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National Urban Fellows develops accomplished and courageous professionals of all ethnic and racial backgrounds, particularly people of color and women, to be leaders and change agents in the public and non-profit sectors, with a strong commitment to social justice and equity.
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National Urban Fellows was founded at the height of the Civil Rights era, a time of unending turbulence in cities across the nation. The country’s urban centers were in crisis as cities struggled to cope with pervasive violence and social unrest, the outcomes of years of social injustice. Communities throughout the U.S. were experiencing the results of discrimination, segregation, poverty, unemployment, poor housing, and police brutality.

The National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors, confronted with the escalating civil disorder, began looking for solutions. In 1969, in partnership with The Ford Foundation, New Haven’s Community Action Institute, and Yale University, a program was designed to bridge the existing gap between city governments and minority communities.

The solution became National Urban Fellows (NUF). Founded in 1969, the NUF program provided local minority leaders with the education and experience needed to manage city governments. Its groundbreaking approach gave individuals who had been traditionally under-represented in the government sector the opportunity, visibility, and recognition necessary to manage programs intended to improve conditions in their communities, while empowering leadership representative of their communities. Recognizing the need for leadership diversity in the nation’s future, in 1974 National Urban Fellows incorporated, becoming a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization.

NUF went on to develop a rigorous, 14-month leadership development program that links academic course work with a nine-month mentorship assignment and culminates in a Masters in Public Administration (MPA) degree from the School of Public Affairs, Baruch College, City University of New York. It is the only program in the country in which Fellows receive an advanced degree and crucial leadership experience. Alumni go on to work in public service, government and nonprofit leadership.

Today, National Urban Fellows continues to address one the most important and challenging issues faced by America today—the under-representation of people of color and women in leadership—particularly in the public and nonprofit sectors. And today, over 1,100 NUF alumni make a personal and professional impact in government and nonprofit organizations across the United States. National Urban Fellows continues to develop the leadership for a changing America.

To celebrate our 40th Anniversary, we commissioned research from the School of Public Affairs, Baruch College, City University of New York, to study the leadership experiences of our alumni. Our goal is to identify strategies for our program and for other organizations to enhance and promote the advancement of talented people of color and women to the highest public service leadership roles.

We are proud to share the results of this research and our Call to Action: Changing the Face of Public Service Leadership.
Overview
This project was planned in two phases. In the first phase, which was undertaken in 2008-2009, researchers conducted a survey of National Urban Fellows and National Urban and Rural Fellows alumni. Information collected in this survey was then supplemented in the second phase by focus groups and in-depth interviews with alumni, and by archival analysis.

Data Collection Methods
Between September 26 and November 4, 2009, Baruch College Survey Research conducted a survey of National Urban Fellows (NUF) alumni by e-mail, first class mail, and telephone. This survey yielded 391 completed interviews from the total potential interview pool of 776 alumni, an overall response rate of 50.4%. Of the 391 surveys, 287 alumni were part of the original group contacted by e-mail, and this group (73.4%) completed the survey online. Twenty-two respondents completed the survey by mail (5.6%), 45 respondents completed the survey online after being contacted by mail and/or telephone (11.5%), and 37 were interviewed by phone (9.5%) (see Appendix II for a full discussion of the survey and the survey instrument).

Two focus groups were conducted in the process of developing question content for the survey. One focus group was conducted in New York City on July 27, 2009, the other in Washington, DC, on August 4, 2009. Each focus group lasted about two hours and was composed of 10-15 NUF alumni from diverse racial, ethnic, gender, and cohort backgrounds (see Appendix III for focus group questions). A total of six targeted interviews were also conducted with the goal of filling in any blanks left by the surveys and focus groups. Interview respondents were selected based on their level of leadership achievement. The study also included an extensive literature review of recent nonprofit literature and related scholarly literature (see Appendix VI).

Key Findings
Leadership: NUF alumni have been and continue to be leaders in civic life. About two-thirds have held a community or civic role, and a similar number have influenced legislation or public policy. About three-quarters feel prepared to fill vacant leadership positions, with those who have already been the most successful also being the most confident in their ability to fill such positions.

Mentoring and Networking: Informal networks established outside of their work environments have been most helpful in advancing the careers of NUF alumni. A mentor’s level of experience is his or her most important characteristic.

Discrimination: Seventy-two percent of NUF alumni have experienced discrimination in the workplace. Experiences with racial discrimination are more common than experiences with gender discrimination.

Workplace Authority: Three in four NUF alumni respondents have staff that reports to them, and 16% have more than 20 direct reports. Most are in positions in which they can hire and fire staff (60% can hire and 53% can fire). Two-thirds (69%) of all alumni respondents have had immediate supervisors to whom they report. Eleven percent control budgets of more than $10 million.

Employment Sector: Forty percent of the respondents work in government. Twenty-seven percent work in the nonprofit sector.

Executive Leadership: Fully 43% of alumni respondents are classified by NUF as being in “executive leadership roles,” with older alumni, earlier cohorts, and male alumni more likely to hold these positions. More than half (53%) of those who were in the program before 2000 hold executive leadership positions.

The NUF Experience: The NUF experience met or exceeded the expectations of almost all alumni. Networking is seen as the most important benefit of the NUF experience, followed by continued leadership development and career support.

Overall Patterns: To the extent that there are differences in responses, they tend to be a function of age, cohort, and level of professional achievement and status, factors that are directly linked to the stage of each respondent’s career trajectory. Older alumni from earlier cohorts credit education for their leadership success more frequently than younger alumni, while younger, more recent cohorts are more inclined to credit networking and mentoring. Older alumni cite visionary thinking among their greatest leadership traits, while younger cohorts are more apt to mention relationship building.

Introduction
By 2050, racial and ethnic minority groups will collectively constitute a majority of the U.S. population. African American, Hispanic/Latino, and Asian communities are growing in every region of the country, from historically diverse urban areas to suburban communities and rural outposts. This shift in the population has important implications for the available labor pool as the percentage of white non-Hispanics/Latinos is projected to decrease from 73% in 2000 to 53% by 2050, with net increases in African American, Hispanic/Latino, and Asian workers totaling 55 million, alongside an aggregate decline in white workers1. As these demographic changes unfold, there will be a growing need for nonprofit and public agencies to recruit,
retain, and promote women and minorities to positions of leadership and decision-making authority. Despite this urgency, many nonprofit, government, and for-profit agencies continue to lack diversity in their executive ranks, in their decision-making positions, and among their board members. If these organizations are to succeed at serving their increasingly diverse clientele and meeting their organizational goals, they will need to recruit leadership that is representative of America’s rapidly changing demographics.

While much has been written about the importance of understanding diversity and its projected influence on organizations, we know surprisingly little about how to prepare people of color to take advantage of the current and projected demand for diverse leadership. To begin filling this gap, National Urban Fellows (NUF) has conducted this research study on leadership and diversity. The purpose of the research is to identify factors that contribute to the successful leadership of people of color in the nonprofit and public sectors of the economy. Four main questions frame the study:

- How do NUF alumni define leadership success?
- What factors contribute to leadership success?
- What barriers impede leadership success?
- How did the NUF program contribute to the leadership success of its alumni?

NUF, a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization, was established in 1969. Its mission is to develop “accomplished and courageous professionals of all ethnic and racial backgrounds, particularly people of color and women, to be leaders and change agents in the public and nonprofit sectors, with a strong commitment to social justice and equity.” What sets NUF apart from all other leadership programs is the opportunity for its Fellows to earn an advanced professional degree while simultaneously obtaining valuable leadership experience through practical mentorship placements with senior administrators throughout the country. Since its founding, well over a thousand men and women have graduated from the program. Many of them occupy positions of leadership in city and county government, philanthropic foundations, and nonprofit organizations in the United States and Puerto Rico.

To commemorate its 40th anniversary, NUF commissioned this research project. The research phase of the project began with two focus groups which were convened in New York City (July 27, 2009) and Washington, DC (August 4, 2009). Information from the focus groups was used to develop a survey which was sent to a representative sample of NUF alumni; this survey had a response rate of 50%. As a final data collection method, and as a way to probe deeper into the survey results, researchers conducted a series of in-depth targeted interviews. The results, which are detailed in the chapters to follow, shed new light on the processes that usher minorities and women into leadership positions, as well as the barriers they often confront along the way. This report, which is aimed at current nonprofit and government leaders, policy analysts, educators, philanthropists, and future leaders of color, concludes with recommendations for research and a call for collaboration across leadership programs and academic institutions.

Chapter Summaries

In Chapter 1, Leadership Success, we begin the discussion of leadership by asking respondents how they define leadership success, and what they regard as their best and as their most challenging leadership skills. Having organizational influence and influence in the government and public policy arena emerged as important measures of leadership success. NUF alumni credited relationship building, problem solving, and visionary thinking among their best leadership skills, while financial and quantitative skills were generally reported as being most challenging.

In Chapter 2, Prepared to Fill Leadership Vacancies, we ask NUF alumni if they are prepared to fill leadership vacancies left by the impending retirements of the current crop of baby-boomer leaders. We also present data showing the extent to which respondents are (or have been) leaders in the areas of policymaking, civic or community leadership, and board membership. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the factors respondents say contributed to their leadership success and to their overall career success. We learn that respondents are very confident that they can fill the leadership void left by retiring baby boomers. A sizeable majority of respondents already consider themselves to be leaders in policymaking as well as civic and community leaders, but very few have served as board members—a finding that is consistent with prior research. Respondents attribute their leadership development and overall career success to three supporting pillars of the NUF program: education, networking, and mentoring.

---

**Chapter 3, Mentoring and Networking,** examines the respondents’ assessment of the most important characteristics of a mentor, the kinds of networks that have most been of benefit to them, and the kinds of networks they used to acquire their current jobs. Level of experience is seen as the quality in a mentor that is most vital to the respondents’ career advancement, along with informal networks outside the respondents’ jobs. Finally, most respondents acquired their most recent job through friends or colleagues, or by means of a formal search.

**Chapter 4, Experiencing and Overcoming Discrimination,** addresses the extent to which respondents have experienced discrimination in the workplace, the type of discrimination experienced, and the ways in which they responded to discrimination. Nearly three in four respondents have experienced discrimination at work, with racial discrimination the most commonly experienced form, followed by gender discrimination—a pattern consistent with national statistics gathered by the EEOC. Respondents described discrimination that manifested itself as blocked avenues to promotion, biased remarks, and lack of professional opportunities. Responses to the discrimination they encountered ranged from ignoring the situation to filing a formal complaint to resigning. Despite their widespread experience with discrimination, respondents expressed a remarkable resolve to forge ahead.

**Chapter 5, Workplace Power,** profiles the current job titles of NUF alumni and the extent to which they exercise authority at work, as measured by “span of control” (the number of direct reports), “span of responsibility” (authority to hire and fire, and to set the pay of others), and “decision-making or managerial authority” (control over budgets). Significant proportions of respondents have job titles that identify them as executive directors, CEOs, and presidents, as well as directors and managers. More than half have authority to hire and fire others, most have between two and twenty direct reports, and the dollar range for those who manage a budget is anywhere from less than $100,000 to more than $10,000,000—a range that captures small, midsize, and large organizations. There is no question that the respondents are accomplished individuals, by any measure of career success. As such, they are uniquely qualified to offer advice on how the NUF program, and other programs aimed at developing leaders of color, can succeed in the future—a subject discussed in Chapter 6.

**Chapter 6, The NUF Experience,** an assessment of the NUF program is presented, with particular attention to whether the program met the respondents’ expectations and to the significance of certain NUF engagement initiatives, such as leadership development, career support, networking, and alumni organizational efforts. Overwhelmingly, respondents say the program either met or exceeded their expectations. Respondents consider continued leadership initiatives, career support, and networking strategies to be vital to the future success of the program, and they recommend similar strategies for other leadership development programs.

