RETHINKING SYSTEMS AND MENTAL MODELS
THROUGH LENS OF EQUITY AND RACE
with Jeremy Chan-Kraushar and Katie King

Katie King: Hi, I'm Katie King and I'm the Director of Strategic Foresight Engagement at KnowledgeWorks.

Jeremy Chan-Kraushar: Hi, everyone. I'm Jeremy Chan-Kraushar. I'm Director of Implicit Bias Awareness and Culturally Responsive Education at the New York City Department of Education.

King: Jeremy is joining us here today to talk about the systems thinking guidebook that KnowledgeWorks recently released and talking about that guidebook in the context of efforts towards racial justice in education. So a little bit of background about this conversation before we dive in. KnowledgeWorks released Looking Beneath the Surface: The Education Change Maker's Guidebook to Systems Thinking back in June. And it's part introduction to concepts of the discipline on systems thinking, part workbook about the tools and some exercises and examples of how education folks might be able to use some of the work of this discipline to better understand the systems that they're working in and ultimately trying to change.

So after we released that paper in June, Jeremy offered us some really useful feedback on Twitter and challenged us to think differently about the way that we had framed the paper and to question whether the resource that we had created really could be useful in the effort to create more racial equity and justice in education. So he has graciously offered to continue that conversation with us. Jeremy and I had the chance to meet virtually a couple of weeks ago and then agreed to talk more and to record this conversation so that anyone who's interested can follow along with KnowledgeWorks because we are engaging in a lot of individual and organizational learning and reflection asking how we can truly be an anti-racist organization and show up for educational justice and equity.

And so we will dive into this conversation talking about this guidebook, talking about concepts beyond the guidebook that we hope will help others as they are also having similar reflections. So my first question for you, Jeremy, we presented the tools, mindsets and processes of systems thinking in a color evasive way and that was some of the feedback that you offered us on Twitter. So can you just talk more about color evasive as a concept and how its harmful to efforts for racial equity and justice in education?

Chan-Kraushar: Sure. Well, first of all, thanks a lot for having me. I love these conversations and I love sort of the commitment to be transparent because there are no right or wrong answers, especially when we're thinking internally about our own racialized selves, the histories that each of us have been a part of. I know for myself it's important to just say right at the onset that while I do work around racial justice, racial equity, implicit bias, I always have to think about how I am in this conversation and how that connects to my own history, the different types of privileges that I have just based on how people perceive me. I'm Asian and White, Jewish man and so that's just part of what comes with any of my viewpoints that are always evolving and changing. So I just want to thank you first for having this
discussion and for taking the feedback that I give you. Sometimes you had some feedback and things make you feel a certain way and I love the idea of just having a dialogue about things and sort of making adjustments, changes, hearing from different perspectives. So I appreciate it.

King: Yeah, thank you as well.

Chan-Kraushar: So the first point just around color evasion, color evasiveness, a lot of people have heard about this term and it's formerly or still currently discussed as color blindness. When people say, "I don't want to talk about race. I don't think I need to talk about racism. Why are you inserting race into discussion? Why can't we all just be color blind?" I really like the lingo color evasive. I think it marks a more active stance because I think while we talk about, "Oh, I don't want to talk about race," when we say color evasive we actually can see how through our learned ways of thinking many of us, and myself included, were taught to not discuss race, not discuss racism because it's in the past. We had the Civil Rights Movement, laws were made, now what are we talking about? Everyone is equal. And I think just in the last couple years there's a lot of folks who have started to have their eyes open to the fact that there's clearly inequities, racial injustice that persists. They've always persisted.

And so I like the idea that we can talk about color evasion because when we have the chance to speak the truth about any subject race is a major core element to a lot of those things, especially in the United States. And so when we are neutral, when race is clearly on the table for a lot of people, my view is that, that is color evasive ideology. We do a lot of workshops on the idea around color evasion, color blindness. Color blindness can also be deemed ableist term. We don't want to associate blindness with something negative and that's also part of our own reflection that we could be doing to have more inclusive language. But in terms of color evasion, color evasiveness, I always think about what's the first time you thought of this term and does it have a positive or negative association?

