major cultural institutions – it proved to be beyond the reach of the three year project horizon. There was not only pressure to achieve that quantitative goal but also begin to shift the current paradigms in major cultural institution board development philosophy and approaches and ask organizations to broaden their concept of what makes an effective board and who can contribute.

Assessing and isolating the effectiveness of IMPACT was complicated and masked by a multitude of internal and external factors that are outside of IMPACT's influence. These include:

- Funder pressure on major cultural institutions to diversify, as well as new funder opportunities to support diversification efforts;
- The individual cultures, plans, and readiness of the participating institutions to engage in this work;
- The differing stages of readiness (i.e. time, financial, and willingness) of potential candidates to commitment to board service;
- The changing economic climate;
- Sociological and political shifts with the emergence of multi-cultural coalitions and the election of the first African American president.

Evaluation observations and findings are offered in this light.

The project design for IMPACT facilitated the desired outcome to identify and appropriately place previously “untapped” executives of color on the boards of major cultural institutions. It broke the perception that there are not additional qualified and committed diverse individuals who might be engaged on major cultural institution boards beyond the usual suspects. The key project components that contributed to success are:

- The use of an executive search firm – Russell Reynolds Associates – with a strong network of contacts in the African American business community tapped into a new network of qualified individuals and provided needed credibility for the project and the A&BC to candidates and organizations;
- A&BC's role as broker and “match maker” in partnership with Russell Reynolds worked to provide candidates with informed guidance to appropriate matches and keep the process of recruitment moving forward on all fronts;

- The self-selected group of participating organizations demonstrated commitment to diversity and provided a home for sound placements in which candidates could be engaged, active and have positive impact in advancing the organization's mission.

There was a high level of satisfaction with the IMPACT process expressed by the candidates – placed and non-placed. It opened a door of access, facilitated thoughtful decision making, and prepared them for board service with the major institutions. Individuals feel that they have been enabled to make significant contributions of time, talent and financial support and are recognized for those efforts. IMPACT personnel were viewed as doing an effective job of establishing “high touch” relationships and keeping them involved with the project. Additionally, non-placed candidates remained in the loop, serving to keep future board service on their radar and perpetuating a viable pool of prospective candidates. A majority of the candidates expressed willingness and enthusiasm about engaging others in IMPACT and offered to help in recruitment efforts.

The participating organizations were generally appreciative of IMPACT's availability as a resource to their diversification efforts and those receiving placements expressed high satisfaction with both the process and candidates. They showed an interest in learning from each other and from colleagues engaged in this work outside of the IMPACT, as well as other resources. Although IMPACT was deemed worthwhile, there was uncertainty as to their capacity to contribute financial support to its continuation particularly within the current economic climate. A fee for services (which might include other activities beyond candidate identification) was mentioned as a possible option, as well as banding together to share costs or provide in-kind services, or in approaching other entities, i.e. an executive search firm, to try to leverage support.

Overall, the percent of diversity on the boards of the 14 participating agencies over the three years, remained about the same – six organizations made gains, six lost members and two remained the same. Over the past year (2008 to 2009) which corresponds to the time period during which the majority of the IMPACT placements were made, there was a slight percentage increase of about .75%. See Appendix F for a three year history of board diversity activity. Organizations with IMPACT placements either maintained the level of diversity on their board or increased the number of diverse board members over the past two years. With so little actual change in most organization boards it is difficult to assess what the decreases might be attributed to, as factors such as term limits or reasons related to natural attrition might have come into play.

Despite IMPACT's considerable accomplishments, the evaluation pointed to a number of shortcomings and missed opportunities that prevented it from fully meeting expectations and goals. Of greatest significance was the relatively small and homogeneous pool of potential candidates who advanced beyond the initial screening conducted by Russell Reynolds Associates. The expectation for the project was to have a pool large enough for each participating organization to consider at least one candidate and was inclusive of Latino, Asian, Native American, as well as African American representation. Early dependence on Russell

Reynolds Associates yielded primarily African American candidates, as that was the strength of the network it brought to the project and may have dampened other efforts to aggressively seek other candidates. While there were expectations that the Steering Committee or other advisors would offer additional and a broader diversity of names, this request appears not to have been clearly understood. Additionally, there seems to have been limited direct and sustained outreach and communication with organizations and other entities that might have mutual interests. Efforts late in the process to network with representatives from the Latino community surfaced participation by only one individual, but did begin a dialogue around involving Latinos in board service.