**Chapter 7, Looking Ahead,** summarizes the answers to the four main questions that frame the report. This final chapter also draws on the key findings of the study to inform recommendations for NUF and other leadership development organizations for meeting the current and projected demand for leaders of color in public service.
Having influence in an organization is one of the central features of successful leadership. Influence is defined here as the ability to affect or change a real-world or organizational outcome, either through having a voice in the policy debate or through the direct exercise of command. When we asked NUF alumni respondents how they would best define leadership success, having influence in an organization was the most popular response, followed by influence in government or the ability to impact public policy (Figure 1).

Specifically, 38% of respondents think influence in an organization best defines leadership success. Twenty-six percent of respondents believe that having influence in the government or public policy arena is the best measure of leadership success, with 17% of respondents pointing to community leadership roles as the strongest measure of leadership success. Interestingly, formal position (job title) in an organization was least often cited as a form of leadership success; it is not the formal positions leaders hold, but what they do with their positions that is seen as the best measure of leadership success by respondents. One focus group participant put the matter this way: “It is interesting who emerges as the leader in your organization. They may not be the people that have the authority, but they are the people that you want on your team...you can have someone with no authority, but who is extremely influential.”

Further analysis of the survey data shows an interesting split between younger and older respondents. The youngest respondents were more likely to select community leadership as the most important form of leadership success, while older respondents were more inclined to define leadership success from the point of view of having influence in government or public policy.

One way to interpret this generational difference is to take into account the fact that older respondents are more likely than younger respondents to place a high premium on the role of government in affecting positive change. Indeed, this pattern is largely a function of the fact that older cohorts lived their formative years during the Civil Rights era—a period of intense governmental concern with the social, legal, economic, and political lives of racial minorities. In contrast, the formative years of younger respondents may be characterized as a period of government retrenchment—which studies now show either slowed or significantly reversed gains made during the 1960s and 1970s.4 Given their differing social and political life experiences, it stands to reason that younger cohorts would place a relatively higher value on community leadership roles outside of government.5

About a third of those employed in the government sector also thought occupying a position of leadership in the government sector with influence over public policy was the best definition of leadership success.

Definitions of what constituted leadership success also depended on the income and level of authority in

---

4 See Tomaskovic-Devey et al. (2006) and Stainback et al. (2005).
5 This pattern was played out on the national level in the recent election of Barack Obama to the presidency of the United States. Among other things, President Obama is credited with mobilizing a diverse army of young volunteers at the grass-roots level—using strategies drawn from his days as a community organizer.

---
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For example, alumni who have more than 20 direct reports (46%), those with salaries of $75-100K (47%), those in charge of budgets over $10 million (45%) and those employed by corporations (42%), were most likely to view “organizational influence” as the most important measure of leadership success. Respondents who selected “organizational influence” over other definitions of leadership success were also more likely to exercise formal authority in the workplace, defined by having the power to hire and fire people and to influence their pay (more on this in Chapter 5).

Our focus group participants provided a deeper understanding of the factors they believed most contributed to leadership success. When asked to describe the characteristics of a “good leader,” they noted that a good leader should be able to:

- Anticipate and manage change;
- Empower staff to do the work;
- Motivate employees; and
- Be appropriately transparent.

As one participant noted, “If you are following a visionary leader, you know that there are things they are not going to share with you. But you trust that they are sharing enough with you so that you can execute their vision.”

Strongest Leadership Skills

Being able to identify one’s own leadership skills is important, especially in the current economy in which jobs are scarce, particularly for people of color. The competition for the best jobs is intense. A December 1, 2009 headline in The New York Times announced: “In Job Hunt, College Degree Can’t Close Racial Gap.” The article offered an astounding revelation: “the [racial] disparity for the first 10 months of this year, as the recession has dragged on, has been even more pronounced for those with college degrees, compared with those without. Education, it seems, does not level the playing field—in fact, it appears to have made it more uneven.”

This means that other factors beyond a college degree will play an increasingly important role in determining the life chances of people of color in the years to come. It stands to reason that one of these factors will be a fine-tuned set of leadership skills and experiences.

With this in mind, we gave survey respondents a list of leadership skills and asked each of them to select the one he or she regards as his or her own strongest skill. Three leadership skills were most frequently chosen: relationship building, visionary thinking, and problem solving.

Specifically, as shown in Figure 2, 29% of respondents selected relationship building as their best leadership skill, 25% selected visionary thinking, and 25% chose problem solving. While the survey revealed few differences across demographic groups, several ethnic and gender differences stood out. Hispanics/Latinos (35%) were more likely than others to select visionary thinking as their best leadership skill, followed by black men (28%). In contrast,
Hispanic women/Latinas (45%) and African American women (28%) were more likely than other groups to select relationship building as their best skill. 7

Our findings also show that the response of “visionary thinking” is positively associated with having control over budgets and staff, and with working in the nonprofit sector. For example, the respondents most likely to think of themselves as visionary thinkers were those with the largest budgets (41% of those with budgets over $10 million), those with over 20 direct reports (38%), and those who work in the nonprofit sector (34%). This self-perception contrasts with the smaller number of respondents who see visionary thinking as their strongest leadership skill and who report having no budget responsibility (18%), or no staff (14%), or who work in the government sector (19%).

We further explored whether respondents differed in their self-assigned best leadership skills based on whether they occupied an executive leadership position. This additional analysis shows that respondents who held executive positions were split between problem solving (30%) and visionary thinking (29%) as their best leadership skills. In contrast, respondents who did not hold an executive position (36%) were most likely to select relationship building as their strongest skill—which was also the case for respondents who either exercised no budgetary responsibility (43%), or had no staff (45%). Interestingly, only 8% of survey participants selected “communicating” as their best leadership skill—a rare selection that was more often selected by men and by members of younger cohorts.

Leadership Challenges

We also wanted to get the “flip-side” of the leadership skill story, so we asked survey respondents “Which leadership skill has given you the most difficulty in your career success?”

Figure 3 shows that overall, financial and quantitative skills were rated most challenging by 28% of respondents, followed by delegating at 17%, and managing others at 13%.

Additional analysis revealed important differences in this question by cohort, size of budget controlled, and staff size. Financial and quantitative skills are more of a problem for the earliest cohorts, with 40% of those who were NUF Fellows before 1980 seeing financial and quantitative skills as most challenging. That more recent cohorts view financial and quantitative skills as less problematic is a good sign when one considers that reports show that future nonprofit leaders will be judged more rigorously by performance standards that include financial acumen and the ability to manage money. 8

Overall, relationship building was cited by only a few respondents as a problem area, but it was cited as the area of greatest difficulty by a third (33%) of alumni who manage budgets under $100,000. Finally, managing others was selected as most challenging by alumni who manage small staffs. Twenty percent of respondents with fewer than five employees reporting to them self-described as being most challenged in managing others, compared to only 4% of respondents with staffs of more than 20.

Which leadership skill has given you the most difficulty in your career success??

Figure 3: Most Difficult Leadership Skill

![Figure 3: Most Difficult Leadership Skill](image_url)

---

7 The statistics for whites and Asians are too small to draw meaningful comparisons.
Much has been written about projected vacancies in leadership positions in the nonprofit sector. Factors projected to contribute to the vacancies include growth in the nonprofit sector and an increase in baby-boomer retirements. Thomas Tierney, author of *The Nonprofit Sector's Leadership Deficit*, predicts that between 2007 and 2016 nonprofit organizations will need to attract 640,000 new senior managers. According to Tierney, there are three ways to fill the expected vacancies: (1) invest in building skilled management teams; (2) structure more competitive management packages with more attractive compensation; and (3) expand recruitment to include new pools of potential leadership talent such as managers in the for-profit sector, and reach out to women who have left the workforce to raise their children.  

While an emerging body of nonprofit literature has echoed Tierney’s call, much of the recent literature emphasizes the need to recruit and retain people of color in positions of leadership. Part of this need is motivated by the aforementioned projections of leadership vacancies in the nonprofit sector, but a good deal of it can also be attributed to the assumption that people of color should be able to play a key role in shaping policies that affect their own communities. This is precisely the argument PolicyLink makes in its timely report *Leadership for Policy Change*: “[V]oices of color can bring an important perspective to critical contemporary economic and social policies” while advancing the cause of justice and equity.  

Another recent report framed the challenge in this way: “There is a need to develop strategies to support a more multi-racial group of leaders who better reflect our communities and who bring the full range of knowledge and ideas necessary to invent and implement effective responses to critical problems.”

NUF survey respondents were informed of the increase in leadership retirements and asked if they felt prepared to fill these vacancies. The vast majority of respondents do feel prepared to assume positions of leadership. As shown in Figure 4, nearly three-quarters (73%) feel prepared to fill vacant positions of executive leadership. Additional analysis further confirmed this finding, regardless of respondents’ demographic background or employment sector. Not surprisingly, the respondents most likely to feel prepared are those who have already achieved a certain level of success, as measured by salary, span of responsibility and control, and current leadership role. This includes 86% of respondents who earn salaries over $100,000; 87% of those who control budgets over $10 million; and 85% of those who supervise more than 20 employees.

When the Young Nonprofit Professionals Network queried its 10,000 members, nearly half of its most skilled and experienced respondents expressed an intention to leave the nonprofit sector but to return later in their careers. More than half of those responding cited a lack of management experience as the major barrier to reaching executive leadership positions, while others mentioned...
a lack of professional development
opportunities—opportunities that most
small nonprofits are unable to provide.
The report concluded that many young
professionals leave the nonprofit sector
in order to pursue training in the private
or public sector, or through graduate
education.\textsuperscript{12} We found evidence to
corroborate this pattern in our research.
When asked why she left the nonprofit
sector to accept a coveted slot as a
National Urban Fellow, one interviewee
answered:

\begin{quote}
I thought that I was getting trapped in an
area in the nonprofit sector that I didn’t
want to stay in, and I thought a master’s
degree would give me an additional
credential and expand my skill set. I
wanted to use the training, education,
and experience from the National Urban
Fellows to become an internal consultant or
a trainer.
\end{quote}

Overall, these patterns underscore why
the NUF program will continue to be
a major player in leadership training
and development for people of color in
the years to come. The program’s focus
on preparing mid-career professionals
through graduate-level training that
includes, among other things, courses
in budgeting and other financial
matters, along with providing months
of hands-on mentoring experience,
distinguishes the NUF Fellows program
as the only program of its kind in the
country.\textsuperscript{13} This can be viewed as an
issue of supply and demand: NUF
is providing a continual supply of
competent, well trained, and credentialed
people of color who are ready to take
advantage of the growing demand for
leaders of color in the nonprofit and
government sectors of our economy.