And a lot of people say it's a positive association. I want to treat everyone the same, I want to treat everyone equally and we can actually think about one of the most sort of poorly rated Supreme Court cases of all time, which was Plessy v Ferguson in the very late 1800's where the dissenting opinion that wound up being on the right side of history said, "I do not agree with this Supreme Court decision to say that separate but equal is the law of the land." And in that dissent is one of the first times it kind of becomes popular to sort of say that the law should be color blind. It should treat everyone equally. And in sort of pop culture it becomes more of a liberal thing to say, a more progressive thing to say that "I should just be color blind." And I think when you ask people about color evasiveness people think about Martin Luther King Jr. And people say that story of little children holding hands and race shouldn't matter and just sort of want to end there.

And I think the reasons why color evasive ideology is so harmful is because, to be honest, and I can reflect personally on this, is that it conveys a false reality about the world. It's a convenient narrative to maintain the comfort of people who often benefit from systems of oppression to say "Why are we talking about race? We already handled this decades ago. Why can't we just be judged on our character, on how hard we work?" And I think that when you talk to any racial scholar there is just decades, decades, hundreds of years of research to sort of go against this line of thinking because whether or not you intend to use it, it is following the lead of folks, a lot of people, who would rather not deal with issues of privilege, issues of inequity because it sort goes hand in hand with this idea that we should all be able to just pick ourselves up by our bootstraps, that everyone should be able to do what they achieve and we shouldn't even talk about the systemic or structural policies that have always been in
place that have oppressed some and benefited others.

And so I think when I really think about this concept of any product, any conversation when race is apparent for a lot of folks and then you opt to say "Why are you adding race to that equation?" One, that, of course, shows sort of your own racial consciousness in the conversation, an ability to listen to the experiences of others, but also I think really it is sustaining a sense of validating this mentality that you should just be working hard and you can achieve whatever. There's no other forces there. And it cuts deep because it's about people's sense of self-worth regardless of privilege. If I am going to acknowledge that there were systems that maybe gave me a little bit of a leg up over another then that's really deep and is a core of question of who am I and I think as a White and Asian person my role has to been to say, "We can still uphold our sense of self-worth as people and also acknowledge the brutal truths of the history of this country, of colonization, of enslavement, of discriminatory practices that still exist and be on the right side of history by first talking about race and racism."

King: Yeah, I think I like your reflection about color evasive being a more active stance. It's something that we, any of us, have to choose to do and I think it's interesting when applied to any of the work that any of us do and what's interesting to me is I often hear color blind and I also appreciate the recognition of the ableism within that term. I traditionally hear that applied to individuals. When we're talking bigger sort of systems, policies, disciplines like systems thinking the term that I often hear is race neutral.

Chan-Kraushar: Mm-hmm (affirmative).

King: Which I think color evasive is more explicit because it acknowledges that there really isn't anything that is race neutral in this country right now. That's a mislabeling. Because it doesn't talk about race doesn't mean that something is race neutral. It would still have impacts as it applies to race and racism. So I appreciated your use of that term in the feedback and in my reflections on it I do think that it's been really helpful and I think the other thing that you just said that is standing out to me is that idea of when race is clearly on the table because it was clearly on the table as we were writing this piece. We used an example of a group of students and parents and teachers really grappling with the discipline policy in their school and the disproportionate ways that black students were being harmed by those discipline policies.

So race was obviously on the table as we were writing the piece. In the framing of the tools and in our offering of how you might use these as an education stakeholder we didn't explicitly talk about, think about how these tools might be useful to you as you are looking at the systems of oppression, of the racist structures that exist in your schools. So I feel like there were some not too difficult ways that we could have been more explicit in the framing that would have been more aligned with some of our thinking about the value of some of these tools. So I think that those are a couple of important reflections from me based on what you've shared.