To have influenced board diversity practices and perspectives of participating institutions directly would have required more proactive activity on the part of IMPACT. IMPACT's relationship with institutions was respectful, but passive, activated when information was needed or when a viable candidate came forward. Having "primed the pump" through the planning meetings with institutional leaders and the demonstrated interest with their enlistment in IMPACT, there was an opportunity lost to further the capacity of this self-selected group with forums for sharing and learning and helping them continue to challenge and reformulate their assumptions and actions around diversity.

Additionally, the project design was perceived by some of the larger major cultural institutions as a "one size fits all" approach that did not adequately address particular individual institutional needs. Questioned was the viability of a project design that did not take into consideration the differences within a group of institutions that varied so greatly in their expectations, established processes, practices and structures, budget sizes, scope, mission and reputations. It was suggested that a more customized methodology might have better addressed the diversity of individual organizational needs.

After a promising start, IMPACT lost momentum that might have been used to sustain interest and cultivate growth. Lags in the vetting process due in part to its pro bono nature, the varied length of time for completing placements, the lack of a critical mass, the inevitable difficulty in engaging busy people, and the economic climate prevented IMPACT from more rapidly evolving and firmly establishing a presence that might propel it forward. This pioneering effort was largely invisible as limited publicity and promotion occurred that might have garnered broader public interest and participation, acknowledged the investment of funders, and validated those involved and what had been accomplished. Underlying this loss of momentum and lack of a public face was the inherent difficulty of how to sensitively and appropriately talk about the intent of this initiative. While there was comfort in discussing it with the candidates, who brought it up themselves as having experienced "being the only one" in their workplaces, there was discomfort and reluctance in the project being perceived publicly as being about "affirmative" or "diversity" action. Key moving forward will be finding a way for IMPACT to publicly position arts institutions as a welcoming and compelling arena for volunteer service and financial commitment so that diverse individuals will be drawn in, want to contribute, feel welcomed and be involved.

Although an experienced, knowledgeable and well connected circle of individuals have been involved with IMPACT, as a group they were underutilized. Expressed lack of clarity around the roles, responsibilities, and scope of authority of key project personnel resulted in some implementation inertia and the absence of prevailing leadership. The Steering Committee of diverse leaders from various community sectors who was critical to effectively launching the project never became fully engaged over the long run. Frequently mentioned by interviewees was that once initial organizing tasks were completed, additional roles and channels for keeping Steering Committee members actively involved were not defined. Additionally, placed candidates and benefiting institutions that might provide ongoing credibility and the strongest endorsement for the project have not yet been mobilized on behalf of the project.

Despite the shortcomings, one of the IMPACT Project's greatest values remains in the visibility that it brought to the issue of board diversification for and with major cultural and arts institutions in the Chicago area. As acknowledged previously, it is not an easy topic to broadly or honestly discuss or explore as it digs into the heart of long standing societal concerns. The mere presence of IMPACT and the successes it has experienced has begun a process of opening up the dialogue and reframing the conversation in a proactive light. In and out of IMPACT participation, it has served as incentive for major cultural institutions to validate and redouble their efforts in board, as well as overall diversification activity. The funders, candidates, organizations, and Arts & Business Council are to be commended for creating this opportunity for discussion and bringing this issue to the starting line. As expressed by one of the IMPACT placed candidates – "board diversity is a marathon, not a sprint."

Section 6: SUCCESS FACTORS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTIONS

Success Factors

The following factors were observed in the evaluation as contributing to success in major cultural institution diversity efforts and for candidates of color to become meaningfully engaged in service on these boards.

