Research Report Findings:
Investing in Dismantling Structural Racism
and Economic Inequity in Rural America

By Linetta Gilbert, Darryl Lester, Peter Plastrik,
Olivia Roanhorse, Vanessa Roanhorse, Maggie Ullman

In 2021, we undertook research to provide recommendations to the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation for development of a network to help to dismantle structural racism and economic inequity in rural America. This public-facing report details findings from the research:

1) Principles for Conducting Anti-Racism Work
2) Defining Key Terms
3) Geography of People of Color and Poverty in Rural Areas – with downloadable database
4) Five-Year Budget for Investing in a Rural Anti-Racism Network
5) Reading Resources

Project Partners

This project was led through a collaboration of four project partners. The project team brings expertise, lived multicultural experience, and project-development experience in three areas critical for project success: rural development, cultural competencies, and network development. The team is made up of the Innovation Network for Communities, Gilbert & Associates, Roanhorse Consulting, and Ullman Consulting.

The partners have had different experiences living and working in and with rural places across the US. At the outset, the organizations agreed to operate the project as a partnership of equals, with decisions by consensus and parity in pay.

Principles for Conducting Anti-Racism Work

Based on the team's research processes—interviews, literature review, and own lived experiences—we adopted a set of guiding principles about working for racial equity, whether in rural areas or elsewhere. These principles are a work-in-progress, not finished or perfect, to be refined and improved through conversations, learning, practice, and relationship-building with others.

Guiding Principles
1. Beware of engaging in "dysfunctional rescue."
2. Don't treat racism as something that's just "out there"; it's "in here" too.
3. Center people and communities most impacted by structural racism.

1. Beware of engaging in "dysfunctional rescue."

The instinct to be a savior should not give way to actions that (a) disempower those who are to be saved, (b) overlook the realities they face and the knowledge they have about problems and solutions, (c) result in new "extractive" activities, or (d) perceive them through a deficit lens. These are huge risks that must be

> *The irony of a project of empowerment is that it requires victims.*
> —Edgar Villanueva[1]

avoided because they have substantial potential to do new harm. Our team has identified practices used by frontline organizations that can ensure that dysfunctional rescue does not occur when tackling structural racism:

- **Frontline communities first.** Frontline leaders in communities of place are the absolutely necessary starting points for efforts to dismantle structural racism. People at the grassroots and frontlines have the deep knowledge from lived experience that best informs the how and what of anti-racism efforts. They know how structures enact racism and who their allies inside structures may be. Without their knowledge and energies there is the risk that efforts launched

> *Community work is complex. It is nuanced. It is homegrown. . . The community tells us what best aligns and fits with their intentions and priorities.*
> —Gaby Strong[2]

  from the outside could worsen local racial and poverty problems. A powerful lever for systems change is *relational change*—relationships and connections, and power dynamics among people or organizations.

- **Designed and led by people of color.** White people have important roles to play in anti-racist work, but they must recognize whether and how to use *and not use* their privilege and resources. Otherwise, they risk unintentionally perpetuating racist power dynamics and a deficit and victim view of people of color. This ignores and stifles the self-drive, knowledge, and creativity that people of color bring to anti-racist efforts when they lead. Work on rural racism should be led by people of color—individuals and organizations—with parity built into alliances with white-led organizations, including philanthropies.

- **Reciprocity, not extraction**. Efforts to develop anti-racist efforts—information gathering, analysis, and other processes—should be guided by reciprocity, giving back, not just taking. Exchange for mutual benefit is best achieved through co-design of purpose, planning, decisions, and actions.

> *Even before failing to listen, funders and investors often exert control by framing the conversation and asking only certain kinds of questions.*
> —Edgar Villanueva[3]

- **Assets, not deficits.** A savior mentality almost always falls into the trap of perceiving those who are to be saved through a deficit lens; they lack something and must be saved. This not only disempowers, it ignores the presence of extraordinary and sometimes underdeveloped assets at

---

[1] Edgar Villanueva, *Decolonizing Wealth* (Oakland: Berrett-Koehler, 2018), 141.