Chan-Kraushar: Yeah, I think it's also hard too because race neutral in a sort of legal sense is an accurate term because it's a way to sort of avoid using race when often race is the goal or there is disparate outcomes that happen when people are trying to get around lawsuits. And so I think there is a place to sort of say this is neutral, but I really like your reflection. I think that even in creating any product or sort of any guidance that can help others, I think especially when the examples are about racial equity, when racial equity and anti-racism is the thing that right now everyone is talking about and i really pray that,
that never goes away and that it’s not just, "Oh, that year when everybody was focused on that."

But when that is such a part of a product I just sort of felt too that in sort of titling it, in framing it, in getting people to even buy into it there is an urge to want to be more inclusive but sometimes being more inclusive for people’s viewpoints because a lot of people are scared to talk about race and are worried that it might reflect other conversations that they've had which maybe haven't been great for their own sort of either defensive or just sort of lack of comfort in discussing some of these things. So I understand where it might come from, but I really appreciate your reflection around that.

**King:** Yeah and what is it that we're protecting and who are we protecting in being, as you say, more inclusive, which is in some cases then leading things to be more exclusive or at least continuing a level of exclusion in conversation and in sort of who's priorities and needs are put at the top of the list. Are we prioritizing people's comfort over the actual need to change our systems?

**Chan-Kraushar:** Right.

**King:** So I think that, that's an important point. One element of the guidebook that you and I discussed previously that I wanted us to dig into was one actual graphic that we created. And just some background before I share it here, this was introduced just as an example to show what a feedback loop is. How when we have multiple variables or elements of a system and they're all connected that it creates this feedback loop and that variables are connected by causal links. And so we put this just as an example wanting to show a simple loop and I say that because I think you and I are going to complicate really quickly here but it is an important complication. So I'm just going to share this graphic and we can talk through it a little bit together.

So in the guidebook we put this feedback loop just to show how variables, how components of a system are connected and so we looked at these links between home values and that when you have higher home values you have more revenue from property taxes. When you have more revenue from property taxes you have more for people spending and when you have more people spending you have a higher perception of school quality and we were intentional in using the word perception as opposed to just school quality, which then that perception leads to higher home values. So we were showing the links here. And when you and I talked we started to think about this one and what's missing from this graphic, which obviously there are a lot of things. So I would just like to hear your reflections on what is here and what is missing and just what comes up for you as you look at this diagram.

**Chan-Kraushar:** Yeah. And obviously when we take any sort of single diagram or it's a slice without the full context it's hard, so even some of the feedback that I might have it might not land exactly.

**King:** And I'll just offer one of the things that I really value about systems thinking is that in the discipline there is no causal loop diagram, which this is a piece of one, that’s ever treated as true. You can’t have a diagram that captures the complexity of the system and they’re reflections of our mental models. And so the purpose of putting them down on paper is so that we can discuss them, so we can pressure test them, as one of our interviewees said. So I say that to say there's absolutely no pressure to offer feedback on what the "right" version of this would be because it's all a reflection of our experiences and of the way that we see the system. And we need to work to be as complete and as thorough as possible. So I just offer that as reassurance that-

**Chan-Kraushar:** Appreciate that. Yeah.
King: That I'd be interested in what comes up and what from your mental model and from your experiences would be valuable to add here.

Chan-Kraushar: Yeah. So first of all, I really, really love the idea of offering guidance on systems thinking. I think there's a lot of people, myself included when I was teaching in a single school in a giant district in a giant city in a giant state, where you only know what you know and there's a level to what you question and what you even think can be changed. So I just want to sort of say I love the idea of taking as far back a view of really complex issues and analyzing them and looking at research and looking at ways to sort of change policies and practices. That's exactly the type of work that we're doing within the New York City Department of Education in the Office of Equity and Access. So I think when I see something like this I really like it.