From the organizational perspective these factors include:

- Demonstrated and authentic long term commitment to inclusion of diverse perspectives at all levels of activity;
- Staff and board leadership that is committed to diversity;
- Continued priority on and sustained engagement of increased numbers of diverse individuals on the board; encouraging ownership and leadership in recruitment, orientation and retention efforts;
- Development of an organizational and board culture that values, learns and benefits from diverse opinion;
- Connecting with a potential member on a one-to-one basis and recognizing that it matters who asks;
- Strong and transparent board development practices and approaches that support full and meaningful participation by all board members;
- Engaging individuals first for their sincere passion for the organizational mission and vision;
- Avoiding pigeon-holing of new and diverse members; taking the time to “get to know” where their interests and talents lie and engaging them appropriately.

From the individual perspective factors include:

- Choosing to serve where one can make a difference – “It is not enough to just be at the table, you have to step up to the plate;”
- Being thoughtful but not reserved in questioning assumptions and raising issues;
- Understanding that credibility is gained through one’s total performance as a board member, however, realistically, on large institution boards, “giving and getting” success will provide immediate acknowledgement;
- Forming meaningful relationships with fellow board members;
- Being willing to provide leadership in furthering the board development and diversification efforts.

Recommendations for Actions

As IMPACT comes to the conclusion of its third year, there are no plans in place for its continuation at the Arts & Business Council. As of the end of August 2009, there will be no stream of financial support or designated staff dedicated to this project. In addition, the formal agreement with Russell Reynolds Associates to provide vetting services concluded at the end of 2008.

With this chapter closing on IMPACT, over the short run, it would be valuable to identify an organization or individual that might serve as an interim connection point for interested individuals and institutions. There are ten individuals who participated in the IMPACT vetting process and have interest, but due to timing issues were not able to commit to board service during the project's duration. Additionally, there are eight organizations with whom no candidate was placed. Of benefit would be to continue to provide that link, at minimum, between these individuals and interested major cultural institutions so that the full influence of what IMPACT began might be realized.

Although this project will formally end, there remains an expressed need and interest by institutions, as well as candidates in having the availability of a resource that is a pipeline and access point for qualified and interested executives of color to serve on the boards of major cultural institutions. In this light, the following recommendations for action might be considered in the future as ways that this service might be continued and augmented.

1. Conduct research to better understand the barriers and motivations of executives of color to serve on the boards of major cultural institutions in order to expand the pool of new and qualified individuals. In particular, focus on gathering the perceptions of Latinos and Asians. Incorporate research into development of additional strategies for recruitment. Reach out and communicate with organizations suggested by interviewees as possible resources and partners.
2. Mobilize those with direct experience in IMPACT as ambassadors, spokespersons and recruiters for the project. The candidates, in particular, offer the strongest endorsement for the initiative and are willing and enthusiastic to help with recruitment. Work with candidates to build a pipeline for increased diversity on their boards as well as other major institution boards by facilitating networking with each other. Enlist benefiting organizations in building credibility for IMPACT with their boards and other major institutions.
3. Work with major cultural institution representatives to identify and implement ongoing opportunities for sharing and learning around diversity and increasing the capacity for meaningful inclusion of diverse perspectives within their institutions. Collaborate with these groups and employ their collective leverage to secure resources or share expenses and responsibilities in sponsoring activities of mutual benefit.

4. Continue to monitor the diversity levels in the composition of major cultural institution boards annually. Specifically do follow-up with the IMPACT institutions and candidates concerning retention and consider conducting additional research into this area. Although retention did not emerge as an issue for this project as this group of candidates had served a relatively short period of time, there is a broader field perception that retaining individuals of color as board members is more difficult than other members. Investigation into this perception might warrant future attention.
5. In light of its current strategic planning, reassess whether and what role, responsibility and scope of activity might be appropriately aligned with A&BC's mission, vision and directions related to IMPACT. Explore how what has been learned through this three year experience might inform ongoing A&BC programs, particularly in expanding the pipeline of individuals of color interested in serving on arts and cultural boards. Of importance is continuing to put emphasis on the training and support of the next generation of volunteer board leaders and reaching out to ensure inclusion of diverse perspectives in that pool.
6. Develop the message and an accompanying communication plan that will provide ongoing visibility for project successes and acknowledgement of IMPACT supporters and participants. As it was coverage in the press that spawned this particular initiative, raising awareness about IMPACT would validate its efforts and the strides that major cultural institutions have made in diversifying their boards over the past five years.