\textbf{Leaders in Policymaking}

The goals and direction of policy
decisions can affect the quality-of-life of
people living and working in poor and
politically marginalized communities.
Having minority voices on policy issues that affect minority communities is not
only a matter of justice and fairness,
but also a practical matter that can
make a difference in the real world. As
PolicyLink puts it, “While the presence
of people of color in leadership positions
does not guarantee progressive social
action, their absence strongly decreases
the probability that the full diversity of
considerations will be reviewed as part
of policy development.”\textsuperscript{14} With this in
mind, we asked NUF survey respondents
if they considered themselves to be
leaders in the policymaking arena—a
very specific type of leadership that
does not describe all of those who
work in the nonprofit and government
sectors. As shown in Figure 5, 63% of
respondents answered “yes” while 32%
answered “no.” When the responses
were grouped by age, cohort, and
gender status, several interesting patterns
emerged: 78% of respondents over
65 believe that they are such leaders,
compared with only 34% of respondents
under 35. Similarly, the earlier the
cohort, the more likely it was that a
respondent would consider himself or
herself a policy leader, with 85% of
those who were NUF Fellows before
1980 thinking of themselves as leaders,
compared to just 42% of the Fellows
since 2000. Given that it takes time to
develop leaders, these findings are not
surprising. Moreover, as with other age
and cohort patterns we have observed
in the data, this, too, may reflect a
generational difference in perceived

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure5.png}
\caption{Self-identification as a leader in the policymaking arena.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{12} Solomon and Sandahl (2007).
\textsuperscript{13} Leadership for Tomorrow, a New
York-based national nonprofit devoted to
developing “the next generation of African
American, Hispanic and Native American
leaders in major corporations, non-profit
organizations and entrepreneurial ventures,”
offers a similar model, except that instead of
the MPA offered by NUF, participants earn
an MBA. For more information see http://
leaders/index.html.
\textsuperscript{14} Marsh, Daniel, and Putnam (2003), p. 11.
In your professional or civic life have you ever:
(CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

Figure 6: Professional and Civic Life

- 63% HELD COMMUNITY OR CIVIC ROLE
- 61% INFLUENCED LEGISLATION/PUBLIC POLICY
- 45% CREATED A DIVERSITY INITIATIVE IN THE WORKPLACE
- 55% LED A COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION
- 29% STARTED A NONPROFIT
- 2% BOARD MEMBERSHIP
- 11% OTHER
- 1% NONE
- 2% NOT SURE
- 5% NO ANSWER

15 One of the goals of the next phase of the research project is to pursue this issue more thoroughly.

ability and/or interest in policy change. Older respondents are more likely than younger respondents to see influence in the policymaking arena as an important career pursuit, while younger alumni may favor more community-based outreach efforts as a strategy for driving social change. Older alumni (including 80% of those over 65) are more likely than younger alumni to have influenced legislation and public policy in the community (only 38% of those under 35 reported having done so).

The data show that 76% of those who currently occupy executive positions describe themselves as policy leaders, but only 53% of those who are not in executive roles consider themselves to be policy leaders. The data also show an important gender difference on this question, with men (69%) more likely than women (58%) to self-describe as current leaders in the policy arena. As prospective leaders contemplate the future state of nonprofit leadership, the NUF data provide several reasons for optimism: being a policy leader is positively associated with higher incomes, controlling larger staffs, and managing larger budgets.

Compared with respondents who did not consider themselves to be leaders in the policy arena, policy leaders were more likely to have higher incomes (79% earned over $100,000), control larger staffs (79% had staffs of more than 20 people), and control larger budgets (89% had budgets over $10 million).

Professional and Civic Leadership

To gain a further understanding of the types of leadership positions NUF alumni have assumed throughout their careers, our survey asked them if they had ever held a position at the community or civic level, influenced legislation or social policy, created a diversity initiative at work, led a community organization, started a nonprofit organization, or served as a board member. Respondents were free to check all items that applied to them. The results of our inquiry, displayed in Figure 6, give a more detailed picture of just how active respondents have been in the pursuit of public service and social justice.

Overall, 63% of respondents have held a community or civic role; 61% have influenced legislation or public policy in a community; and 55% have taken the lead role at a community organization. Almost half (45%) have created a diversity initiative in the workplace, and 29% have started a nonprofit organization.

Our analyses further revealed that respondents who have influenced legislation or public policy, or led a community organization, have larger salaries, manage larger budgets, and have a greater span of control relative to other respondents.

Older alumni (including 80% of those over 65) are more likely than younger alumni to have influenced legislation and public policy in the community (only 38% of those under 35 reported having done so).
We also found a significant gender difference, in that men are more likely to have influenced legislation and public policy in the community (69% as against 54%) and to have led a community organization (60% as against 50%) than their female counterparts.

Respondents who have more people reporting to them are more likely to have influenced legislation or public policy in a community (76% of those with staffs of more than 20 as against 55% of those with no staff).

Survey respondents who work in the corporate sector are more likely than nonprofit and public sector respondents to have created a diversity initiative in the workplace (57%). This pattern reflects the fact that formal diversity initiatives are largely a staple of corporate environments owing to factors such as organizational size, resources, and demographic composition.

Respondents who currently hold executive positions (69%) are more likely than non-executives (43%) to have led a community organization. These executives are also more likely (68%) than non-executives (56%) to have influenced legislation.

**Board Membership**

The call to recruit and retain people of color in leadership positions also extends to nonprofit board membership. Recent research reports that both midsize nonprofit firms and larger firms have difficulty recruiting new board members—with midsize firms having more difficulty. Especially acute is the challenge of recruiting people of color to nonprofit boards. A nationally representative survey conducted by The Urban Institute revealed that 83% of board members of midsize nonprofit organizations are white, 9% are black, and 4% are Hispanic/Latino, with the remainder coming from other groups.

This study made an important observation: “[T]here are many nonprofit boards with no minority representation, even among organizations that serve a high percentage of minorities, particularly in the case of Hispanics/Latinos.”

This dismal picture is reflected in the NUF data. As shown in Figure 6, only 2% of NUF alumni respondents have ever served on a board.

**Factors Determining Leadership Development**

One of the key goals of the study was to gain an understanding of the core factors that contribute to leadership development. We asked survey respondents: “What was the single most important experience that you would say contributed to your leadership development?” As shown in Figure 7, the two most often cited factors were education and mentoring. Both factors have been identified in other reports as critical for increasing the ranks of people of color in the policy-making arena. Specifically, one in three (33%) respondents selected education, and almost as many (31%) cited mentoring as most important to their leadership development. Another

---

16 Ostrower (2008).
17 Ostrower and Stone (2006), and Powell and Steinberg (2006).

**What has been the single most important experience that you would say contributed to your leadership development?**

**Figure 7: Most Important Leadership Development Experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/Life Exper.</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20% of respondents selected the next most popular category, networking.

Additional analyses show that the relative importance of mentoring versus education for respondents appears to vary directly with age, with mentoring being most important to those under 35 (42%) and least important to those over 65 (23%). Conversely, education was cited as most important to older respondents (40%) and least important to younger respondents (27%).

**Contributions to Overall Career Success**

Beyond leadership development, we were interested in the factors that contributed to the overall career success of respondents. To that end, we gave survey respondents a list of items to choose from and asked them to select the one item they believe contributed the most to their career success. As seen in Figure 8, respondents are divided equally between naming networking (28%) and education (28%) as a factor most crucial to their career success. In Chapter 3, we will explore the importance of different types of networks for the career advancement of respondents. It stands to reason that two of the most critical functions of the NUF program, networking and education, would rank the highest among respondents as factors contributing to career success. By comparison, only 14% of survey respondents cite mentoring, 12% say credentials were most important in their career success, and even fewer credit training (7%) and diversity initiatives (2%).

Age is again an important factor in the choice of education versus networking. Older respondents are least likely to cite networking (15%), but they are most likely (33%) to credit education for their success. The youngest respondents showed the opposite pattern, with 32% crediting networking and 23% pointing to education as the factor most important to their career success. The data also revealed important cohort differences, with more recent cohorts more likely to see networking as the key factor in their success (37% of those who were Fellows since 2000) compared to older cohorts (17% of those who participated before 1980).

Importantly, the perception of the factor most vital to career success also varied by gender, with women (32%) more likely than men (22%) to attribute networking to their career success while men (35%) were more likely than women (23%) to point to education.
Which ONE or TWO characteristics of a mentor or of mentoring has been most helpful to your career advancement? (CHECK 1 OR 2 RESPONSES)

Figure 9: Most Helpful Characteristics of a Mentor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58%</td>
<td>Mentor’s Level of Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26%</td>
<td>Stature of Mentor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26%</td>
<td>Mentor’s Level of Commitment/Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Same Race Mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Cross Race Mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Same Gender Mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Cross Gender Mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>No Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>No Answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nonprofit researchers have produced many reports that recognize the importance of mentoring and networking as key factors in the development of minority leadership. One such report concluded that “Programs should provide opportunities for formal and informal mentoring and support networks of relationships across boundaries of race, ethnicity, and class.”\(^{20}\)

The diversity advocacy organization DiversityInc reported in its list of the best companies for diversity in 2009 that 100% of those companies offer mentoring programs and train both mentors and mentees, and 96% have a cross-cultural component to their mentoring programs.\(^{21}\)

Mentoring is a widely-recognized best practice in human resources and scholarly literature. Yet many surveys find that lack of equal access to mentoring is a frequent problem for women and minorities in the workplace, and that this differential access can have a serious and continuing negative impact on career development.\(^{22}\)

Given the centrality of mentoring to the career development of workers across employment sectors, we asked respondents to share their thoughts on mentor characteristics that have been most helpful in their career advancement. The results are displayed in Figure 9. By a significant margin (58%), respondents cited a mentor’s “level of experience” as being most helpful in their career advancement. Next in degree of importance was a mentor’s “stature” and “commitment/focus” (both at 26%).

Further analysis showed that respondents who are now executives are more likely than non-executives to favor cross-race mentoring (14% as against 7% respectively). As with prior studies, this research showed that cross-race mentoring (usually when the mentor is a white male and the mentee is a person of color) is both challenging and necessary.\(^{23}\)

As one focus group participant noted:

*I think you need to have diversity within your own networking circle. A white man at [company name] was my mentor. He told me what I needed to do in order to get to the big boys’ club. Then I got there and decided I wanted to do something that was more fulfilling. So I moved to [another department]. Sometimes people wonder why they didn’t get a position. Well, did you network with that group? I think that you need to put your competitive foot out there to include a lot of different people.*

An open-ended response from an NUF survey respondent yielded the following comment:

*Since NUF, I’ve worked both in the public and private sectors. Despite my professional accomplishments, I’ve found that the toughest challenge lies in forging relationships that extend beyond the*

---


\(^{22}\) For the most frequently cited studies, see Thomas (2001), and Thomas (1990).

\(^{23}\) For a discussion of the pros and cons of cross-race mentoring see Thomas and Gabarro (1999).
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workday. Organizational decisions are at times made during “downtime,” and creating an affinity with older white males (as a mid-30s African American male) poses a unique set of challenges.

Whether cross-race mentoring helps or hinders the career prospects of people of color is an important subject deserving of additional research. Cross-race mentoring is likely to remain an important issue in the years to come because many professional people of color work in settings where they are the numerical minority, and most of them have to report directly to supervisors and managers who are white, usually male at present, but increasingly female.

According to organizational researchers, many professional people of color largely work with and report to white supervisors and managers. This means that opportunities for mentoring will more than likely have to occur, if at all, across racial and ethnic lines, with whites predominantly serving as mentors. What we know so far from prior literature suggests that when people of color work mostly around whites and report to white supervisors and managers, they tend to have higher wages and better career prospects relative to people of color who work mostly among their own in racially segregated jobs. There are at least two ways of understanding these patterns. First, there is the theory of “status composition,” which maintains that jobs that are largely held by racial minorities (and women) are devalued simply because they are held by racial minorities and women. Second, some researchers have speculated that reporting to a white supervisor may be seen as a proxy for being located relatively high in an organization.

Whatever the case, these studies show that demographic context matters for the career mobility of people of color. While it is beyond the scope of this research to determine whether workplace context has any impact on the career success of respondents, we did make a baseline determination as to whether our respondents worked mainly in heterogeneous or homogenous environments and/or whether they directly reported to a white supervisor or manager.

As reported in Figure 10, nearly half of all respondents (47%) work in organizations in which most of the people who do the same kind of work they do are white. Only 18% work mostly with African Americans, and only 10% work mostly with Hispanics/Latinos. Further research will have to

---

determine whether these are segregated jobs or not.

Further, respondents are more often than not in positions that require them to report to a white manager or supervisor. For example, we asked respondents if they had a supervisor on the job to whom they were directly responsible (Figure 11). Nearly 70% of respondents report to a supervisor, compared with 26% who do not.