With that being said, I think within a project around racial equity where all of the examples are really about, "Well, how are we going to lessen disparities and suspension rates or gifted and talented rates along the lines of race," which were a lot of the examples and which are what a lot of folks are trying to do right now. This example of a feedback loops I think sort of highlights or can highlight the dangers in starting history at a certain point. And what I mean by that is I think the variable of home values taken as something that just is never going to change, it is what it is, that is the way suburban and urban areas have home values and it's connected to our school systems funding and property taxes that I think just using this as an example sort of devoid of the opportunity to teach about the inequities that led to home value difference is something that makes me cringe a little bit because I think it doesn't open us up to an even larger sort of understanding of the way things are.

Chan-Kraushar: I think there is a danger in looking at any model following sort of a loop but doing it too far along in history and I think that, that's a problem in terms of our collective memory, especially for White folks, for a lot of East Asian folks, for New Immigrants who might have had the full education in the racialized history of the United States. Usually it's you come here and we learn a history that is super sugar coated, is not telling the truth about the way things are, how our system was built off of the enslavement of Africans who came to the United States or to the colonies without their consent, that the entire structure of the economy was built off of this. Even all the way up until the Civil War and beyond that, that's so important to understanding why things are the way they are. And I think when we have feedback loop examples that don't at least at the very least sort of have caveats or learn more or what are the other factors that play into each of these components that sort of hide that manifest even worse inequities even today I think it may oversimplify some of sort of the actions that people can take.

With that being said, I think that something like this it can be really helpful to sort of say "Where are we at a certain point and what's in my locus of control to change knowing this is a loop that affects it?" But I also think that there is a level of sort of just deepening each of our understanding around the history of this country, around socio, political, cultural aspects that maybe we don't know and that we have to unlearn. That might make us think out of the box around the types of solutions that we will propose, especially if we are in positions of power because I think there's a reason why there hasn't been fundamental change around racism, around racial equity in schools and that sure, there's been some progress over time, but it is not moving quickly enough and we have neighbors and friends and families and loved ones who are still suffering I think often because people are not thinking deeply about the connections of history and how they pertain to what's going on today.

King: Yeah, I definitely appreciate all of that and I think looking back at this diagram I think the driving
value for it was in simplicity, which there is something useful about being simple and straightforward. And we have to grapple with where is it more important to be simple and straightforward and where is it more important to show the fuller picture even if it's more complicated and either helping people kind of walk through that complexity or finding a way to make that work and I think since we've talked I've just thought of what are the other things that affect these variables? And in systems thinking there is no standalone feedback loop. This could never be considered a complete diagram so what else could and should we show that complicates it and then how do we help people sort of process that? I think is another way to go as opposed to just saying "let's show the simplest version of it for understanding." Instead can we show a more complicated version of it and sort of work through the processing?

Chan-Kraushar: Absolutely. And I think, again, especially with racism and anti-racism work you realize how complex some of the issues are but also sort of how simple they are that people don't want to address. So you think about home values and this being a variable that then starts this loop that is at least trying to explain some of the perception of school equality when in reality I can think of similar feedback loops based on research that was done even last year. Newsday on Long Island had a massive, really comprehensive assessment of the discrimination that happens for home buyers in different neighborhoods on Long Island in New York. This sort of plays into why home values are the way they are because there are implicit biases and direct forms of racism that are still creating this vast difference in home value. So when we can't talk about sort of the Black White wealth gap in the country and we want to just sort of create change just sort of saying that, that's just how it is I personally don't think that, that's enough. I think there's a lot of people sort of in this space who believe we need to go deeper and it starts with those who are creating these sort of systems doing that work to understand that better.

Because I think when you start creating a new guidance or document but it might not allude to or take the opportunity to teach around some fundamental aspects of race and racism I think there are some people who might say, "Oh, this was really useful. I'd change this or that." And others would be like, "It didn't even discuss some of the main elements to why home values are the way they are."