Over the past three years, IMPACT has been a significant player in the sea change of activity around the diversification of major cultural institution boards. It has demonstrated that there is pool of qualified and talented candidates of color that are not currently engaged with major institution boards and are willing and able to serve fully. As important, IMPACT has provided a critical link to these individuals for interested major cultural institutions, advancing their efforts to build organizational climates that value and embrace diverse perspectives as essential to meaningfully serving their communities and realizing their missions.

Appendix A

Evaluation Participants

The following is a list of individuals who were interviewed for the evaluation.

IMPACT Major Cultural Institution Representatives

Lynn Abrahamson, Director of Individual Giving and Board Relations, Chicago Botanic Garden
Duffie Adelson, President, Merit School of Music
Martin Grochala, Director of Development, Hubbard Street Dance Chicago
Criss Henderson, Executive Director, Chicago Shakespeare Theater
Charles Katzenmeyer, Vice President, External Affairs, Adler Planetarium
Mary Krinock, Director of Strategic Initiatives, Museum of Science and Industry
Stephanie Lieber, Associate Vice President, Individual Giving, Chicago Children's Museum
Jo-Elle Mogerman, Vice President, Planning and Community Relations, Chicago Zoological Society
Lynn Osmond, President, Chicago Architecture Foundation
Stuart Strahl, President and CEO, Chicago Zoological Society
Sheridan Turner, President, Kohl Children's Museum
Christine Zrinsky, Senior Director of Development, Lincoln Park Zoo

IMPACT Candidates (Placed and Non-placed)

Bob Christian, Board Member, Merit School of Music (Principal, October Family Holdings)
Kathy Hannan, Board Member, Adler Planetarium (Managing Partner, KPMG)
Phyllis Lockett, Board Member, Adler Planetarium (President/CEO, Renaissance Schools Fund)
Robert McGhee, IMPACT candidate (Vice President Community Development, US Bank)
Dorri McWhorter, Board Member, Chicago Architecture Foundation (Partner, Crowe, Chizek & Company, LLC)
David Nichols, Board Member, Lincoln Park Zoo (President/COO, PPM Global Corporation)
Benjamin Reyes, Board Member, Hubbard Street Dance Chicago (President/CEO, DSR Group, Inc.)
John Sydnors, IMPACT candidate, unplaced (COO, Melvin Securities)
Ken Thompson, Board Member, Chicago Zoological Society (Client Services Director, DLC, Inc.)
Willard Woods, Board Member, Chicago Architecture Foundation (Principal, Ernst and Young)

IMPACT Staff, Advisors, Steering Committee Members and Funders

Michelle Boone, Program Officer – Culture, Joyce Foundation
Les Coney, Executive Vice President, Office of the Chairman, Mesirow Financial Corporation; Chair, IMPACT Project Steering Committee
Suzy Connor, Senior Program Officer, Chicago Community Trust
Kassie Davis, former Senior Program Officer, Chicago Community Trust; Executive Director, CME Group Foundation
Joan Gunzberg, former Executive Director, Arts & Business Council of Chicago
Peter Kuntz, Executive Director, Arts & Business Council of Chicago
Eric McKissack, President, Channing Capital Management; IMPACT Project Steering Committee
Mignon McPherson Nance, IMPACT Project Manager, Arts & Business Council of Chicago
Clare Muñana, IMPACT Project Advisor; Principal, Ancora Associates
Lyndon Taylor, Managing Director, Russell Reynolds Associates; Board Member, Hubbard Street Dance
Greg White, President/CEO, LEARN Charter School; IMPACT Project Steering Committee member