[2] Gaby Strong, "Building Indigenous Power in Philanthropy," in NDN Collective, *Required Reading*, 260. Strong, an enrolled citizen of the Sisseton-Wahpeton Dakota Oyote, is managing director of the NDN Collective Foundation.

[3] Villanueva, *Decolonizing Wealth*, 130.

the individual, organizational, and community levels. Assets that can be increased and built on in the effort to end intergenerational poverty and racism.

2. Don't treat racism as just "out there"; it's "in here" too.

The practice of anti-racism is personal as well as institutional; "in here" as well as "out there." The personal level is where relationships blossom and where racial healing occurs. From there, bonds of care between people can be extended to organizations and communities. Yet a great

deal of the national conversation about anti-racism tends to treat the racism that is embedded in policies and structures, and overlooks how it lives in ongoing *personal* traumas, even of white people.

> *Fundamentally racism—its heartbeat—has always been denial. And the sound of that heartbeat has always been "I'm not a racist." To be more specific, the sound of that heartbeat has always been "not racist."*
> --Ibram Kendi[4]

We have identified several practices to anchor anti-racism work in the personal:

- *Personal truth telling.* It's essential to truth-tell about one's own experiences with racism, as well as to develop an understanding of how government, community, economic, and other structures explicitly and implicitly perpetuate racism. This is the foundation for building trusting, meaningful relationships across racial lines.

- *Heart before head.* Relationship building in the context of anti-racism work starts with the heart—the sharing of feelings, intuitions, vulnerabilities, beliefs, and opinions with each other, and the authentic emotional responses to the heart-sharing of others. This develops the empathy, caring, and feeling of "safety" that is crucial to building trust among people and engaging in often uncomfortable conversations and work about racism. Heart work is the foundation upon which head work--analysis, measurement, assessment, ideas—can be built.

3. Center people and communities most impacted by structural racism.

Racial and ethnic minority groups in rural areas may benefit from general improvements in economic and community development (the "rising-tide-lifts-all-boats" approach), but targeted efforts that center entirely on generating racial equity and justice are essential. An argument for centering race in rural areas, rather than just "lensing" it, can be found in Cynthia Duncan and Jessica Ulricvh-Schad's "Marginalization of Rural Communities in the U.S." which states that "in most cases, persistent rural poverty stems not from spatial isolation but from a historical political economy and, in all cases except Appalachia, deep structural racism. These are places where many poor people were deliberately vulnerable to powerful elites and where local corruption undermined local institutions, especially educational institutions, denying the poor access to a decent education and economic opportunity."[5]

We see two ways this occurs:

---

[4] From an excerpt of a speech delivered by Ibram X. Kendi at U-California-Berkeley on September 12, 2019
[5] Quote appears in a chapter in "Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, Investing in Rural Prosperity (2021), page 47.

- *Mission focus.* Organizations and networks that make racial equity their core mission and organize their work accordingly, naming white supremacy and oppression. Examples include policy advocacy for dismantling racist policies or racial healing processes in communities.

- *Population focus.* Organizations and networks that work exclusively with people of color on community and economic development or other types of activities. Examples include Native Nations enterprise development, capital access for black farmers, and black philanthropy.

