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Executive Summary

Movement Research (MR) is one of the world’s leading laboratories for the investigation of dance and movement-based forms. For over 40 years since its founding in 1978, MR has been a creative incubator for artists and emerging ideas, with 11 interrelated core programs that annually serve over 16,000 participant interactions, including artists, students and audience members. Since its inception, MR has played a unique role in support of the research and development of dance, in a field usually focused on product. MR is dedicated to creating and implementing free and low-cost programs that nurture and activate discourse and experimentation while striving to reflect the cultural, political and economic diversity of its community of artists and audiences alike.

MR made a great effort to sustain its programs, operations and fulfill its mission since March 2020. That said, its dance-artist community suffered tremendous instability, isolation, loss and grief during this period between pandemic-related quarantines, shut-downs, human loss, persistent police brutality and continued attack on civic and human rights for immigrant, disabled, BIPOC and LGBTQAI+ communities.

Acknowledging this collective trauma, MR sought to get feedback from its staff, faculty, participants, advisory boards and community members to understand their needs and assess how MR may align to them. In particular, MR seeks to understand the experience of immigrant, disabled, BIPOC and LGBTQAI+ groups who have been historically marginalized and disproportionately impacted by these systemic challenges so that these groups can be better centered in MR’s future priorities.

For this effort, MR engaged Community Impact Advisors to understand the community’s perspective on what the current and future needs and challenges will be for dance-artists and how MR can be more engaged and responsive to them. In this report we present the methodology, key findings and proposed recommendations based on our analysis of 11 community conversations with 80 individuals.
Key Findings and Collective Views

● MR’s essential work is in providing both a space and community for dance-artists to explore movement-based forms and ideas without an emphasis on product, performance or monetization.

● MR’s programs, learning opportunities, rehearsal spaces, workshops, and publications are viewed positively by the community and organizational peers. Especially affordable rehearsal space, the opportunity to present works-in-process at Judson Church, learning through MELT, exploring and developing ideas through residencies and publications.

● While some improvements in MR’s diversity, equity and inclusion practices were mentioned, historically marginalized groups including immigrant, disabled, BIPOC, and LGBTQAI+ community members continue feel left out and tokenized. These groups mentioned a need for more power, resources and accountability from MR and a desire to be resourced and empowered agents of change working within the organization.

● The work-load and demands on MR contract, part-time and full-time staff exceed what staff feel is feasible and reasonable. For part-time and contract staff, the demands and workload tend to outweigh the compensation-level, and many of MR’s full-time staff expressed tremendous burnout, frustration and sense of hopelessness in the face of mounting pressures, demands, deadlines and community needs.

● There is a collective concern about financial resources and funding both at the individual and organizational level. At the individual level, most participants are concerned about how to pursue their creative development while meeting their concrete needs (housing, food, healthcare). At the organizational level, there is pressure to generate revenue and raise funds while encouraging new ideas and resisting the commodification of arts and artists.
Recommendations

Community Impact Advisors presents five recommendations to MR based on our research and analysis. The recommendations are elaborated upon in the report and highlighted below.

- **Identify 3 priority areas for MR to focus on in the next 1-2 years.** Review the strengths and challenges presented by participants in the reflection sessions and collaboratively decide on which challenges to address in the short term. Invest significant staff time to implement these strategies, even if it means taking a pause on daily operations.

- **Identify opportunities to cede power, leadership and financial resources to the Artist of Color Council and the Accessibility Advisory Team.** Review all past recommendations provided by these groups and co-create a plan to put them into action. Co-develop a process for future adjustments and a process for MR to remain accountable.

- **Increase personnel resources and capacity.** Conduct a comprehensive audit of all staff and personnel resources. Working from an inventory of all tasks and responsibilities, collaborate with existing staff to understand how to make each position more feasible, better resourced and sustainable. Develop a wish-list of new staff positions from this analysis, and identify personnel resources that could be allocated differently, including augmented investments in development/fundraising and human resources capacity.

- **Review all existing program commitments, funding partners and revenue streams.** Assess all existing programs and services in collaboration with staff. Identify programs that can be scaled back or phased out. Identify opportunities to shift existing funding and resources to help MR align to its goals, appeal to existing funders to implement your new priorities and explore avenues for earned revenue.