King: Mm-hmm (affirmative). The other variable that I have been reflecting on in thinking about this diagram is what else contributes to perception of school quality and-

Chan-Kraushar: Exactly.

King: We know that separate from per people spending that the percentage of the student body that is Black students that changes the perception of school quality kind of regardless of the socioeconomic status of the area and of per people spending that, that changes the perception of the school. And so that's a factor that's not part of this exact loop but is affecting that perception variable outside of it, which is something also important to acknowledge because then that shows us that it's not just this one thing.

Chan-Kraushar: And along with the PTA spending, the things that are sort of outside the government at least for a lot of places. But yeah, totally.

King: Yeah, yeah. Well, the next question that I wanted us to discuss is just kind of about how we use research and tools in trying to further efforts for racial justice and equity in education and when we spoke before you had mentioned that education leaders, in your view, really need to proceed carefully when we use research and tools that either are not specifically from education field or were not
designed with the purpose of racial justice in mind, which systems thinking is neither of those things. And so I would just be interested to hear more about how you approach those kinds of situations, what kind of questions you ask or support others in asking. Is there thinking about what kind of tools and research really can be valuable in these efforts?

Chan-Kraushar: That's great. Yeah, I think there's a lot of questions to ask. I think there's a lot of organizational reflection and sort of values work that should be happening. Every organization should be doing better at that, I think, but for me, the gist of this I think is about representation and it's about goals. So in using models or research or sort of schema from other places and sort of applying it, especially applying it to racial equality, a really specific and narrow and complicated focus in schools that has not had the attention in sort of mainstream academia and mainstream educational consultants sectors for a very long time. I think the question has to be whose expertise has been valued? Whose expertise has been monetized, rewarded? Has been a part of boards? Have been a part of decision making? And for what purposes?

And so I think that, that's super important because while a model or a way of thinking of something of an issue might have worked for one issue, but I think when you think about issues especially around racism and racial equity, I think people need to be very, very careful about what they sort of try to copy and paste. Not to say that you all did that, but that this is something that's triggered in my mind because I have my own process of unlearning so much that I went to segregated schools that were only Asian and White. I went to college where it was 80% White. I had some friends of color that were non-White, but really my whole mental models were based on sort of the status quo and until I sort of work with students and communities that were different than mine, Black and Brown folks in New York City and had colleagues that had wildly differently lived experiences than me I didn't really know how much I had to unlearn and how much I couldn't just sort of say "Well, this worked based on my experience. Shouldn't it just work here?"

And I think that, that's a problem for a lot, especially public school educators that, that's not a bad intentions but that's what we know what we know. We know what has worked for us, we know what education should feel and look like and then we sort of try and apply it in another context without thinking about some of the things that are at the heart of racial equity, which are culture and which are understanding differences in how people view education and resources and access and understanding the history behind all of that is just so, so important. So I've had to learn that and I keep learning it sort of everyday by reading more and talking to people who are different than me. And so I think in terms of this, I think about we have massively influential organizations, non-profits that I think definitely are well intentioned, are trying to do the best, they're trying to provide resources that will help, but I think there's often a level of reflection that organizations are not at right now and I think reflection on who is represented in the decision making, if you're using tools, and I think this happens a lot, especially systems oriented things, if they have been applied to the business sector.

If they've been applied to efficiency related sort of outcomes, which many are, we have to think deeply around does that even align with the values of racial equity in schools? Does that align to the goals of communities that sort of need and should be getting adequate, way more than adequate, but an equal education in terms of our taxpayer dollars, our resources? And so I just think that there are deeper conversations to be had around when you apply a systems thinking that was oriented toward being more efficient, getting certain goals that are often inherited from this sort of capitalistic, corporate,
individualistic mentality. When we apply it to, especially racial equity and lessening sort of racist gaps that have always exist and continue to exist, I would argue that sometimes that might be misguided or might be missing the mark. I think that what I've learned about anti-racism, having a mindset that's always learning and saying "I don't have all of the answers. I'm going to keep asking, trying things out," I think that's part of the process but I also think that there have been fundamental issues of education from its founding that we have to understand before we try to use sort of models from other fields.