Working on racial equity focuses on power and ownership—control—of assets and narrative, not just diversity and inclusion, which boost the presence and engagement of people of color in organizations, communities, and networks. (We use the Aspen Institute's description of racial equity: "What a genuinely non-racist society would be like, with the distribution of society's benefits and burdens not skewed by race. This is in contrast to the current state of affairs in which a person of color is more likely to live in poverty, be imprisoned, drop out of high school, be unemployed and experience poor health outcomes.") Diversity and inclusion may be steps toward equity, but equity and justice are far more challenging objectives to achieve.[6]

Practices for moving toward equity include:

- Developing a new and shared understanding of terminology, history, data, and personal stories, and a more accurate understanding of the origins and nature of existing inequities.
- Shifting of power within collaborations; avoiding top-down decision making.
- Moving from working *in* communities to working *with* communities. Listening to community requires trust and engagement, seeing communities and residents as assets rather than as problems to be solved.
- Holding people in power accountable for progress in their personal and organizational work on anti-racism. "Leaders must do personal, deep introspection to understand their own contribution to the status quo."[8] They must take a public stand, name their own or their organization's past racism and acknowledge harms done.

> *Many people are more comfortable talking about diversity and inclusion than about power, but without addressing power, efforts that highlight diversity only scratch the surface.*
> —John Kania, Junious Williams, Paul Schmitz, Sheri Brandy, Mark Kramer, and Jennifer Splansky Juster[7]

- Creating a safe space for vulnerability; sharing one's own trauma and grief; modeling listening, compassion, and empathy. Enabling people to bring their full selves to the conversation and to work.
- Apologizing to those who were harmed, acknowledging part and ongoing responsibility.
- Recognizing and valuing that this work will take more than a generation to achieve transformational change.

---

[6] Just achieving diversity within most institutions that white people have controlled for decades has been challenging, with only slow progress. For instance, in 2021 only 17% of the directors of boards of the 3,000 largest US companies (in the Russell 3000 Index) were people of color. Meanwhile, in December 2021, 17 states sued to prevent Nasdaq from implementing a rule requiring listed firms to disclose the demographics of their boards; those that don't have any self-identified women and at least one underrepresented minority or LGBTQ+ person have to explain why not. See https://www.nytimes.com/2022/01/03/business/corporate-board-diversity.html and https://www.seattletimes.com/business/gop-led-states-slam-crude-and-odious-nasdaq-diversity-rule/.

[7] "Centering Equity in Collective Impact," 43.

[8] "Centering Equity in Collective Impact," 45.

- Nurturing the wisdom and creativity within every community as essential to solving the nation's problems.[9]

Defining Key Terms

The Foundation's initial framing of the project—to develop a network to address structural racism and economic equity in rural BIPOC communities—was extremely broad. It left us with definitional issues and a need to establish narrower boundaries—a more precise "container"—that would be workable for network design and not obscure on-the-ground realities. Conceptual, "satellite-level" formulations—e.g., visions and aspirational goals, including those in the *Thrive Rural* framework, which was under development during our project—can help build shared general understandings across contexts. But they may also obscure critical contextual differences and on-the-ground realities that shape how change-work can advance.

As we worked through the definitions of key terms, we found ourselves developing nuances that helped to shape the container more precisely and aligned better with our guiding principles.

- ***Structural racism and white supremacy.*** It is essential that frontline/grassroots communities shape efforts to address structural racism/white supremacy. Only networking the players in structural positions in government, business, and academia could result in efforts that end up enacting "dysfunctional rescue," when local communities have not been empowered to guide the design and implementation of anti-racism interventions. It may also overlook leverage points for change—such as civic, frontline action in communities and private and nonprofit entrepreneurial efforts for wealth creation.

- ***BIPOC.*** Although BIPOC can be a convenient shorthand for describing people of color, it obscures a great deal that's important when dealing with racism. For instance, many Hispanic/Latinx people do not self-identify as "people of color." The same may be true of mixed-race people. Many immigrants—the primary source of population growth in rural areas—don't see themselves in the American race framework; instead, their identities are rooted in the nation and culture from which they came. This is also true of immigrants from Africa, Asia, and the Middle East. For many people of color, race or ethnicity is just one dimension of social identity. Navajos, for example, are also citizens of the Navajo Nation.