Appendix B

IMPACT Steering Committee

Les Coney (Chair), Senior Managing Director/Executive Vice President, Mesirow Financial
Michelle Boone, Program Officer – Culture, Joyce Foundation
Gloria Castillo, President, Chicago United
Kassie Davis, Director, Chicago Mercantile Exchange Trust
Sunil Garg, Vice President, Exelon Corporation
Marguerite Griffin, Senior Vice President, National Director of Philanthropic Services, Northern Trust Company
Kym Hubbard, Chief Investment Officer, Ernst & Young
Abe Tomás Hughes, II, Managing Director, Hughes Girardi Partners
Reginald Jones, Executive Director, Steans Family Foundation
Lisa Lee, Director, Jane Addams Hull House Museum
Eric T. McKissack, President, Channing Capital Management
Jesse Ruiz, Partner, Drinker, Biddle, Gardner, Carton
Lyndon Taylor, Managing Director, Russell Reynolds Associates
Charles T. Tribbett, Managing Director, Chicago, Russell Reynolds Associates
Gregory White, President/CEO, LEARN Charter School

Arts & Business Council and IMPACT Project Staff

Joan Gunzberg, former Executive Director, A&BC
Peter Kuntz, Executive Director, A&BC
Clare Muñana, IMPACT Project Advisor; President, Ancora Associates
Mignon McPherson Nance, IMPACT Project Manager, A&BC

Appendix C
Chicago Area Major Cultural Institutions
with Annual Budgets Over \$5 Million

Those starred are IMPACT project participants.

Adler Planetarium*
Art Institute of Chicago
Chicago Academy of the Sciences (Nature Museum)
Chicago Architecture Foundation*
Chicago Children's Museum*
Chicago History Museum
Chicago Horticultural Society (Botanic Garden)*
Chicago Shakespeare Theater*
Chicago Symphony Orchestra
Chicago Theatre Group (Goodman Theatre)*
Chicago Zoological Society (Brookfield Zoo)*
Facets Multimedia
Field Museum of Natural History
Hubbard Street Dance Chicago*
Joffrey Ballet of Chicago
John G. Shedd Aquarium*
Kohl Children's Museum of Greater Chicago*
League of Chicago Theatres Foundation
Lincoln Park Zoo*
Lyric Opera of Chicago
Merit School of Music*
Museum of Contemporary Art
Museum of Science and Industry*
Music Institute of Chicago*
Newberry Library
Old Town School of Folk Music
Ravinia Festival
Steppenwolf Theatre Company
Victory Gardens Theater
WBEZ Alliance
WTTW Communications

Appendix D

IMPACT Candidates

This list includes those individuals that were qualified through the vetting process. Those starred reflect individuals that were placed on a major institution board through IMPACT.

Martin Cabrera, CEO, Cabrera Capital Markets LLC
Bob Christian, Principal, October Family Holdings*
Nelda Connors, President, Tyco Electrical and Metal Products
Kathy Hannan, Managing Partner, KPMG*
Darryl Hendricks, Illinois President, Citibank
Phyllis Lockett, President/CEO, Renaissance Schools Fund*
Robert McGhee, VP Community Development, US Bank
Dorri McWhorter, Partner, Crowe Chizek & Company*
David Nichols, President/COO, PPM Global Corporation*
Benjamin Reyes, President/CEO, DSR Group, Inc.*
Judy Rice, VP and Director of Government Relations, Harris Bank
Gloria Santona, EVP, McDonalds Corporation
John Sydnors, COO, Melvin Securities
Lyndon Taylor, Managing Director, Russell Reynolds Associates*
Stephen Thomas, Founding Principal, SVO-Capital Markets/American Mortgage Capital Group
Ken Thompson, Client Services Director, DLC, Inc.*
Willard Woods, Principal, Ernst & Young LLP*
Leroy Wright, LIW Global