Though the scope of this reflection process was limited and presents several areas for further exploration, there are some meaningful collective views that can allow MR to begin the process to identify opportunities and future actions. MR is poised to build on their unique role, now with a renewed focus to center and partner with immigrant, disabled, BIPOC, and LGBTQAI+ dance-artists that have been historically marginalized.
Introduction

About Movement Research

Movement Research (MR) is one of the world’s leading laboratories for the investigation of dance and movement-based forms. Valuing the individual artist, their creative process and their vital role within society, MR is dedicated to creating and implementing free and low-cost programs that nurture and activate discourse and experimentation. MR strives to reflect the cultural, political and economic diversity of its community of artists and audiences alike.

For over 40 years since its founding in 1978, MR has been a creative incubator for artists and emerging ideas, with 11 interrelated core programs that annually serve over 16,000 participant interactions, including artists, students and audience members. Since its inception, MR has played a unique role in support of the research and development of dance, in a field usually focused on product.

Building on its history, MR is dedicated to programs that:

- Bring a diverse, intergenerational community of artists and audiences together in an ongoing exploration of new dance and movement-based ideas-in-process;

1 The authors would like to acknowledge that this section was written by Movement Research and slightly adjusted for this report.
● Are created through participatory, artist-driven structures that allow the organization to be directly responsive to the needs of its artist community;

● Stimulate dialogue across new dance and art forms and engage with civic and social issues.

MR has influenced the evolution of contemporary dance languages with its programs and its community of artists. As such, MR plays a critical role in the field by providing a supportive and fertile environment for research and experimentation that encourages risk, innovation, discourse, critical feedback and debate.

Reflection Sessions Purpose

MR made a great effort to sustain its programs, operations and fulfill its mission since March 2020. That said, its dance-artist community suffered tremendous instability, isolation, loss and grief during this period between pandemic-related quarantines, shut-downs, human loss, persistent police brutality and continued attack on civic and human rights for immigrant, disabled, BIPOC and LGBTQAI+ communities.

Acknowledging this collective trauma, MR sought to get feedback from its staff, faculty, participants, advisory boards and community members to understand their needs and assess how MR may align to them. For this effort, MR engaged Community Impact Advisors to facilitate and learn more about the community’s perspective on what the current and future needs and challenges will be for dance-artists and how MR can be more engaged and responsive to them.

The primary goal of these community reflection sessions is to understand how well MR is responding to community need and to identify opportunities to better support dance-artists in the future. In particular, MR seeks to understand the experience of immigrant, disabled, BIPOC and LGBTQAI+ groups who have been historically marginalized and disproportionately impacted by these systemic challenges so that these groups can be better centered in MR’s future priorities.

The secondary goal of these sessions is to inform MR’s future priorities, activities and allocation of resources. After this initial phase of learning, MR is hoping to identify key processes, actions and adjustments, feasible within its the limited internal capacity, to determine how MR will evolve in the short-term future.

Enclosed in this report is the methodology of how sessions were assembled and facilitated, the topics covered, key findings and proposed recommendations.

---

2 MR defines dance-artist broadly, including individuals and collectives engaged in movement practice and discourse such as: activists, advocates, educators, curators, access workers, thinkers and so on.
## Methodology

### Development of Key Research Domains and Questions

Community Impact Advisors facilitated a collaborative process to define and develop the research topics to be explored through the reflection sessions. Over several weeks, MR members of the Board Committee on Racial Equity, leadership and staff generated a list of over 40 questions and areas of interest that they wanted to explore through the reflection session process. Community Impact Advisors went through the questions generated by MR and consolidated and organized them into five key themes of inquiry: organizational identity; organizational culture; diversity, equity, and inclusion; programming and outreach; and inventory of future needs.

![Figure 1: Summary of research domains and questions](image-url)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH DOMAINS</th>
<th>KEY QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Organizational Identity               | • What is MR’s essential work? Are there ways in which MR can better focus on its essential work?  
• How has MR contributed to your development as an artist? |
| Organizational culture                | • To what extent is MR's current staff and working structure supportive of artists and the community?  
• How can MR better support you? |
| Diversity, equity and inclusion       | • How can MR address structural racism within the organization?  
• How can MR engage in antiracist and anti-ableist work?  
• Is MR and its programs and resources accessible to different communities? |
| Programming and outreach              | • What programs and activities are working well?  
• What areas of virtual and/or in-person programming could be improved or eliminated?  
• How can MR better connect with its community?  
• What would you like MR to do in support of artists that it isn’t currently doing? |
| Inventory of Future Needs             | • How has COVID shifted your practice and the dance community as a whole?  
What can MR do to respond to this shift?  
• What challenges and needs exist for the dance community?  
• What will be the future needs of dancers? How can MR align to this future? |