  In addition, the BIPOC framing leaves out rural white people who themselves are negatively impacted by racism. The growing number of in-migrants who are moving to rural areas as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic is bringing new tensions regarding land assets, political perspectives, economic privilege, and a need for newcomers to learn about the history, (past and living) culture, and cultural practices of small, rural places. Power and race are critical dynamics in these situations.

  Finally, lumping people of color together in one general category overlooks basic differences in some of the conditions of different races. Many Native people, for example, are part of sovereign nations with their own governments, laws, land, and infrastructure; they have a degree of control that is not the case for other people of color. Hispanics have a different unique

---

[9] From PolicyLink, "The Equity Manifesto," https://www.policylink.org/about-us/equity-manifesto.

situation: millions are undocumented, which leaves them endlessly vulnerable to economic and other exploitation.

- ***Poverty.*** Focusing on poverty as an economic condition, i.e., using the federal poverty line data, leaves out the intersectionality of conditions that diminish economic mobility and asset building of people of color with low incomes. And the economics-only approach tends to channel thinking into a deficit framework, which ignores the presence of capacity, energy, action, hope, and courage. At the same time, there are big challenges in finding and using other data. The Urban Institute's 2021 "Reenvisioning Rural America" report uses 50 measures of assets to categorize rural places into seven types—but within the rural development field there is dissatisfaction with this assemblage of data, and the report authors acknowledge that the data does not reveal on-the-ground nuances that would be captured in localized case studies.

Presence in Rural Areas of Organizations Led by People of Color

The team conducted a desktop scan of 120 organizations—mostly community-based organizations and nonprofit intermediaries—for their rural presence, commitment to centering racial equity, programs and activities. It appears that 60 of the organizations are led by people of color. We drew organizations from multiple reports: RuraLead, Rural Development Hubs, Justice40 Accelerator, *Thrive Rural!*, and several other sources.

Our interviews with rural leaders and our desktop scan revealed important conditions that have to be taken into account when engaging organizations to form a rural network.

- ***Rural fragmentation.*** Rural is not monolithic; it is a patchwork of remarkably different contexts, even when considering rural places with non-white populations and persistent economic poverty. Similar fragmentation occurs among rural organizations, even the 134 identified in our scan, when it comes to their missions and activities.

> *There is no single rural America. Its communities have diverse industries, cultures, and people.*
> --Urban Institute, "Reenvisioning Rural America"

- ***Rural leaders and organizations are stretched thin.*** Leaders of rural anti-racism/poverty entities are extremely busy, carry exhausting emotional burdens, are pulled in many directions, and are under-resourced with little capacity to take on new work that doesn't strongly support existing strategies. While they might acknowledge the potential value of connecting with new people, they also weigh the costs of the opportunity (in their time and energy) against the other work they need to do for their organizations/businesses.

- ***Rural leaders already informally connect with other rural leaders, usually within their mission-sector and/or region.*** Many of the individuals and organizations have networks, some of them longstanding—but they are usually informal, low-key, and involve people and organizations that share purpose, place, race/ethnicity, or issue focus. The connections are organized to meet people and organizations' highest priority value propositions.

- ***Emergence of next-generation rural leadership.*** Although we do not have any data to confirm this perception, our scan found that many of the leaders of rural organizations—boards, managers, and staff—come out of younger generations, and are under 40 years old. These

younger people may see ways forward, which older actors might not know about or believe possible.

We applied several filters to the 120 organizations: Is the organization led by people of color (staff, boards)? What is the organization's focus on rural and on addressing racism? At which scale does the organization operate? With which racial groups is the organization closely associated? What is the organization's mission and how does it work on the mission?