And I think there's a way to do it well together, but I also think that any organization needs to really be thinking about who's represented, who's making these decisions, how does it connect to the goals of the guidance? And I wanted to share a quote because I think that this is important not to be like and I think we're doing it in this conversation. We don't want to be scared to be making mistakes or not doing the right thing and I think that's part of sort of shopping anything that we're going to put out there as products and sort of saying "Here is a draft. We want feedback. We want a call to get more edits." So it's not just "we're an organization and this is the thing." That it's a quote from David Gillborn who writes a couple essays in a book called Developing Anti-Racist Social Policy. And I really love this because I do it all the time and I need to be okay with the fact that I'm not going to say the right thing, I'm not going to do the right thing.

But it says, "Anti-racism entails a constant struggle to move toward greater equality. Anti-racist educators must even guard against the possibility that our own actions might inadvertently support the injustices we are working against." And I think about this all the time because in leading implicit bias awareness and talking about race and racism and its history, I know that I'm not going to say the right thing all the time. I can only speak from my own lens, shop it with folks to say, "Where are the holes in how I'm thinking about something?" And I think that, that shouldn't prevent us from being really proactive and especially talking to folks who share our identities. For me it's often speaking to friends and family members and colleagues who are either Asian or White or have similar experiences to me that we can push each other's thinking.

**King:** Mm-hmm (affirmative). Yeah, I think all of that is so important as we're thinking about what are... Because in my mind it's the goal, whatever goal we have and particularly when we're talking about a goal of racial equity how we go about pursuing it to me matters as much as having the goal in the first place. If we're not sort of living the values as we're pursuing the goal, then we're probably not actually pursuing it in a way that's going to get us anywhere. So I think that, that's right. For me, I feel like what's coming up is I feel like systems thinking at its core really has so much of what you're talking about in the good sense. That it really is about understanding that my lens is one lens. It's about recognizing that there are historical dynamics at play that we have to unpack. It's about sort of having as many lived experiences represented in your analysis of the system as possible. And I think when I think about the way that I conducted interviews for this project, I was not explicit enough in my questioning because I know that some of the people we talked to have done some really powerful work with communities, with students that were working on systems problems specifically related to race and racism.

But because I framed the questions from my lens and from this idea of "let's do this broad systems thinking guidebook" that didn't come out as much and so it's just having from the folks that we were talking to and who have used a lot of these tools in their own work. So I think that, that's just another example of how without getting lots of ideas on sort of what we're doing that we have a tendency, I have a tendency to make it follow the line of thinking. Just I think, honestly, it was I would ask a general
question and sort of just believe that it would come out if there was something related to racial equity that was relevant. And instead, I needed to be comfortable asking explicitly and saying, "How have you seen these tools be useful in creating more racial justice and equity in education?" And just really be explicit about that and find those examples a little more clearly. So I think that's part of what's coming up for me in this.

Chan-Kraushar: Yeah, I agree. I like that reflection. I also think that in doing this I just think a diversity of voice, especially racial diversity at the table is so important because we know the makeup of a lot of organizations. Predominately White, have always been. And so how do we realize that there is also a level of tokenism that might be happening when organizations or even schools hiring is not done with an explicit on saying we're valuing all different types of voices, but particularly around anti-racism I think that even in doing facilitation often it's I think it's really, really great to have multiple different lenses to speak to different audiences, to share different perspectives. It's always something that's really difficult, but you need I think folks to understand the history of race, of racism, which I don't think a lot of people do, and to not be afraid to talk about racism, to not be afraid to talk about anti-Blackness, which is a pervasive force, which is the guiding force in racism from its founding and today.