Of those who have an immediate supervisor, 57% of those supervisors are white, 21% percent are African American, and 15% are Hispanic/Latino. A very small percentage of respondents report to an Asian supervisor (4%) (see Figure 12).

The Importance of Networks

The old saying, “it’s not what you know, but who you know” is a time-worn truism, especially as it applies to how people find jobs and how they move up in the organizational hierarchy. Studies show that both formal and informal networks are tremendously important in professional recruitment, training, and retention. Networking expert Herminia Ibarra argues that when seeking access to positions of power and influence, many women and people of color are forced to choose between personal and career networks that comprise mostly either culturally and phenotypically similar members (homogeneous race/gender networks) or majority group members, who are more likely than their minority counterparts to have access to power and are therefore better able to help them advance in their careers. By comparison, Ibarra notes that white men rarely have to cross race/ethnic and gender lines to reap the benefits of strategic networks.28 Because these choices have such a profound impact on the working lives of people of color and women, we asked respondents to identify the types of networks that have been most helpful in their career development. As shown in Figure 13, respondents identified informal networks outside their jobs as being the most helpful in advancing their careers. Specifically, nearly two out of three respondents (62%) found informal networks outside their jobs to be most important for their career development, followed by informal networks inside the workplace (33%). Respondents also listed professional organizations (26%), formal workplace networks (24%), and same-race groups (15%) as helpful. Least important in their career development were same-gender groups (3%).

Networks and Job Acquisition

Beyond overall career assistance, we were specifically interested in how respondents acquired their jobs. We gave survey respondents a list of items and asked: “Which one or two of the following best describes how you acquired your current or most recent job?” As shown in Figure 14, two-thirds of alumni were likely to have found their current positions through either a friend or colleague (35% of respondents), or a formal search (31%) Ten percent of respondents were likely to have used other strategies.

If yes, what is/was your immediate manager/supervisor’s race/ethnic origin?

Figure 12: Race/Ethnicity of Supervisor or Manager

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which ONE or TWO types of networks has been most helpful in your career advancement? (CHECK 1 OR 2 RESPONSES)

Figure 13: Most Helpful Network Types

- 24% FORMAL WORKPLACE NETWORKS
- 62% INFORMAL NETWORKS OUTSIDE THE JOB
- 33% INFORMAL NETWORKS INSIDE THE JOB
- 26% PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION OR CLUB
- 15% SAME RACE GROUPS
- 3% SAME GENDER GROUPS
- 4% NOT SURE
- 2% NO ANSWER

Which ONE or TWO of the following best describes the way you acquired your current or most recent job? (CHECK 1 OR 2 RESPONSES)

Figure 14: Means of Acquiring Most Recent Job

- 31% FORMAL SEARCH
- 1% RELATIVE
- 35% FRIEND/COLEAGUE
- 9% EMPLOYER
- 4% NUF ALUM
- 6% NUF MENTOR
- 10% OTHER
- 5% NO ANSWER

and 9% were likely to have found their current jobs through an employer. Smaller numbers of respondents credit an NUF mentor (6%), other NUF alumni (4%), or a relative (1%).

Further analyses show a correlation between age, cohort, and whether a respondent found his or her current position through a formal search or through a friend or colleague. The older the respondent (41%) and the older the cohort (42%), the more likely it is that s/he found his or her new position through a friend or colleague. The reverse was mostly found for younger cohorts, who are more likely to have obtained their current jobs through a formal search. This makes sense, as it suggests that, relative to older cohorts, younger cohorts have fewer network contacts with access to jobs.

The size of the budget a respondent controls and the number of employees who report to him or her also had an impact on the methods used in finding his or her most recent position.

There was little difference in job search mechanism between respondents who earned the highest incomes (at and over $100,000 – 42%) and those who earned the lowest incomes (less than $50,000 – 47%); both groups were most likely to rely on friends or relatives, as were alumni in the nonprofit sector (41%) when compared to those in the government sector (36%).

Hispanic women/Latinas (42%) and African American women (35%) respondents were more likely to have found their positions through a friend or colleague, while these percentages were lower for their male counterparts (33% and 30% respectively).

Overall, these results are consistent with the vast literature on networks. Most people, regardless of race, gender, or other factors such as social class background, continue to find their jobs through friends and relatives.29

---

29 Reskin (1998), Royster (2003), and Seidel et al. (2000).
Despite the implementation of Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, prohibiting private employers, state and local governments, and educational institutions with fifteen or more employees from discriminating based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, employment discrimination remains an everyday reality for many women and people of color. National data from the EEOC shows that between 1997 and 2008, discrimination claims based on race and gender have remained fairly steady, but racial discrimination claims remain the single largest category of EEOC complaints. 30 When it comes to the nonprofit sector, PolicyLink cites institutional racism as an important barrier preventing people of color from rising to policymaking positions. 31 Similarly, sociological studies, including recent audit studies, show that discrimination, although subtler in nature, remains a prominent feature of the American workplace.

Given the importance of this issue, we queried respondents about whether they had ever experienced discrimination in the workplace, the type of discrimination experienced (for example, race, gender, age, etc.), and the manner in which the discrimination manifested itself (for example, lack of promotion, blocked professional opportunities, unequal pay, biased remarks, etc.).

Because discrimination is often experienced through blocked access to employment and promotion opportunities—gateways to leadership positions—we first asked NUF survey respondents if they have ever experienced discrimination in the workplace. The results were unequivocal: a large majority of respondents have in fact experienced discrimination at work. As shown in Figure 15, 72% (one of the largest responses to any question) of respondents have experienced some sort of discrimination in the workplace, while only 18% said that they have not.

A deeper analysis of the NUF data showed that African American men (80%) and women (78%) are more likely than Hispanic/Latino men (66%) and women (71%) to say that they had been the target of discrimination.

When the subject in one of our focus groups turned to discrimination, a generational split in opinion emerged. A relatively young African American woman made the following comment:

There is this thing about white male privilege, like who gets paid attention to. Let’s say we are [in a debriefing meeting]. We are all key players, but in terms of who is listened to, whose idea is taken…it is going to go to the white males around the table. I can’t believe that in 2009 that is still happening…It is not as prevalent as [it was in] the 60s, 70s and 80s, but it is still happening.

An older focus group respondent (African American woman) countered with a more philosophical take on the matter:

I am going to be the odd man out. I think it comes down to going back to your values, [your] sense of self, and your own competence and strength. I have sat in many board meetings. I was in the position of having to fire the director of [organization]. She was white. Her friends on the board wanted to protect her. Someone came to me and said he didn’t approve of what I was doing. When he got through I said, ‘I am so happy to hear you express yourself. Now I know where you are coming from, and I have heard you.’ When I went back to the table it went down my way. If you start with a white thing and a black thing, you are already giving them 20% of the power.

The above two focus group responses represent a small portion of a much larger discussion around discrimination. To gain a deeper understanding of this issue, after asking survey respondents if

30 Charge Statistics FY 1997 Through FY 2008
Have you ever experienced discrimination in the workplace?

Figure 15: Discrimination in the Workplace

- 72% YES
- 18% NO
- 9% NOT SURE
- 2% NO ANSWER

If yes, describe: Type of Discrimination Experienced

Figure 16: Type of Discrimination Experienced

- 38% DISCRIMINATION BASED ON RACE
- 8% DISCRIMINATION BASED ON AGE
- 22% DISCRIMINATION BASED ON GENDER
- 7% SEXUAL HARASSMENT
- 29% OTHER
- 20% NO ANSWER

They had ever experienced workplace discrimination, we provided them an opportunity to describe the type of discrimination they had experienced. After coding each response, we grouped similar responses into categories and organized them as shown in Figures 16 (Type of Discrimination) and 17 (Manifestation of Discrimination). The results of this procedure closely parallel national statistics from EEOC data. Beginning with Figure 16, 38% of respondents said the discrimination they experienced was related to race, while 22% attributed it to gender. A few respondents pointed to age discrimination (8%) while others included sexual harassment (7%) as a form of discrimination.33

Our research found that discrimination manifests itself in many forms. For example, our analysis of open-ended responses to the discrimination question revealed that for respondents, the most common manifestation of discrimination came in the form of blocked promotion opportunities (20%), followed by biased remarks (15%), lack of professional opportunities (13%), unequal pay (8%), and lack of acknowledgement (6%) (see Figure 17). The fact that respondents identified blocked promotion opportunities as the leading form of discrimination shows a pattern found in other research, marking a shift in the focus of fighting discrimination from gaining access to organizations to being promoted up the organizational hierarchy to positions of power and influence—a subject we turn to in the next chapter.34

Intersecting Group Identities

The type of perceived discrimination experienced by respondents was often a function of two intersecting group identities. For example, when asked to explain the “type of discrimination experienced,” some respondents pointed to both race and gender as a source:

---

34 For further discussion of blocked promotion opportunities by race and gender, see Smith (2005).
There have been a number of instances where my being a woman of color has impacted how I have been treated. I think that in my current position (which is a fairly senior position) there is often the expectation that I will not know something. I often feel that I am speaking for all Latinas everywhere, and though I take on the role there have been instances where the level of discomfort around other staff members is visible and evident.

[It's] been asked if I was the “cleaning lady…by a white male colleague.

Other respondents referenced age and gender discrimination:

In several instances, I’ve felt discrimination for being young, a woman (I’m also Latina, but haven’t felt discriminated against for that). At a previous job, my boss was sexist and would often give important assignments to the men that worked there. In another job, the city manager would often make comments about my age. At staff meetings, if I would speak up and express my opinion, he would say how much I remind him of his daughter because I was outspoken. This always felt very derogatory.

Still others pointed to gender and sexuality:

Early in my working life, I faced both sexual harassment [as a woman] on jobs and discrimination based on [sexual] orientation. In both instances, it was considered just part of the workplace environment that you had to deal with as someone who is female or is gay. Later in life, this kind of discrimination at work has been rare, though it has arisen in the domain of community service—but other, perhaps more subtle issues, have been at play at work. In some jobs and using some comparisons to peers (depending on the indicators), I have not advanced at the same rate as others with equal or lesser credentials/skills/experience. Salary has generally been on par but not formal (stated) authority.

If yes, describe: Manifestation of Discrimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discrimination Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Promotion</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Professional Opportunities</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unequal Pay</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Acknowledgment</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biased Remarks</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted Sexual Advances</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostracized</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How did you respond?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal Complaint Reported</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talked to Someone</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Nothing/Ignored</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked Harder</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resigned</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confronted/Took Action</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed Culture/Educated</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something Else</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35 For a comprehensive review of this literature see Browne and Misra (2003).
These are just a few representative examples of the manner in which different group identities may intersect to form differential workplace experiences for employees. While further research is needed in this area, the NUF findings confirm recent calls urging social scientists to consider the possibility that having more than one “minority” status may cause some individuals to experience the workplace differently than workers who have only one minority identifier, or none at all.35

Responses to Discrimination

When confronted with discrimination, a total of 26% of respondents filed a formal complaint (14%) or confronted or took action against the perpetrator (12%) (see Figure 18). Executives were twice as likely as non-executives to have confronted a perpetrator (executives 16% versus non-executives 8%), or to have willed themselves to simply work harder on the job to deflect discriminatory practices (executives 12% versus non-executives 4%).

Nearly one in five respondents (19%) elected to “do nothing or ignore” the situation, and a further 14% resigned. That one-third of respondents felt they had to ignore discrimination or resign as a result of it underscores the difficulty of addressing discrimination in the workplace.

Strategies for Reducing Discrimination

The fact that almost three-fourths of respondents say they have experienced some type of discrimination highlights a need for effective strategies for reducing discrimination in the workplace. This survey was a unique opportunity to query a group of accomplished men and women of color about the strategies they have used to survive in hostile work environments.