Applying the filters resulted in the following results:

- 34 of the organizations are led by people of color <u>and</u> exclusively or strongly tied to rural areas <u>and</u> exclusively or strongly focused on offering solutions that address racism.
- Of the 34 organizations, 12 operate at the local scale, 8 at state scales, 7 at regional scales, 7 at the national scale, and 9 at Tribal Nation scale (which can overlap with other scales).
- The 34 organizations have close associations with different racial groups. 15 are associated mostly with Black people, 10 with Native people, 5 with white people, 3 with Latinx people, and 1 with mostly Asian people.
- The 34 organizations have some overlap in the type of activities they undertake:
  - Community development (12 organizations)
  - Racial equity (8 organizations)
  - Economic development (8 organizations)
  - Environmental (7 organizations)
  - Wealth building/providing access to capital (7 organizations)

Our team believes the scan results show that a multi-racial, multi-geography network could be launched with rural-based organizations led by people of color dedicated to dismantling racism, as long as network design takes into account the conditions we also found in organizations like these.

Geography of People of Color and Poverty in Rural Areas

Our demographic analysis focused on what could be learned about the "lumpy" geographic distribution of people of color with low incomes in rural America. Roughly 4 million rural people of color live below

the federal poverty level. But where do these people reside? How geographically concentrated is their population?

Our data analysis started with a focus on the 151 rural counties (out of a total of 1,976 counties) in which people of color make up a majority of the population and the 301 rural counties that have experienced persistent poverty. We found that:

- 80% of these counties are also persistent poverty counties.
- 50% of rural counties with persistent poverty contain majorities of people of color.
- 12% of all rural people of color living in poverty (510,000 people) live in 6% of rural counties, which have persistent poverty and most of which are in just 6 states (Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas)
- In the 20 most populated of the majority-minority counties, there are 734,000 people of color. Roughly 256,000 of them live in poverty. Thus, in 1% of all rural counties, there are roughly 5% of all rural people of color living in poverty.

We started by focusing on rural counties with persistent poverty. Background data from 2020:[10]

- Total US rural population (non-metro counties) = 57 million
- White % of rural population = 76%
- Total # of rural people of color = 13.7 million
- Total # of rural counties = 1,976 counties
- Total # of rural counties in persistent poverty = 301 counties (15% of total counties)
- Total population of persistent poverty counties = 5.7 million people (10% of total rural population)

Using county-level data assembled by the Carolina Population Center at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, we determined that:

- 151 rural counties (7% of total # of rural counties) have populations that are a majority people of color. These 151 counties contain roughly 3.0 million people, about two-thirds of them—2.0 million—people of color (14% of all rural people of color).
  - 985,000 African-American
  - 591,000 Hispanic
  - 389,000 American Indian
  - 18,000 Asian
  - 78,000 multiple races
  - 960,000 white
- In nearly each of these counties most of the people of color are of a single race/ethnicity (Native, African America, Hispanic or Latinx).
- 122 of these 151 counties (80%) have also experienced persistent poverty. They have a total people of color population of about 1.7 million. 70% of these counties (86 counties) are located in just 6 states:
  - Alabama – 9
  - Georgia – 17

---

[10] Per https://www.ers.usda.gov/webdocs/publications/102576/eib-230.pdf?v=4409

- o   Mississippi – 24
- o   South Carolina – 10
- o   South Dakota – 9
- o   Texas – 17

(The other counties are in Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Louisiana, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma)

- Assuming a 30% poverty rate for people of color in the 122 counties with persistent poverty and majority-minority populations, these counties contain 510,000 people of color living in poverty. That's about 12% of all rural poor people of color living in 6% of all rural counties—a notable concentration.

- The 24 BIPOC-majority rural counties with the largest populations contain roughly 921,000 BIPOC people. Of these counties, majority BIPOC is Black in 12, Hispanic in 7, Native in 5. Geographically the counties are in 8 states: TX has 5; MS, 5; SC, 4; NC, 3; AZ, 3; NM 2; OK 1; AL 1.