There are folks that fit within different racial categories that always change, but that it has been anti-Blackness that has always been the core element of racism. So people that are not afraid to talk about those things and if people in an organization, in any organization, aren't comfortable with that I really don't think that you can do anything to move the needle around racial equity if we’re not going to be able to talk the truth about some of the really big concepts. And even when we sort of say racial equity, racial justice, I think sometimes I know there needs to be on ramps for folks to be comfortable, but we also know that this has been studied for so, so long and people have been screaming at the top of their lungs fighting for their lives, for their existence, for equity. It's time for people to swallow their pride and start rolling up their sleeves and not being scared of the truth and not letting it affect our own sense of our own self-worth.

King: Yeah. Great, well thank you. Is there anything else that you want to share or reflections or questions back to me that you might want to pose as we close out our conversation?

Chan-Kraushar: I have many. I don't know if you want to keep it going, but I am just generally interested in the types of organizational changes that might have happened at KnowledgeWorks. I've been following and been a partner and friend of organization and others in the competency education world throughout the country. And so I've thought it has been really interesting to see people's commitments based on the events of even the last six months. We have our twin crises that people say of COVID and also racism, which has always been a crisis. But thinking about what reflection, what changes are happening in organizations that maybe did some things related to race or racism when it wound up being a project. But how is it core to sort of mission statements, values, hiring practices. Those are the things that I think are super important for people and organizations to be transparent about, especially if we are committed and dedicated to making that central to our work.

King: Yeah. Yeah, I agree and I think that, that is kind of the conversation that we're having at KnowledgeWorks right now and the work that we're doing in the investigation of our own policies, practices, culture and taking that hard look because we have been tinkering around the edges internally, I think, for a long time. And I have a sense that we are getting more to the core of who we want to be as an organization and what's holding us back from that and I think a big part of it is some of what we've
been talking about it. Is just the willingness to speak explicitly and be frank about racism's role in shaping education as it exists and then what is our role in undoing that? So those are the conversations that we're having every day and I hope that this conversation is one of many.

Chan-Kraushar: Yeah.

King: Public ones that we have that's just trying to demonstrate our ongoing learning and knowing that we have a lot of access to so much great thinking and so many folks in the field that we can turn to as we're doing that learning. So I believe and hope that, that's going to be a part of our process that we're engaging in.

Chan-Kraushar: I genuinely, genuinely think that, that sense of vulnerability, not having to be perfect, and then speaking to folks about your own experience I feel like that's so much part of my work, which is just sort of saying, "Look, these are all of the biases I have. These are all the racist tendencies that are happening in my brain. I'm not a bad person for it. I need to talk about it, I need to do more work on myself and then create connections with other people so that I can sort of be a partner, an accomplice in dismantling these systems because that's what needs to happen." I sort of commend you all for sort of doing that openly and transparently. I think that vulnerability is contagious. I genuinely think that, that is the way to go. It can't be, "You need to think this way or that way." It needs to be, "This is where I was in my thinking. This is where I am now. This is how I got there. What do you think about that? What's your reflection?" And then moving people that way I think is really, really helpful.

King: Yeah, I agree. And it's certainly freeing in a way to just be able to talk about it and to just be able to read your feedback on Twitter and say yeah, let's talk more about that as opposed to trying to explain anything away or trying to prove anything or defend anything that we maybe did or didn't do and instead let's talk and let's reflect and let's think about what we do now and what we do in the future. And that I feel like is a lot of what I'm taking from this experience.

Chan-Kraushar: Awesome. Well, you have so much influence as an organization that so many people follow and look to for guidance, so I think there is a really big opportunity to really shift the needle.

King: Yeah, and we're interested in engaging in conversation with all those folks, so thanks for helping us kick it off with this conversation.

Chan-Kraushar: Cool. Thank you so much.