



Appendix A: Methodology

Multiple data collection methods were employed to provide a holistic perspective of the Ohio Arts Council's (OAC) equity strengths and weaknesses and to understand the practical actions that can be taken. Data collection methods were interconnected; earlier parts of the process were intended to inform the structure and inquiry specifics of subsequent methods.

Descriptions of each method are provided in this section, with references to additional appendices for further information as appropriate. Research was conducted March 1 to June 13, 2022. Further information is available upon request from the Ohio Arts Council or the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies.

OAC Document Review

Materials reviewed were primarily related to the implementation of the OAC's operating support programs and included program descriptions and guidelines, program application forms, evaluations, constituent surveys, and communications examples. To provide context, materials related to other programs and to the organization as a whole were also requested. Documents were reviewed for their purpose, intended audience, accessibility, promotion of equity and biases.

Scan of State Arts Agency Policy/Practice

NASAA provided a sampling of state arts agency program materials, planning reports, evaluation plans and equity related work. This included publications authored by NASAA in support of members' equity efforts. In total, 42 documents with information about 25 state arts agencies and one regional arts organization were reviewed. The review was intended to establish a policy frame for the interpretation of the OAC's approach and also to inform the list of possible actions that the OAC could consider in its own work.

NASAA Data Analysis

NASAA conducted a quantitative analysis of OAC grant awards based on data supplied by the OAC and comparative benchmarking data from other state arts agencies. Draft findings were shared for review and feedback. The information shared informed the recommendations presented in this report. Highlights are supplied in Appendix C and an in-depth technical report is available under separate cover. In addition to its statistical analysis, NASAA conducted a review of grant summary information routinely supplied to the OAC board through the course of annual grant approvals. This material supplies a high-level snapshot of new applicants entering the Accessibility and Sustainability funding categories. Findings of that review are presented in Appendix B.

Scan of Equity Audit Resources

While an equity assessment model specifically for state arts agencies does not currently exist, those used by other grant makers can provide valuable lessons. NASAA provided a preliminary set of 11 resources. Online research was conducted and an additional 15 assessments and other equity tools were identified. This material is presented in Appendix D.

OAC Staff Interviews

Interviews with seven OAC staff were conducted. The purpose of these interviews was to better understand current grant-making practices, explore desired grant-making practices, probe perceptions of equity needs connected to grant making and gain insight into how actionable change might be realized. OAC staff also facilitated the identification of constituents who might serve as interview or survey informants.

NASAA Staff Interviews

Interviews with four NASAA staff were conducted. The purpose of these interviews was to gain insight into relevant activity occurring in other state arts agencies, common obstacles facing SAAs and NASAA's own equity work.

Constituent Feedback: Interviews

The purpose of the constituent interviews was to learn how organizations serving specific populations were currently impacted by the OAC's grant support and how GOS could be shifted to become more supportive. Interviews with representatives from 20 organizations were scheduled and 19 were conducted between May 24 and June 9. Potential interviewees were all organizations that specifically served one or more of the specific populations; none are current Arts Access or Sustainability grantees. Organizations were primarily identified by OAC staff, but SMU DataArts was also consulted and a few non-OAC grantees were also identified. Interviews were conducted virtually via Zoom using a predetermined and structured set of questions. Interviews were one-on-one conversations with either Angela Han or Jonas Cartano, both independent consultants.

Constituent Feedback: Survey

The purpose of the survey was to gain insight into how organizations were currently impacted by the OAC's grant programs, how GOS could be shifted to be more supportive, how OAC could support their DEI efforts and feedback on the OAC's equity efforts. An online survey was administered using the Alchemer platform and was open May 31 - June 13. Outreach was done to all organizations that had applied for an OAC grant in the last four fiscal years (one email per organization). The survey was a mixture of multiple choice and open-ended questions. The survey invitation went out to 1,129 email addresses and 392 surveys were completed, a 35% response rate.

Research Limitations

The Equity GAP Project limited its focus to the OAC's general operating support programs. The OAC's current program requirements allow only current project grantees to be eligible for GOS. In a strict sense, this assessment was limited to considering how current project grantees could enter GOS. The interviewees recruited were primarily current project grantees (only two did not have a grant history with the OAC). The survey respondents recruited were past OAC applicants. Consequently, the majority of recommendations provided in this report are focused on the experience of current grantees.

This project was fairly narrow in time and scope, so the number of constituent interviews that could be conducted was limited. Although the 19 informants engaged through this

assessment offered nuanced and highly useful feedback, expanding the number of contacts would doubtless add value to future equity assessments.

In addition, there are a few constraints to the survey that are important to note. Responses were recruited through email invitations. The survey was administered in English, using an online-only format. This possibly discouraged responses from those with technology or language limitations. Survey analysis was limited to counts and percentage calculations. It is possible that further statistical testing (error, power, t-test) could reveal more insight into the survey's quantitative data.

Interview referrals and the quantitative analysis were based on data supplied by the OAC. This information did not indicate whether an organization's mission or leadership is formally anchored in a particular constituency (such as a specific BIPOC community or the disability community). Although the OAC data allowed the researchers to make educated guesses, it is not possible to determine with complete certainty whether any individual organization included in the data analysis pool is representative of or rooted in a particular community.