We asked survey respondents, “In your experience, what has been effective in reducing discrimination or bias in the workplace?” Changing the culture of the organization was the most often-cited strategy (30%)—a response that was particularly prominent among recent cohorts, that is, those who graduated from the NUF program since 2000 (Figure 19).

That respondents would overwhelmingly select “change the culture of the organization” as a strategy to combat discrimination is consistent with theoretical models of diversity management36 and a recent American Humanics Report that argues that in order to be inclusive, “A comprehensive approach aimed at

---

changing organizational culture and practices should examine external elements, such as how an organization relates to underserved populations, and internal elements, including the recruitment, retention, and treatment of diverse staff members.”

To a lesser extent, NUF respondents also cited several other “effective strategies” for reducing discrimination, including visionary leadership (18%), discrimination laws or policies (16%), exercising interpersonal skills (15%), and diversity training (12%).

We found it interesting that NUF survey respondents who currently occupy executive roles are more likely (25%) than non-executives (13%) to credit visionary leadership as an effective tool to reduce discrimination.

We wanted to gain a better understanding of these survey results so we probed our interviewees as to why targeting the “organizational culture” was viewed as viable way to reduce discrimination. In one enlightening exchange, an interview respondent linked a negative organizational culture to poor leadership, which resulted in her resignation.

**Interviewer:** One of the major responses that people gave in the survey about reducing discrimination in the workplace was changing the organizational culture. What do you think that means?

**Respondent:** To me [affecting the] organizational culture has to do with whether there is tolerance for that type of [discriminatory] behavior. I experienced that they allowed that type of behavior from senior leadership. I resigned from my position because I can’t work in an environment like that.

**Interviewer:** Do you think that situation stifled your career mobility because you felt compelled to resign instead of going along with it?

**Respondent:** That is not a leader. If you are about leadership, you are about change. If I am going to allow that behavior, then how do I make change?

**Interviewer:** What about those that say you can effect change from within as well?

**Respondent:** Absolutely. That is definitely the way to work things out. But when you see it from the leadership, those who make executive decisions, then the buck stops there. You can follow formal procedures [to file] lawsuits and bring it to the next level. I can sue the organization and it is a win for me, but not necessarily for the organization.

This is only one of many similar responses. Space limitations prevent us from describing the full array of remarks made about workplace discrimination. Suffice it to say, workplace discrimination is viewed as a fact of life by most interviewees, but not one that could really alter a person’s ultimate life chances if he or she were resolved to work hard and acquire the best education and experience possible. This theme resonated through the focus group discussions, sometimes implicitly and at other times more explicitly.
All leaders need to look more closely at how they address issues of race, gender, and power within their own organizations and in the development of new leadership.38

Workplace power and leadership are inextricably linked to race and gender. While there are many different ways to define workplace power and even more ways to measure it, social scientists have settled on job authority as an important dimension of workplace power. Three of the most important dimensions of workplace power are: span of control (the number of people under one’s direct supervision), span of responsibility (the ability to influence the pay or promotions of others, and to hire and fire), and decision-making or managerial authority, which includes, among other things, control over budgets.39 While important in their own right, these forms of workplace authority are also positively associated with higher income, greater prestige, greater job satisfaction, and higher intrinsic value.40 Importantly, as a coveted resource, workplace authority is unevenly distributed by race and gender in the workplace—those who have it have a vested interest in keeping it, and those without it would like to acquire it. Not only is it impossible to understand workplace inequality without addressing the issue of who exercises authority at work (and who does not), but it is difficult to imagine how projected leadership vacancies will be filled by qualified people of color without first understanding the gatekeeping function of those currently in authority. While we don’t have space to fully discuss this issue in this report, we could not pass up an opportunity to query respondents about their own levels of workplace power. In addition to the authority measures noted above, we began by asking survey respondents to identify their current job titles. The results of this inquiry establish the sample of respondents as bona fide leaders with power and influence in the workplace. We discuss key elements of their profile here as a prelude to the final two chapters. Several points are worth highlighting.

First, we gave NUF survey respondents a list and asked them to pick their current (or most recent) job title. The results show that 20% of survey respondents self-identified as executive directors, CEOs, or presidents; 21% as directors; and 16% as managers. Men were more likely than women to be executive directors, CEOs or presidents, or directors. A majority (51%) of male respondents hold these positions, compared to only 37% of female respondents. Part of the gender difference may be due to the fact that the earlier cohorts have a greater percentage of men than do the later cohorts, or it could be due to gender barriers faced by women in the workplace. More research is needed in this area.

The gap between Hispanic/Latino men and women in executive leadership positions is much larger than the gap between African American men and
women—suggesting more gender parity among African Americans than Hispanics/Latinos. As we might expect, age matters. We found that older respondents and earlier cohorts were more likely than younger respondents and more recent cohorts to hold executive leadership positions.

Finally, a majority (53%) of those who were in the program before 2000 hold executive leadership positions, compared to just 22% of those who have been Fellows since 2000.

Second, we asked survey respondents about the number of people who report(ed) to them in their current or most recent job—an important measure of span of control. As shown in Figure 20, most respondents have between 2-5 (21%) or 6-10 (20%) direct reports, but a further 21% registered no direct reports.

Further analysis reveals that most respondents who were NUF Fellows before 2000 (53%) have more than five people reporting to them, significantly more than the 28% of respondents who graduated from the program since 2000. When the issue turns to gender, men (52%) are also more likely than women (40%) to have a staff of more than five people. While only a few respondents of either gender have more than 100 people who report to them, men are still more likely (9%) than women (3%) to have reporting staff of more than 100.

Third, most respondents are in positions in which they can hire and fire staff. Figure 21 shows that 60% of respondents have the authority to hire others, 53% can fire staff, and 43% have authority to influence the pay of others.

Fourth, when the issue turned to budget responsibility, we learned that 70% of respondents control a budget. As shown in Figure 22, 11% of respondents oversee budgets of more than $10 million, but most of those who control a budget have budgets in the range of $1 million to $10 million (21%), and 34% control budgets ranging from less than $100,000 to $1,000,000. One in four respondents (27%) have no budgetary responsibilities at all.

It is clear that the respondents are very accomplished by most measures of career success. As we will see, they attribute a good deal of their success to many factors, including the NUF program. This being so, they are uniquely qualified to offer advice on how the NUF program, and other programs aimed at developing leaders of color, can succeed in the future—a subject we turn to next.
Here we present the results of an inquiry into the programmatic experiences of NUF alumni. Particular attention is paid to whether the program met the respondents’ expectations, and to the significance of certain NUF engagement initiatives, such as leadership development, career support, networking, and alumni organizational efforts. Beyond a mere attempt at program evaluation, the goal was to draw on the collective professional experience of current and future leaders of color to assess how NUF might continue to supply a well-trained group of leaders to the nonprofit and government sectors. We believe the results offered here can inform future programmatic strategies for NUF and other programs whose mission it is to develop leaders of color.

How did the NUF experience meet your expectations?  
Figure 23: Expectations of the NUF Experience

- 38% Exceeded Expectations
- 50% Met Expectations
- 9% Did Not Meet Expectations
- 3% No Answer

Expectations of the NUF Experience

The NUF experience met or exceeded the expectations of the vast majority of respondents. Figure 23 shows that 50% said that the program met their expectations, while 38% said it exceeded expectations, for a total of 88% of respondents finding the program to be all they expected or even more.

All cohorts found that the program at least met their expectations, but older cohorts were more likely than the younger ones to find the program went beyond their expectations. Fellows from classes before 1980 were almost evenly divided between seeing the NUF experience as meeting or exceeding expectations (43% and 45% respectively), while those who were Fellows after 2000 are twice as likely to see the program as meeting expectations (55%) rather than exceeding expectations (28%).

Our analysis also shows that the most successful respondents express the most satisfaction with the NUF experience. While “success” can be defined in many different ways, we found that respondents with salaries over $100,000 are most likely (54%) to say the experience exceeded expectations, while those who earn less than $50,000 are least likely (26%) to agree. Similarly those who control larger budgets (49% of those who control budgets over $10 million) and larger staffs (49% of those with more than 20 direct reports) are more likely to say the experience exceeded expectations, compared with those with no budget (32%) or staff supervisory (25%) responsibilities.

Half (50%) of the current executives among the respondents say that the program exceeded their expectations, compared to 30% of non-executives.

It comes as no surprise to learn that those who are most likely to express disappointment with the experience (20%) are those currently working in the corporate sector, because preparing leaders of color to enter the corporate sector has not been the focus of the program.

NUF Engagement Initiatives

Continued Leadership Development

As discussed in previous chapters, the dominant theme in many nonprofit reports is the need to intensify the development of leaders of color. Given this mandate, and as a baseline inquiry, we asked respondents to reflect on whether future NUF endeavors should focus on leadership development. The results (Figure 24) show that, collectively,
75% say that leadership development is either very or somewhat important. Only 11% say it is not too important; while 10% say it is not at all important.

Further analysis of the data revealed no differences by gender, but there is a difference by race in that African Americans (55%) are more likely than Hispanics/Latinos (41%) to see continued leadership development as very important.

While a majority of all age groups and cohorts say such continued development is important, more of the older cohorts, those in the later stages of their careers, or those who have already retired, say continued leadership development is not at all important.

**Career Support**

When asked about career support, 70% of respondents found it to be a very important or somewhat important alumni engagement initiative (Figure 25). Only 14% said that it is not too important and 11% said it is not important at all, for a total of 25% judging career support to be unimportant.

The importance of career support is mostly a reflection of age, with 68% of those under 35 seeing it as very important compared to 36% of those over 45. The time elapsed since respondents graduated from the program is similarly related to the importance of career support, with 62% of respondents who are members of NUF cohorts since 2000 saying it is very important, versus only 33% of those in the program before 1980.

A gender comparison showed that career support is less important to male respondents (32% not too important or not important at all) than to female respondents (18% cited it as not too important or not important at all); and differences emerged between African American and Hispanic/Latino alumni: the former (50%) are more likely than the latter (38%) to see career support as very important.

Not surprisingly, career support is more important to those earning salaries under $100,000 (51%) than to those earning more than $100,000 (32%). Career support is similarly more important to non-executives (51% very important) than to executives (37% very important).

Similar results were found when the respondents were queried about the importance of networking (Figure 26).

A majority (53%) found networking to be very important, while 28% found it somewhat important, for a total of 81% who consider it an important engagement initiative. Only 7% said that it is not too important, and 7% saw it as not important at all.
How important is networking as an NUF Alumni Engagement Initiative to you?

Figure 26: Networking

- 53% VERY IMPORTANT
- 28% SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT
- 7% NOT TOO IMPORTANT
- 7% NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT
- 5% NO ANSWER

How important is an Alumni Organization Structure as an NUF Alumni Engagement Initiative to you?

Figure 27: Alumni Organization Structure

- 28% VERY IMPORTANT
- 40% SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT
- 16% NOT TOO IMPORTANT
- 9% NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT
- 7% NO ANSWER

Additional analysis reveals that younger respondents and more recent cohorts are more likely to see networking as very important. Sixty-seven percent of those under 35, and of those in NUF cohorts since 2000, say networking is very important, compared to 41% of those over 65 and those in NUF cohorts from before 1980.

Alumni Organization Initiative

Only 28% say an alumni organization is very important, while 40% say it is somewhat important. Sixteen percent say it is not too important, and 9% say it is not important at all (Figure 27).

While no group saw alumni activities as very important, several demographic patterns were found. African American respondents found an alumni organization structure to be more important than did others, and the youngest respondents (under 35: 42% very important) and newest cohorts (those after 2000: 39% very important) see greater importance in this initiative than do older respondents (over 65: 25% very important) and earlier cohorts (those before 1980: 23% very important).

