IDEA (inclusion, diversity, equity, access)

Linked files located here

Research (what we've done and what we've collected)

- **Developed definitions** for inclusion, diversity, equity, access, and accessibility
- **Facilitated conversation with Regional Arts Partners (RAPs) to help to develop survey**
- **Assessed/Benchmarked Organizational Grantees** through a survey and 2 focus groups
    - Where are grantees in this work?
    - Is IAC effectively communicating the value of its priorities concerning this work?
- **Assessed IAP 4 year granting history to POC** (people of color)
- **Reviewed State Arts Agency Field Scan** (Summary, Full doc)
- **Provided Summary presentations to IAC staff and RAPs to develop potential strategies**
- **Conducted an internal "document review": applications, final reports, guidelines**
- **Established a Study Group (to occur) for validity test, definition review, and strategy input**

What we Learned: Quinton Presentation (ppt) • Recording

- Inclusion, equity, and access are thought of as offshoots of diversity
- Diversity is context specific (diversity in rural vs. urban is very different)
- Race and ethnicity were most commonly associated with participant's understanding of diversity (respondents citing barrier to increased diversity efforts is lack of diversity aka race/ethnicity)
- While nearly 70% of responders indicated their strategic plans outlined IDEA related priorities, roughly 56% felt it was a high priority (leaving around 44% that do not)
- Some focus group participants recognized intrinsic value of this work (e.g. build communities), and that it contributes to their relevancy and thus sustainability (new audiences/shifting demographics)
- Challenges cited: it's hard, it's risky (perceived), it's time consuming, it's resource intensive, and difficult to start or even receive buy-in from leadership
- Folks need data/credible evidence of its value, resources, support, and encouragement in this work
- Folks recognize the value in this work and for the most part think IAC has clearly communicated the value of its priorities around IDEA work.

What we're doing in this work right now (snapshot below)

Summary of other SAA actions and how IAC compares
Granular Level • NEA Data we're collecting

- Policies & Structure
    - Accessibility Coordinator on Staff
    - Regional Arts Partner System to provide rural access
    - Included in 2017-2021 strategic plan priorities including new IAC "funding imperatives"
- Grant Policies

        - Panel composition (panels should be of broad representation both demographically and professionally)
        - Funding policy: Arts Project Support funding strategy to increase rural access
        - State policies
    - Grants Programs (beyond "underserved")
        - FY18-19 Increased prioritization of IDEA in applications and evaluation criteria (beyond "underserved" & Accessibility statement): included under "community engagement" – new priority area under new strategic plan
            - Arts Organization Support all levels (AOSI, II, III)
            - Arts Project Support
        - PACE: inclusion – school-based arts integration program only available to those schools with low scores and high free/reduced lunch (socio economic)
        - APHS program increases rural access by nature of where grantees may provide activities (state parks / state historic sites primarily located in rural IN)
        - IAP: accessibility – separate panel for "access" category for artists with disabilities
        - TAI: rural access and inclusion (rural, creative aging)
        - On-Ramp: prioritization to diverse representation (racially, rural/urban, disciplines)
        - Cultural Districts: Requires accessibility features map (prioritization)
    - Capacity Building
        - Workshops, webinars, conferences for internal and external
        - 2018 Annual Arts Conference Scholarship prioritization to diversity, rural access, emerging leader

What could/should we be doing?

1) Be the change / model behavior we'd like to see in the field. (Current staff, partners, and commission board are all majority white)
2) Encourage grantees to work in this area
    a. How does your board reflect the geographic territory you serve?
    b. Applications/Evaluation criteria: leverage to deepen work and monitor work in field
    c. Leverage status of state arts agency to help shift perspectives
3) New Grant program for emerging artists that has reduced barriers occurring in current process
4) Build capacity internally and externally
    a. Increased opportunities for informal engagement (as what occurred with focus groups)
    b. If trying to build capacity, could the study group help us outline what educational opportunities would be most useful. What is their experience? What has been successful for them?
    c. We saw great success in this collaborative via focus group
5) Resources: provide best practices and data informed evidence (for building leadership buy-in)
6) Develop a grant program that targets racially diverse
7) Prioritize racial representation that is reflective of IN demography in On-Ramp cohort

Thoughts after Evaluation Summary Presentation (transcript)

- Establish focus point or champion for this work in our organization

    - Is there someone looking at the diversity aspect of things when we're creating/releasing products?
- Create an internal task force
- Consider bringing someone in externally to evaluate/determine strategies for distinct groups:
    - Our internal group: looking at what we offer (grants/services) and determine whether or not diversity/inclusion is applied
    - Grantees: those we're supporting
    - Participants: the folks grantees are serving

What are our priorities, moving forward? (study group recommendations)

What does success look like?