Appendix E

IMPACT Implementation Timeline

April 2004	Crain’s article appears about lack of non-white representation on major cultural institution boards
	Conversations between The Joyce Foundation and The Chicago Community Trust about this issue
	Conversation with Arts & Business Council about its possible role in addressing this issue with these funders
January 2006	A&BC initiates formal planning for the project with support from The Joyce Foundation and The Chicago Community Trust
March 2006	Meeting of an ad hoc group of individuals from different sectors with interest in this topic to discuss the concept of developing a project that might begin to address this issue
May 2006	Two meetings attended by 27 institutions are held to introduce the concept and solicit feedback – representatives included staff and board leadership
August 2006	IMPACT Project initiated with first year support from The Joyce Foundation
September 2006	Project Advisor engaged
November 2006	Project Manager engaged
December 2006	Project Steering Committee meets: discuss letter soliciting organization involvement and candidate pool/qualifications
January 2007	Invitation issued to major cultural institutions with annual budgets over \$5 million to participate in IMPACT Thirteen institutions agree to participate
March 2007	Russell Reynolds Associates is formally engaged as a project partner
March - May 2007	Leadership from participating institutions interviewed July 2007 Executive summaries for all participating institutions completed and approved

May 2007	Project Steering Committee meets: discuss expectations of institutions, recruitment and committee involvement
August 2007	Second year of implementation begun with support from The Joyce Foundation and Boeing Corporation
September 2007	First candidate meetings with A&BC
January 2008	Project Steering Committee meets: discuss project process, communication strategy, adding more institutions and forum
March 2008	First candidates elected to boards
August 2008	New Executive Director at A&BC begins Third and final year of implementation begun with support from The Joyce Foundation and The Chicago Community Trust
October 2008	Project evaluator engaged Press release on Project distributed to 14 media sources
November 2008	IMPACT Project receives coverage in Charles Storch's <i>Chicago Tribune</i> column, "Grants and Giving"
October 2008 - June 2009	Project evaluation conducted
December 2008	Formal pro bono agreement with Russell Reynolds Associates ends
July 2009	Formal project evaluation completed
August 2009	Three year project funding reaches conclusion
September 2009	Project closure event/gathering of candidates, major cultural institutions, Steering Committee members, and others involved with IMPACT

Appendix F
**IMPACT Organizational Participants:
 Summary of Board Diversity 2007-2009**

IMPACT Project Participating Institutions	2007			2008				2009				% diversity change over 3 years	IMPACT candidates		
	Total # of board members	Total # of diverse members	% of diversity in board	Total # of board members	Total # of diverse members	# change 2007 to 2008	% of diversity in board	Total # of board members	Total # of diverse members	# change 2008 to 2009	% of diversity in board		Total placed	African Americans	Latino, Native American
Adler Planetarium	34	4	12%	39	6	2	15%	39	6	0	15%	3%	2	1	1
Chicago Architecture Foundation	45	5	11%	35	5	0	14%	37	5	0	14%	3%	2	2	
Chicago Children's Museum	46	10	22%	41	7	<3>	17%	46	9	2	20%	<2%>			
Chicago Horticultural Society	77	8	10%	76	7	<1>	9%	77	8	1	10%	0%			
Chicago Shakespeare Theatre	61	1	2%	59	0	<1>	0%	58	0	0	0%	<2%>			
Chicago Theatre Group	81	15	19%	80	16	1	20%	80	15	<1>	19%	<1%>			
Chicago Zoological Society	50	5	10%	50	6	1	12%	51	7	1	14%	4%	1	1	
Hubbard Street Dance Chicago*				47	5	---	11%	45	6	1	13%	2%	2	1	1
Kohl Children's Museum	38	4	11%	38	4	0	11%	40	7	3	18%	7%			
John G. Shedd Aquarium	47	9	19%	49	8	<1>	16%	48	8	0	17%	<2%>			
Lincoln Park Zoo	74	8	11%	74	8	0	11%	73	8	0	11%	0%	1	1	
Merit School of Music	38	4	11%	38	4	0	11%	35	5	1	14%	3%	1	1	
Music Institute of Chicago	28	3	11%	28	2	<1>	7%	26	0	<2>	0%	<11%>			
Museum of Science and Industry	70	16	23%	70	14	<2>	20%	74	14	0	20%	<3%>			
Total	689	92	13.40%	724	92	<5>	12.70%	729	98	6	13.44%	.04%	9	7	2
No Hubbard							13.60%								

*not a participant in 2007