Community Impact Advisors proposed questions for each research domain that were reviewed and adjusted by MR members of the Board Committee on Racial Equity and staff. These questions were then used to develop several discussion guides, and a summary of these questions is shown in Appendix 1.
Development of Reflection Session Groups

Community Impact Advisors conducted 11 reflection sessions, or focus groups\(^3\), with a variety of Movement Research stakeholders: dance makers, curators, panelists, artists in residence, disabled artists, the Accessibility Advisory Team, faculty, staff, board, publications, the Artists of Color Council, and colleagues. These focus groups ranged from 54 minutes to 1 hour 22 minutes in length and included a total of 80 individual participants. The focus groups were conducted virtually using Zoom, and the audio was recorded. In addition, the MR Board Committee on Racial Equity hosted a virtual town hall once the sessions were completed to give space to the broad community to share their thoughts. This town hall was open to all and had over 50 participants.

The sampling method (the process for choosing and inviting participants) for the focus group participants was led by MR. MR chose the types of groups to connect with, and invited participants for each who were either actively affiliated with the group or had been in the past. Community Impact Advisors designed the focus group discussion guides for each participant-type based on the key questions and research domains.

Figure 2: Participant group summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SESSIONS HELD</th>
<th># OF PARTICIPANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Dance Makers in the Schools Staff</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Current and Former Artists-in-Residence</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Panels &amp; Selection Committees</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Festival Curators</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Faculty</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Current and Former Staff</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Disabled Artists/Accessibility Advisory Team</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Leadership Staff</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Publications Staff</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Artists of Color Council</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Peer Organizations</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\) Reflection session and focus group will be used interchangeably in this report. A focus group is a qualitative research method defined as a carefully planned group interview led by a trained facilitator to gather ideas, opinions and/or experiences on a specific topic and generate interpretations of collective views.
Community Impact Advisors used Otter.ai transcription software to transcribe the audio files of the focus groups into text files, and manually quality-checked and corrected the transcriptions. The text files were then imported into Dedoose, a qualitative data analysis software. Community Impact Advisors staff then coded the interview transcriptions using an open coding approach, whereby key messages were named and developed as they were encountered rather than starting with and looking for preconceived ones. The codes were developed within 13 broad “parent” themes: essential work, need met, unmet need, DEI need met, DEI unmet need, future need, programmatic positive, programmatic negative, supported in, not supported in, challenge, COVID challenges, and recommendations. A description of these parent themes can be found in Appendix 2.

The coding analysis resulted in 340 unique codes (“child” codes) being applied 837 times to 567 excerpts of the focus group transcripts. After coding was complete, the 340 codes were then organized into 38 key themes.

The findings in the next section of the report present the key themes interpreted from focus group responses along with graphs that show the number of times a theme was mentioned across the 11 sessions. These findings attempt to provide a summary of the collective views of those who participated and are organized in the areas of inquiry defined by MR: organizational identity and MR’s essential work, organizational strengths, organizational challenges, diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) strengths, DEI challenges, COVID-19 challenges, and an inventory of future needs.
Findings

1. OVERVIEW

When analyzing the 340 codes that were applied to the focus groups, an interesting dichotomy of themes rose to the top of those that were most frequently applied. MR’s support for creating community and meeting a need for artists rose to the top as positive elements of MR, while staff burnout/overworking, a lack of resources for staff, and inadequate staff and resources to fully serve the community rose to the top as areas of concern. Interestingly, the fourth most commonly applied code was that MR was adaptable, flexible, and responsive — a programmatic positive that can help bridge the gap between the strong artistic community building at MR with the perceived lack of support felt by and for the staff that help foster that community building.