Executives were more likely to say that an alumni organization structure is not too important (21%) than were non-executives (13%).

How NUF Has Helped Respondents

As a final area of inquiry, we asked respondents to explain how NUF has specifically contributed to their leadership success. Space limitations prevent us from fully reporting the wide range of transformational statements we received from them about the positive role the NUF program has played in their professional and personal lives. Suffice it to say, we offer a sampling of responses below which we believe properly conveys the range of those sentiments:

- I think the NUF program was beneficial for several things, such as completion of the master’s program and exposure to a wide group of people that I worked with in the NUF program including Fellows that came from different parts of the country. The assignment to the [city identified] Redevelopment Agency gave me a different exposure to a minority community.
  (Interview comment)
• I think certainly the academics. For me the most overriding influence was my placement in [city identified]. I wrote a manual when I was there to formulate certain tax entities...Businesses formulate groups and tax themselves so they can do certain things. They have oil wells there, and this was an oil cartel. After the program was over they flew me back twice to participate in some city things. When I was working with the city I reported directly to the city manager. They thought very highly of me, and I felt that it was necessary for me to do everything I could to make myself look good, [make] the program look good, and create a body of work while I was there. (Interview comment)

• I think that it increased my confidence. It gave me a network of people that I respected who had more experience than I had. There was an increase in confidence and resources in the form of professors and other alumni. (Interview comment)

• It changed my life. It put me in a visible profile in leadership. I had already experienced leadership in civil rights efforts and community organizing. When I gained the academic experience it was life changing. It was a great opportunity to blend my experiences with organizing and grass roots with an academic profile. (Interview comment)

• At the time I learned about NUF I was seven years into my corporate career. It was about the bottom line and I translated that to mean money and not people...I thought the program was really neat because you had 50 people from around the country all with the same mindset, same passion for serving the underserved and the urban core...NUF helped me discover my passion. It provided the academic course work to understand how [the nonprofit] sector operates, and the internship provided me with the skills to sharpen my tool kit. (Interview comment)

• Prior to my NUF experience I ran a leadership development organization, and I enjoyed helping my peers develop leadership skills and I wanted that for myself. The National Urban Fellows program spoke to me. I felt like having an academic experience would enhance my skill set and get me to another place. I was excited about urban affairs and nonprofit management...When I came to the program I found a couple of things that were profound...seeing people of color doing what I was doing was also substantive. There is historical significance because it [NUF] started in 1969 and because it changed the face of leadership. That was a point of pride for me. The mentorship experience shows you that there are many communities struggling with the same issues...I was very proud because I felt there were only a few people that have had this experience when getting their master's degree. (Interview comment)

• I work on a committee that is focused on the oversight of government aid. I feel like I am using my graduate degree for the first time. I think being able to say that I have a master's degree is the most tangible part. But, having to write the Capstone was the richest part of the year for me. The process was beneficial. (Focus Group Comment)

• I think what helped me the most was the exposure to public administration and seeing how many minorities are doing great work. I had a mentor who helped me understand foundations. I worked at a corporate foundation. The Capstone project helped me realize that I like policy. I do a lot of performance analysis so this experience has helped. My mentorship experience was positive. I got to work with different departments. I saw how much power the funders had, and also how the foundation helped the community. (Focus Group Comment)

• I wouldn't be where I am today if it weren't for NUF. I thank NUF not so much for my career, but for saving my life. The way that it prepared me to deal with the business world, helped me to deal with my personal world. It helped to give me meaning in my life, and helped me to become a better parent. When I was accepted, I was still finishing my bachelor's degree. When I got accepted, I was on welfare and had a two-year-old to support. I didn't have management skills, and my writing skills were not great. What gave me the ticket was the ability to present myself and speak truthfully. They challenged me with every insecurity that I had. When I got an A in statistics, I asked what did I do to deserve that. [The professor] said that I earned it. I was shocked today when I saw [classmate], because we were in the same class. We haven't seen each other in 15 years. But when we were doing NUF we were inseparable. I miss that. I never had that in any relationship outside work, family, or college. I had it with the NUF program. I will always treasure that experience. I will always treasure the way that I was given knowledge in a way I did not receive in another classroom setting. (Focus Group Comment)

• We need to maintain the network. I very seldom get involved in NUF activities because of my schedule. But I'm here because NUF did so much for me, and I felt that I needed to give back. I wish we had more opportunities to get together like this so we can network with each other and see how we are doing. (Focus Group Comment)

The range of comments offered above brings into sharp relief the transformational impact the NUF program has had on the professional and personal lives of its alumni. Collectively, these comments underscore the unique programmatic role and comprehensive vision NUF has undertaken in the past and will continue to pursue in the years to come.
Summary and Conclusion

This report began with four core questions. In this final chapter we summarize the answers to each question and draw on the key findings of the study to inform recommendations for meeting the current and projected demand for leaders of color.

How do NUF alumni define leadership success?

We started our inquiry by asking respondents about how they define leadership success, and what they regard as their strongest and most challenging leadership skills. Respondents were also asked about the extent to which they feel prepared to fill vacant leadership positions left by retiring baby boomers, whether they are currently leaders in the policymaking arena, and the factors they deem most important for the development of their own leadership skills.

Respondents regarded influence in an organization and influence in government and over public policy as the most important definitions of leadership success. Their strongest leadership skills are relationship building, visionary thinking, and problem solving, while financial and quantitative skills and delegating responsibility are seen as most challenging.

Overwhelmingly, respondents are prepared to fill projected leadership vacancies in the nonprofit sector with a majority of them (63%) currently occupying leadership positions in the policymaking arena, and the factors they deem most important for the development of their own leadership skills.

What factors contribute to leadership success?

To tap into the factors that contributed to respondents’ leadership success, we asked the question in two ways. First we asked about the factors that contributed to their leadership development, then we asked about factors that contributed to their overall career success. What we learned is informative for leadership development programs nationally. In both cases respondents pointed to their graduate education (MPA degrees) followed by mentoring and then networking as being most important. These three factors, working together, provide the credentials, actions, and strategic interventions necessary to help minorities and women achieve leadership success.

What barriers impede leadership success?

Recent studies have identified workplace discrimination as a barrier to preventing people of color from assuming leadership positions. When queried about this issue, an overwhelming percentage of respondents said they had experienced discrimination in the workplace (72%). Most had experienced racial/ethnic discrimination, but gender discrimination was also identified. Although not as frequently mentioned, manifestations of workplace discrimination can involve intersecting group identities, that is, an individual can experience discrimination related to his or her race and gender, age and gender, or gender and sexuality.

When asked to offer strategies for reducing workplace discrimination, many respondents focused attention on changing the organizational culture and on visionary leadership—strategies also suggested by leading diversity change agents.

Interestingly, when we queried respondents about how they responded to discrimination, some filed a formal complaint or confronted the perpetrator (combined numbers) but even more chose to do nothing, simply ignored the
situation, or resigned (combined numbers). This is an area in need of further research.

**How did the NUF program contribute to its alumni’s leadership success?**

Reflecting upon their time as National Urban Fellows and on their experiences as people of color working in the nonprofit and government sectors, respondents noted several common factors that contributed to their leadership success. We have already mentioned education, networking, and mentoring—the three pillars of the program, which we feel should be part of any leadership development model. Beyond that, when we dug deep into how respondents experienced these factors, we learned that the program also served to increase their overall confidence, establish purpose and career direction, broaden vision, and cultivate passion for social justice.

**Suggestions for Programmatic Strategies**

Respondents provided helpful suggestions for the program going forward and identified five basic areas for action:

- **Curriculum:** Continuously assess course sequence and continue to focus on relevant skills, especially leadership.
- **Mentorship:** Prioritize matching and preparation of mentors.
- **Career Preparation and Opportunities:** Develop a career support system.
- **Networking:** Engage alumni and mentor networks.
- **Marketing and Branding:** Strengthen messaging and visibility of mission.

**A Call to Action**

Because of the need for new leaders, our nation’s challenges, our rich diversity, and demographic shifts, NUF must develop public service leaders of color who are ready to move from access to influence to power as change agents with the skill and will to impact public policy and social justice.

Based on our 40th Anniversary research, National Urban Fellows proposes a five-point plan of action.

1. **Shift public service leaders of color from access to influence to power...a cross-sector opportunity to develop individual ambition to be in charge and to achieve expected results.**
2. **Create a results-driven public service leadership diversity model that develops high-impact visionary thinking, relationship building, change management, data-driven problem solving, financial/quantitative acumen, motivational delegating, and great communications skills combined with the values of honesty, respect, and responsibility.**
3. **Drive individual career success through an integrated system of education, mentors with experience, and informal networking. Train public service leaders of color to develop their leadership career platforms through civic leadership on boards, local government roles, and community training as change agents.**
4. **Combat perceived discrimination and institutional racism through a new culture of inclusion and workplace attitudes combined with individual empowerment and willingness to take charge of self.**
5. **Strengthen organizational leadership development and diversity systems to focus on preparation and readiness to advance people of color through education, equal access to mentoring, and support of multicultural networking.**

**National and Regional Collaborations and Forums designed to identify issues, opportunities and actions to address public service leadership diversity.**

**Results Driven Leadership Diversity Model to strengthen readiness of people of color for public service leadership roles.**

**Diversity Tools and Best/Promising Practices to share with government and nonprofit organizations.**

**Communications and Social Media to ensure:**

- Awareness of supply and demand for leaders of color in public service
- Messaging the Call to Action
- Tracking pledges and results in diversity of public service leaders.

Forty years ago, civil and urban unrest were the catalysts for the creation of National Urban Fellows. Today National Urban Fellows is determined to be the catalyst for civil and urban leadership to meet our nation’s challenges. We will take action and seek partners to change the face of public service leadership.

We will mobilize and connect our 40 years of experience, our 40th Anniversary research, our 40th Anniversary Government and Leadership Advisory Councils, our 1,100 alumni, our 600 mentors, and thousands of great community leaders to join together with a common voice of determination. The public service leadership gap is real in America and the time is now to create the pipeline of leaders of color who are ready, willing and able to step up and out into roles of power.
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The National Urban Fellows Survey of 391 alumni was conducted by Baruch College Survey Research (BCSR) via e-mail, first class mail, and telephone from September 26 - November 4, 2009. The survey instrument was developed jointly by the National Urban Fellows (NUF) staff, led by Paula Gavin, President, National Urban Fellows; Ryan Smith, Ph.D., Associate Professor, School of Public Affairs, Baruch College, City University of New York; and the Baruch College research team, led by Micheline Blum, Director, Baruch College Survey Research. The field operation was conducted by BCSR in accordance with the standards and procedures approved by the Baruch Institutional Review Board.

The survey was intended for the full census of NUF Fellows who graduated from the program between 1970 and 2009. NUF provided BCSR with the names of 964 NUF alumni, as well as available contact information (1-4 e-mail addresses, 1-4 telephone numbers, 1-2 postal mail addresses), demographic information (gender, age, race), and academic history (NUF graduation class, degree prior to NUF, mentor information) about the alumni from NUF administrative records. Of the original 964 records, 162 had no contact information and another 26 records were later found to have no correct contact information, reducing the number of possible respondents for the survey to 776.

In order to maximize the response rate, the survey team employed a mixed-mode approach to data collection. The mail and e-mail components of the survey began on September 26, 2009. Invitations to the online survey were sent out to 668 alumni for whom there was an e-mail address provided in the population list, and a hard copy version of the questionnaire was mailed to 136 alumni for whom e-mail addresses were not provided. Of the 668 originally supplied e-mail addresses, 187 were found to be non-working e-mails.