County	Total Population
Robeson County, North Carolina	132596
Navajo County, Arizona	109270
Orangeburg County, South Carolina	87687
McKinley County, New Mexico	72438
Apache County, Arizona	71511
Starr County, Texas	64078
Maverick County, Texas	58174
Halifax County, North Carolina	51190
Val Verde County, Texas	48969
Cherokee County, Oklahoma	48664
Santa Cruz County, Arizona	46480
Washington County, Mississippi	46057
Vance County, North Carolina	44479
Jim Wells County, Texas	40972
Pike County, Mississippi	39532
Rio Arriba County, New Mexico	39159
Dallas County, Alabama	39149
Panola County, Mississippi	34190
Clarendon County, South Carolina	33957
Bee County, Texas	32611
Bolivar County, Mississippi	31848
Williamsburg County, South Carolina	31324
Marion County, South Carolina	31308
Adams County, Mississippi	31266

The geographic concentration of rural people of color with low incomes suggests several possibilities for network building. It may point to areas of intense need—high-value targets for change—and to areas of potential local

political power, given voting majorities of people of color.[11]

[The database assembled by University of North Carolina is available as a free download.

Five-Year Budget for Investing in a Rural Anti-Racism Network

We developed a 5-year budget for a robust start-up and expansion of a rural anti-racism network of organizations. Our analysis shows that the development of a nationwide network of rural organizations led by people of color that centers racial equity in community and economic development efforts requires an initial investment of roughly $7.4 million over five years.

During this period, the network would establish operations, grow its membership substantially, and initiate a portfolio of activities with impact. With this investment in hand, the network could reach a mature state and raise additional funds from other sources. We arrived at this amount of investment by developing a 5-year budget for the network based on our experiences working with more than 50 social-impact networks. Then we tested the result against the budgets of four national networks of organizations.

The 5-year budget contains several important assumptions:

- The budget ramps up each year, driven by growth of network membership, staffing, and projects. In Year 4 it contains 200 member-organizations and reaches steady-state operations.
- The cost of an annual convening covers travel, lodging, and meals for members, as well as venue rental and other typical convening costs.
- The budget includes modest annual stipends for member-organizations, which support and value member participation, and reflects an investment, rather than extraction, approach.

Five-Year Budget for Investment in Rural Anti-Racism Network

	YEAR 1	YEAR 2	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5	TOTAL	NOTES
Network Manager	150000	160000	170000	170000	170000	820000	Includes benefits @ 30% salary
Staff	85000	170000	170000	255000	340000	1020000	Yr1: 1 FTE; Yr2-3: 2 FTEs; Yr4: 3 FTEs; Yr5: 4 FTEs; includes benefits
Infrastructure	40000	50000	75000	75000	75000	315000	IT, equipment, office, expenses

---

[11] We noted that some of the states with these counties—Alabama, Arizona, Oklahoma, and Texas—are among those in which state legislatures have imposed new voting restrictions, clearly aimed at minority voters. Some—Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Texas—are among those in which legislatures have restricted the teaching of Critical Race Theory or limited how teachers can discuss racism. In 44 of the 151 majority-minority counties, majorities of voters voted for the Republican presidential candidate in the 2020 election; this compared with 30 counties voting for the Republican in 2008.

Annual Convening	120000	200000	300000	400000	400000	1420000	$2,000 per member; Yr 1=60 members; Yr2=100 members; Yr 3=150 members; Yrs 4-5: 200 members; assumes 1 annual convening or equivalent (e.,g,, multiple regional meetings)
Member Stipends	180000	200000	450000	600000	600000	2030000	$3,000 per member (6 days @ $500/day); Yr 1=60 members; Yr2=100 members; Yr 3=150 members; Yrs 4-5: 200 members; assumes 100% of members receive stipends
Collaborative Projects	100000	250000	400000	500000	500000	1750000	Projects determined by network
TOTAL	675000	1030000	1565000	2000000	2085000	**7355000**	

We validated our budget for the network by looking at the budgets of four mature national networks, with organizations as members, that are steady-state operations.