The hard copy version of the questionnaire was immediately mailed to 111 of that group, for whom home addresses were available. Respondents who received the survey by mail had the option of mailing the questionnaire back or completing the survey online. After repeated mail and e-mail follow-ups, BCSR attempted to reach 235 alumni by telephone. Telephone interviews were conducted with alumni for whom there was a phone number but no mail or e-mail address, as well as with alumni who had been sent the survey by mail or e-mail but had failed to complete the survey. Additional e-mail reminders were sent after the telephone component was completed. The survey data collection continued until November 4, 2009.

The survey’s mixed-mode data collection yielded 391 completed interviews of the possible 776 alumni, an overall response rate of 50.4% by the cutoff date. Of the 391 surveys, 287 alumni who were part of the original group contacted by e-mail completed the survey online (73.4%), 22 completed the survey by mail (5.6%), and 37 were interviewed by phone (9.5%); 45 of the alumni contacted by mail and/or telephone completed the survey online (11.5%).

In order to estimate the non-response and non-coverage errors, BCSR compared the demographic characteristics of the alumni in the original 964 population records to the characteristics of the 391 respondents and to the records of the 162 alumni for whom there was no contact information. Details are provided in Appendix V.

The results of the survey were weighted by gender, race, and NUF cohort to the population parameters provided in the original NUF list of 964 alumni to assure survey weight of each unit used in the analysis was divided by the unweighted mean of the survey weights of all the analyzed units.

APPENDIX II: SURVEY METHODOLOGY AND QUESTIONS

41 The 60 graduates of the Corporate and Environmental Science Fellows concentration, a special program that ran in the 1990s, were not included.
42 Sixteen additional completed interviews were received after the cutoff date, but they were not included in the analysis.
National Urban Fellows Alumni Survey

CHECK ONLY ONE RESPONSE UNLESS OTHERWISE MARKED

1. What would best define leadership success to you?
   - Position in an organization
   - Influence and responsibility in an organization
   - Community leadership role
   - Influence in government or public policy
   - Other definition of leadership success (SPECIFY) ________________________
   - Not sure

2. What one of the following has been your best leadership skill?
   - Visionary thinking
   - Problem solving
   - Relationship building
   - Communicating
   - Delegating
   - Financial/Quantitative skills
   - Other (SPECIFY) ________________________
   - Not sure

3. Which leadership skill has given you the most difficulty in your career success?
   - Visionary thinking
   - Problem solving
   - Relationship building
   - Communicating
   - Delegating
   - Financial/Quantitative skills
   - Other (SPECIFY) ________________________
   - Not sure

4. The demographic complexion of America is rapidly changing and at the same time, there’s been an increase in the number of majority group leaders retiring from the workplace. Do you feel prepared to step-up to fill the vacant leadership positions left by these retirements?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Not sure

5. According to a recent study, “Leaders of color are critically needed to advance a new generation of policies that address the economic and social inequities confronting” our national community. In your current or last job, do (did) you consider yourself to be a leader in the policymaking arena?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Not sure

6. In your professional or civic life have you ever: (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
   - Held community or civic role
   - Influenced legislation/public policy in community
   - Created a diversity initiative in the workplace
   - Led a community organization
   - Started a nonprofit
   - Other civic activity (SPECIFY) ________________________
   - Not sure

7. What was the single most important experience that you would say contributed to your leadership development?
   - Mentorship
   - Coaching
   - Networking
   - Education
   - Other (SPECIFY) ________________________
   - Not sure
8. Which was most important in your career success?
   - Mentoring
   - Networking
   - Academics
   - Credentials
   - Personnel policies
   - Training
   - Other (SPECIFY)________________________
   - Not sure

9. What ONE or TWO types of networks has been most helpful in your career advancement?
   - Formal workplace networks
   - Informal networks outside the job
   - Informal networks inside the job
   - Professional organization or club
   - Same race groups
   - Same gender groups
   - Not sure

10. Which ONE or TWO characteristics of a mentor or of mentoring have been most helpful to your career advancement?
    - Cross race mentoring
    - Same race mentoring
    - Cross gender mentoring
    - Same gender mentoring
    - Mentor’s level of experience
    - Stature of mentor
    - Mentor’s level of commitment/Mentor’s focus on National Urban Fellows experience
    - Other (SPECIFY)____________________
    - Not sure

11. Have you ever experienced discrimination in the workplace?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Not sure

12. If yes, describe ______________________________
    ________________________________________________
    ________________________________________________
    ________________________________________________
    ________________________________________________
    ________________________________________________

13. How did you respond? __________________________
    ________________________________________________
    ________________________________________________
    ________________________________________________
    ________________________________________________
    ________________________________________________

14. In your experience, what has been effective in reducing discrimination or bias in the workplace?
    - Discrimination laws or policies
    - Diversity training or program
    - Visionary leadership
    - Interpersonal skills
    - Other (SPECIFY)____________________
    - Not sure

15. How did the NUF experience meet your expectations?
    - Exceeded expectations
    - Met expectations
    - Did not meet expectations
How important are each of these NUF Alumni engagement initiatives to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not Too Important</th>
<th>Not At All Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Continued leadership development</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Career Support</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Networking</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Alumni Organization Structure</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. What should leadership programs like National Urban Fellows do to produce highly successful people of color and women leaders in government and nonprofits?
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________

21. Are you currently

- □ Employed full-time
- □ Employed part-time
- □ Temporarily employed
- □ Homemaker
- □ Unemployed
- □ Retired

22. Which of the following best describes your current or most recent sector of employment?

**Government (SPECIFY)**

- □ Federal
- □ State
- □ Local

**Nonprofit (SPECIFY)**

- □ Human services/Health
- □ Arts/Culture/Recreation
- □ Neighborhood/Community/Social justice
- □ Education
- □ Environment
- □ Other (SPECIFY) __________

**Philanthropy/Foundation**

**Private sector/Corporate**

**Consultant**

**Business owner/Self employed**

23. What is your current (or last job) title?

- □ Executive Director, CEO, President
- □ COO
- □ VP
- □ Director
- □ Manager
- □ Supervisor
- □ Associate
- □ Other (SPECIFY) __________

24. What was your previous position?

- □ Executive Director, CEO, President
- □ COO
- □ VP
- □ Director
- □ Manager
- □ Supervisor
- □ Associate
- □ Other (SPECIFY) __________

25. What was your position before that?

- □ Executive Director, CEO, President
- □ COO
- □ VP
- □ Director
- □ Manager
- □ Supervisor
- □ Associate
- □ Other (SPECIFY) __________
26. What is/was the race and ethnicity of most of the employees doing the kind of work you do/did at your current/last place of employment?

- White
- African American
- Hispanic/Latino
- Asian
- Other (SPECIFY) ______________

27. Do you have an immediate supervisor on your job to whom you are directly responsible? (IF NO, SKIP TO QUESTION 30)

- Yes
- No

28. If yes, what is your immediate manager/supervisor’s race/ethnic origin?

- White
- African American
- Hispanic/Latino
- Asian
- Other (SPECIFY) ______________

29. What is/was your immediate supervisor’s gender?

- Male
- Female

30. In your job, do/did you have authority to (Check all that apply)

- Hire others
- Fire others
- Set the pay of others
- None of the above

31. How many people report(ed) to you?

- None
- 1
- 2-5
- 6-10
- 11-20
- 21-50
- 51-100
- More than 100

32. What size budget are/were you responsible for?

- None
- Less than $100,000
- $100,000 to $500,000
- $500,000 to $1,000,000
- $1,000,000 to $10,000,000
- More than $10,000,000

33. Which ONE or TWO of the following best describes the way you acquired your current or most recent job? (Check 1 or 2 responses)

- Formal search
- Relative
- Friend
- Acquaintance
- NUF Alum
- NUF Mentor
- Other (SPECIFY) ______________

34. Did you receive any academic degrees AFTER your NUF fellowship?

- Master’s degree (other than MPA from NUF)
- Ph.D.
- JD
- Other (SPECIFY) ______________

35. What is your current or most recent annual salary?

- Less than $30,000
- $30,000-$40,000
- $40,000-$50,000
- $50,000-$75,000
- $75,000-$100,000
- $100,000-$200,000
- More than $200,000

36. What is your marital status?

- Single
- Married
- Living with a partner
- Separated
- Divorced
- Widowed
NUF Focus Group Recruitment

Between July 22 and August 4, 2009, Baruch College Survey Research (BCSR) selected and recruited participants for the New York City and Washington, DC focus groups. The prospective participants were selected from a contact list of 403 program graduates provided to BCSR by the NUF leadership team. The New York City focus group participants were selected only from the 158 alumni living in New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, and the DC participants were selected only from the 78 alumni living in DC, Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania. Approximately two weeks before the scheduled focus group sessions, an initial recruitment letter was sent to both alumni groups, explaining the purpose of the focus group and outlining the incentives provided ($50 plus refreshments); the date, time, and place of the session; and a sample of the topics to be discussed. A purposive sample of participants was then selected and recruited by phone, with attention paid to diversity within the groups, ensuring that both focus groups would include 12-15 alumni of both genders, as well as different graduation cohorts, ethnicities, and employment sectors.

Focus Group and Interview Protocol for NUF 40th Anniversary Project

I. Defining leadership success and the factors that contribute to it

1. What is your definition of leadership?
2. What factors do you believe contribute to leadership success?
3. In your view, what is the best way to develop leaders?
4. Some scholars believe that the leadership development experiences of racial minorities and women are somewhat different from that of their white male colleagues. What are your views on this issue?
5. You have achieved a measure of success at this stage of your career. Would you agree? What factors contributed to your success?

II. Barriers to leadership and how they overcame the barriers

1. As a minority, have you experienced any barriers to your career mobility?
2. Did any of those barriers have to do with your race?
3. Did any of those barriers have to do with your gender?
4. How did you respond when you became aware of those barriers?
5. Did anyone in particular help you overcome the barriers?
6. How did the NUF program contribute to your leadership success?
7. Did your NUF experience connect you to a social network of people who helped in your career development?
8. Are you still in touch with some of these people?
9. Are these people made up mostly of your own race/ethnic group?
10. Are these people made up mostly of your own gender group?
11. Did you have opportunities to network with people from different race/ethnic and gender groups? How did these network experiences help you in your career?

III. How the mentorship experience contributed to leadership success

1. Were you assigned a formal mentor at your mentorship site or did you develop an informal mentorship relationship with someone? Which was most effective for you?
2. Was your mentor a person of the same race/ethnicity?
3. Was your mentor a person of the same gender?
4. Did you find your mentor helpful? *Probe for what they mean by “helpful.”* Ask for examples.
5. Did you have any problems with your mentor or with your mentorship site? *Probe for what they mean by “problems.”* Ask for examples.
6. Did any of these problems stem from your race/ethnicity?
7. Did any of these problems stem from your gender?

IV. Conclusions

1. Is there anything that we have not discussed that would be helpful for us to hear?
2. Do you have any comments or feedback for us about the project?