- A national network, 12 years old, with 200 member organizations, 1 annual meeting.
  - Total budget for 2022: $8.3 million
  - Staff size = 49 FTEs

- A national network, 6 years old, with 120 member organizations, 1 annual meeting.
  - Total budget 2022: $5 million
  - Staff size = 15 FTEs

- A national network, 3-year initiative (2020-22), 20 member organizations, 3 convenings.
  - 2.5-year budget: $7 million, including $2 million in project grants to members
  - Staff size = 3-4 FTEs + contracts for communications, evaluation, expert advisors

- A national network, reset 5 years ago, 350 member organizations, 1 annual meeting
  - Total budget for FY 2022: $3.2 million
  - Staff size = 11 FTEs

These and other network budgets vary due to several factors:

- Number of members
- Amount of staff and contracting
- Number of convenings
- Number and cost of projects initiated by the network

Without this level of lead investment, it is unlikely that a critical mass of founders—already stretched thin in their organizations—will have the interest and energy to make launching the network a priority, even though they see its potential value.

Reading Resources

The team conducted a partial literature review, with the partners sharing and examining materials, tools, and books, and monitored relevant contemporary articles, including:

- Edgar Villaneuva, *Decolonizing Wealth: Indigenous Wisdom to Heal Divides and Restore Balance* (Berrett-Koehler, 2018)
- NDN Collective, *Required Reading: Climate Justice, Adaptation and Investing in Indigenous Power* (Loam, September 2021)
- US Climate Action Network, "Ten Core Principles of Antiracism."
- Tema Okun, "white supremacy culture," www.dismantlingracism.org.
- Audrey Jordan and Diana Scearce, "Equity and Networks" (November 2020)
- John Kania, et al, "Centering Equity in Collective Impact," *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Winter 2020
- Madeleine Taylor, John Cleveland, and Pete Plastrik, *Connecting to Change the World: Harnessing the Power of Networks for Social Impact* (Island Press, 2014)
- Community Strategies Group, "Rural Development Hubs," The Aspen Institute, 2019, https://www.aspeninstitute.org/publications/rural-development-hubs/.
- Justice40 Accelerator website, "Meet the Justice40 Accelerator Cohort," https://www.justice40accelerator.org.
- Jason Schneiderman, "Generational Differences in Racial Equity Work," https://nonprofitquarterly.org/generational-differences-in-racial-equity-work/
- "Equitable Implementation At Work," ssir.org, https://ssir.org/articles/entry/equitable_implementation_at_work.
- Brookings Institute, "Federal Development Assistance for Rural and Tribal Communities," https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/201119_global_rural_report_fig1.png.
- Aspen CSG Thrive Rural, "An Action Framework for Advancing Equitable Rural Prosperity," https://drive.google.com/file/d/1O5IGwsWMjJjG63ekPLA8EBvjz3mXj_8l/view.
- Aspen Institute, "Rural Development Hubs Report," https://www.aspeninstitute.org/blog-posts/rural-development-hubs-report/
- ESPN Video, "Paige Bueckers advocates for Black female athletes," http://www.espn.com/video/clip?id=31797167
- From the *New York Times*:
  - "Why Rural America Needs Immigrants," https://www.nytimes.com/2021/07/21/opinion/rural-america-immigrants.html?referringSource=articleShare=
  - "Lost Lives, Lost Culture: The Forgotten History of Indigenous Boarding Schools," https://www.nytimes.com/2021/07/19/us/us-canada-indigenous-boarding-residential-schools.html?referringSource=articleShare
  - "You Just Feel Like Nothing: California to Pay Sterilization Victims," https://www.nytimes.com/2021/07/11/us/california-reparations-eugenics.html?referringSource=articleShare

- o "'You Can Feel the Tension': A Windfall for Minority Farmers Divides Rural America," https://www.nytimes.com/2021/05/22/us/black-farmers.html?smid=em-share.