V. Wrap up and Close

1. Follow up questions, points requiring clarification from discussion, anything else?
2. Thank you and close.

---

43 We started with semi-structured interview questions but then allowed the interviewer the freedom to follow up responses with additional questions.
### Employment Status %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTERISTIC</th>
<th>TOTAL (N=391)</th>
<th>BLACK WOMEN (N=122)</th>
<th>LATINAS (N=65)</th>
<th>WHITE WOMEN (N=18)</th>
<th>ASIAN WOMEN (N=14)</th>
<th>BLACK MEN (N=88)</th>
<th>LATINOS (N=69)</th>
<th>WHITE MEN (N=7)</th>
<th>ASIAN MEN (N=8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporarily Employed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Employment Sector %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTERISTIC</th>
<th>TOTAL (N=391)</th>
<th>BLACK WOMEN (N=122)</th>
<th>LATINAS (N=65)</th>
<th>WHITE WOMEN (N=18)</th>
<th>ASIAN WOMEN (N=14)</th>
<th>BLACK MEN (N=88)</th>
<th>LATINOS (N=69)</th>
<th>WHITE MEN (N=7)</th>
<th>ASIAN MEN (N=8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private/Corporate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Owner/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Employed</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy/Foundation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demographic Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTERISTIC</th>
<th>TOTAL (N=391)</th>
<th>BLACK WOMEN (N=122)</th>
<th>LATINAS (N=65)</th>
<th>WHITE WOMEN (N=18)</th>
<th>ASIAN WOMEN (N=14)</th>
<th>BLACK MEN (N=88)</th>
<th>LATINOS (N=69)</th>
<th>WHITE MEN (N=7)</th>
<th>ASIAN MEN (N=8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (mean) *</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (median) *</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Highest Degree Completed %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTERISTIC</th>
<th>TOTAL (N=391)</th>
<th>BLACK WOMEN (N=122)</th>
<th>LATINAS (N=65)</th>
<th>WHITE WOMEN (N=18)</th>
<th>ASIAN WOMEN (N=14)</th>
<th>BLACK MEN (N=88)</th>
<th>LATINOS (N=69)</th>
<th>WHITE MEN (N=7)</th>
<th>ASIAN MEN (N=8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree other than MPA from NUF</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. in Progress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Job Characteristics

#### Annual Salary %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTERISTIC</th>
<th>TOTAL (N=391)</th>
<th>BLACK WOMEN (N=122)</th>
<th>LATINAS (N=65)</th>
<th>WHITE WOMEN (N=18)</th>
<th>ASIAN WOMEN (N=14)</th>
<th>BLACK MEN (N=88)</th>
<th>LATINOS (N=69)</th>
<th>WHITE MEN (N=7)</th>
<th>ASIAN MEN (N=8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$200,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-$200,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000-$100,000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$75,000</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000-$50,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000-$40,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$30,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Work Authority %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hire Others</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Others</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set Pay for Others</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Authority</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Number of Direct Reports %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Size of Budget %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$10,000,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000,000-$1,000,000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000,000-$500,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000-$100,000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$100,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organization Provides Service in...%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Services/Health</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts/Culture/Recreation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood/Community/Social Justice</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Leadership Characteristics (Self-Identified)

#### Best Leadership Skill %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visionary Thinking</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Building</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARACTERISTIC</td>
<td>TOTAL  (N=391)</td>
<td>BLACK WOMEN (N=122)</td>
<td>LATINAS (N=65)</td>
<td>WHITE WOMEN (N=18)</td>
<td>ASIAN WOMEN (N=14)</td>
<td>BLACK MEN (N=88)</td>
<td>LATINOS (N=69)</td>
<td>WHITE MEN (N=7)</td>
<td>ASIAN MEN (N=8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegating</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Others</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial/Quantitative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Most Difficult Leadership Skill %**

| Visionary Thinking                | 7              | 8                   | 8             | 13                | 13                | 6               | 5              | 0              | 0              |
| Problem Solving                   | 1              | 1                   | 1             | 0                 | 0                 | 2               | 2              | 0              | 0              |
| Relationship Building             | 10             | 9                   | 10            | 10                | 0                 | 8               | 16             | 20             | 9              |
| Communicating                     | 4              | 6                   | 5             | 9                 | 4                 | 1               | 2              | 0              | 0              |
| Delegating                        | 17             | 18                  | 15            | 30                | 20                | 20              | 8              | 0              | 16             |
| Managing Others                   | 13             | 19                  | 13            | 0                 | 25                | 5               | 11             | 20             | 34             |
| Financial/Quantitative            | 28             | 21                  | 33            | 32                | 29                | 33              | 28             | 40             | 16             |
| Dealing with politics/bureaucracy | 2              | 1                   | 1             | 3                 | 0                 | 0               | 4              | 0              | 0              |
| Time Management                   | 1              | 1                   | 1             | 0                 | 0                 | 3               | 0              | 0              | 16             |
| Public Speaking                   | 0              | 0                   | 2             | 0                 | 0                 | 0               | 0              | 0              | 0              |
| Other (specify)                   | 2              | 3                   | 0             | 0                 | 0                 | 3               | 4              | 0              | 0              |
| Not Sure                          | 15             | 12                  | 12            | 3                 | 9                 | 20              | 20             | 20             | 9              |
| Refused to answer                 | 0              | 1                   | 0             | 0                 | 0                 | 0               | 0              | 0              | 0              |

**Prepared to fill Vacant Leadership Position %**

| Yes                               | 73             | 67                  | 76            | 78                | 70                | 74              | 81             | 60             | 84             |
| No                                | 13             | 16                  | 7             | 10                | 26                | 14              | 9              | 40             | 16             |
| Not Sure                          | 12             | 17                  | 15            | 13                | 4                 | 10              | 5              | 0              | 0              |
| No Answer                          | 1              | 0                   | 2             | 0                 | 0                 | 2               | 5              | 0              | 0              |

**Leader in Policy Arena %**

| Yes                               | 63             | 58                  | 56            | 64                | 59                | 67              | 72             | 60             | 73             |
| No                                | 32             | 37                  | 37            | 33                | 29                | 28              | 23             | 40             | 27             |
| Not Sure                          | 5              | 4                   | 6             | 3                 | 13                | 4               | 3              | 0              | 0              |
| No Answer                          | 1              | 0                   | 2             | 0                 | 0                 | 2               | 0              | 0              | 0              |

**Most Important in Leadership Development %**

| Mentoring                         | 31             | 27                  | 29            | 27                | 54                | 35              | 32             | 40             | 0              |
| Coaching                          | 5              | 4                   | 10            | 6                 | 13                | 4               | 3              | 0              | 16             |
| Networking                        | 20             | 24                  | 22            | 13                | 24                | 16              | 16             | 20             | 25             |
| Education                         | 33             | 37                  | 30            | 22                | 8                 | 35              | 34             | 0              | 50             |
| Work/Life experience              | 7              | 3                   | 5             | 22                | 0                 | 3               | 11             | 40             | 9              |
| Other (specify)                   | 3              | 2                   | 3             | 3                 | 0                 | 4               | 3              | 0              | 0              |
| Not Sure                          | 1              | 3                   | 0             | 6                 | 0                 | 1               | 0              | 0              | 0              |
| No Answer                          | 1              | 1                   | 2             | 0                 | 0                 | 2               | 0              | 0              | 0              |
### Most Important in Career Success %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credentials</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Initiatives</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/Life experience</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Qualities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Types of Influence %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Held community or civic role</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influenced legislation/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public policy in a community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created diversity initiative</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created diversity initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Led community organization</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started a nonprofit</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Membership</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Networking and Mentoring

### Most Helpful Networks %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal workplace</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal outside job</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal inside job</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional organization</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same race group</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same gender group</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Most Helpful Aspects of Mentoring %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTERISTIC</th>
<th>TOTAL (N=391)</th>
<th>BLACK WOMEN (N=122)</th>
<th>LATINAS (N=65)</th>
<th>WHITE WOMEN (N=18)</th>
<th>ASIAN WOMEN (N=14)</th>
<th>BLACK MEN (N=88)</th>
<th>LATINOS (N=69)</th>
<th>WHITE MEN (N=7)</th>
<th>ASIAN MEN (N=8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross race</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same race</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross gender</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same gender</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor’s experience</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stature of mentor</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor’s commitment/</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared values</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared vision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Workplace Discrimination

### Experienced Workplace Discrimination %

| Yes             | 72            | 78            | 71            | 65            | 46            | 80            | 66            | 20            | 57             |
| No              | 18            | 12            | 16            | 16            | 42            | 12            | 27            | 60            | 27             |
| Not Sure        | 9             | 9             | 12            | 14            | 13            | 8             | 6             | 20            | 16             |
| No Answer       | 2             | 1             | 2             | 6             | 0             | 1             | 2             | 0             | 0              |

### Most Effective in Reducing Discrimination %

| Discrimination laws or policies | 16            | 13            | 14            | 10            | 8             | 20            | 13            | 40            | 0              |
| Diversity training/programs      | 12            | 12            | 14            | 0             | 8             | 12            | 17            | 0             | 0              |
| Visionary leadership            | 18            | 15            | 14            | 16            | 0             | 18            | 21            | 0             | 33             |
| Organizational culture           | 30            | 28            | 25            | 49            | 60            | 30            | 22            | 60            | 9              |
| Interpersonal skills             | 15            | 14            | 19            | 10            | 8             | 13            | 16            | 0             | 50             |
| Other (specify)                 | 2             | 10            | 6             | 6             | 9             | 4             | 6             | 0             | 9              |
| Not Sure                        | 4             | 3             | 5             | 3             | 7             | 2             | 2             | 0             | 0              |
| Refused to answer               | 4             | 6             | 3             | 6             | 0             | 2             | 4             | 0             | 0              |

### National Urban Fellows

### NUF Experience %

| Exceeded expectations | 38            | 38            | 45            | 29            | 25            | 40            | 37            | 60            | 15             |
| Met expectations       | 50            | 47            | 43            | 54            | 67            | 54            | 47            | 20            | 85             |
| Did not meet expectations | 9             | 11            | 9             | 10            | 8             | 4             | 11            | 20            | 0              |
| No Answer               | 3             | 4             | 3             | 6             | 0             | 2             | 4             | 0             | 0              |
### NUF Alumni Engagement Initiatives %

#### Continued Leadership Development %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>TOTAL (N=391)</th>
<th>BLACK WOMEN (N=122)</th>
<th>LATINAS (N=65)</th>
<th>WHITE WOMEN (N=18)</th>
<th>ASIAN WOMEN (N=14)</th>
<th>BLACK MEN (N=88)</th>
<th>LATINOS (N=69)</th>
<th>WHITE MEN (N=7)</th>
<th>ASIAN MEN (N=8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not too important</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all important</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Career Support %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>TOTAL (N=391)</th>
<th>BLACK WOMEN (N=122)</th>
<th>LATINAS (N=65)</th>
<th>WHITE WOMEN (N=18)</th>
<th>ASIAN WOMEN (N=14)</th>
<th>BLACK MEN (N=88)</th>
<th>LATINOS (N=69)</th>
<th>WHITE MEN (N=7)</th>
<th>ASIAN MEN (N=8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not too important</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all important</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Networking %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>TOTAL (N=391)</th>
<th>BLACK WOMEN (N=122)</th>
<th>LATINAS (N=65)</th>
<th>WHITE WOMEN (N=18)</th>
<th>ASIAN WOMEN (N=14)</th>
<th>BLACK MEN (N=88)</th>
<th>LATINOS (N=69)</th>
<th>WHITE MEN (N=7)</th>
<th>ASIAN MEN (N=8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not too important</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all important</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Alumni Organization Structure %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>TOTAL (N=391)</th>
<th>BLACK WOMEN (N=122)</th>
<th>LATINAS (N=65)</th>
<th>WHITE WOMEN (N=18)</th>
<th>ASIAN WOMEN (N=14)</th>
<th>BLACK MEN (N=88)</th>
<th>LATINOS (N=69)</th>
<th>WHITE MEN (N=7)</th>
<th>ASIAN MEN (N=8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not too important</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all important</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These measures are based on 385 cases (6 missing/not reported)*
## Appendix V: Population vs. Sample Descriptives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Completed Sample(^1)</th>
<th>Non-Respondents</th>
<th>Non-Coverage(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>964</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>964</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NUF Cohort</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1980</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 - 1989</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 - 1999</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000+</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>964</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Survey disposition status as of 11/04/2009

\(^2\) Population records for which no working contact information could be established
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