Figure 4: Top Six Most Applied Codes in Focus Group Analysis (by number of times the code was applied)
2. ORGANIZATIONAL IDENTITY AND ESSENTIAL WORK

Focus group participants were asked to describe the essential work of MR from their perspective. These responses help describe the organizational identity of MR and fall almost exclusively into two key themes: building artistic community and providing diverse dance programming.
FINDINGS

Building Artistic Community and Supporting Artistic Process

“I feel that movement research has really set up a stand there for really pushing the boundaries of dance. Really focusing on process, you know, I think that has been one of the characteristics of Movement Research for a long time — to really support artistic process.” – Faculty Member

Artistic community was a frequent theme across all topics, but it was a particularly strong part of the discussion of MR’s essential work. Participants commented on how MR builds an artist ecosystem, builds spaces for connection and engagement, engages community and constituencies, and connects artists with communities.

Participants also commented on how MR pushes the boundaries of dance, serves community where there is need, and supports the artistic process. While less concretely tied to community-building than the other responses mentioned, these responses underscore MR’s essential work as propelling an innovative and inclusive artistic community.

Providing Diverse Dance Programming

“I think Movement Research seems to have its organizational hand in many parts. So it’s trying to serve many purposes, and be an umbrella for a lot of different ways to support artists.” – Dance Maker

When asked about the essential work of MR, participants listed classes, performance series, workshops, festivals, pedagogical activities, and adding new programs to improve DEI practices. These tangible programs and services offered were highly regarded and spoke to the many purposes MR has in the eyes of its various stakeholders.

3. ORGANIZATIONAL STRENGTHS

Seven key themes of organizational strengths were discussed in the focus groups: supportive culture; community and network; adaptable, flexible, and responsive; innovation and experimentation; welcoming; strength of programs; and support of career development.

Figure 7: Key Themes of Organizational Strengths (by number of code applications)
Supportive Culture

“And I’ve always really respected that Movement Research has always stayed incredibly focused on the artist, and from every level, not just like, who they’re supporting, but who they’re employing and who they’re, you know, it’s who they’re talking about all the time. It’s never diverged from that. And I think that’s incredibly unique.” -Colleague

The supportive culture was frequently discussed in the focus groups as an organizational strength. Specifically, participants discussed that they felt supported in the organizational culture, the artistic community, learning opportunities, their artistic identity and vision, their professional development, their ability to present with low pressure, MR’s accommodation of schedules, and through virtual classes. Some participants cited that they valued the financial resources provided by MR and how that made them feel supported.

Community and Network

“I think expanding community was one of the best resources that have kind of come out of this residency.” -Artist in Residence

A common theme in conversation was that participants felt supported in creating community. Programmatic positives that fostered this community and network included collaboration, mentorship, partnerships, community building, attention to diversity, relationships with schools, and overall network development and management. Many participants mentioned long lasting friendships that started at MR and how rewarding that has been for them.

Adaptable, Flexible, and Responsive

“The first thing that comes to mind is that Movement Research...is good at, and should be good at, is improvising and adjusting to what is happening.” -Panelist

Many focus group participants alluded to MR’s adaptability, flexibility, and responsiveness, and how that has allowed it to stay active and relevant over time. Participants mentioned how MR is open to change, ambitious, aligns multiple needs, has an informal style environment, learns about artistic issues and ideas, and offers new perspectives.

Innovation and Experimentation

Several focus group participants said they felt supported in experimentation and innovation. MR has embraced and encouraged the development of new and fresh approaches to movement.

Welcoming

“And I feel like in a way, Movement Research has always been approachable... It feels as if you know, I’m just saying, I’m positive that Movement Research has been approachable, I feel that even from the beginning. You know, if you wanted to take a class and wanted to intern, they were there. And there’s several entry points that are welcoming.” -Colleague

Focus group participants also discussed MR’s welcoming nature. MR was described as an approachable organization, welcoming and inclusive, and welcoming to non-academically trained dance-artists. Individuals cited that they appreciated the several entry points into MR and the variety of involvement that was made possible, from learning to development and presentation.
FINDINGS

**Strength of Programs**

The strength of virtual programming was frequently discussed, and the Artists of Color Council was also mentioned as an organizational and programmatic strength. A few individuals also mentioned their appreciation for how MR was not a presenting organization, for staying focused on the research and development of movement-based ideas, and having an expansive point of view on movement.

**Support of Career Development**

Several individuals mentioned leadership development, professional development, artistic development, and career development as opportunities that they value in MR.

### 4. ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES

Five key themes of organizational challenges were discussed in the focus groups: lack of resources and recognition for staff, lack of support for experimentation and pushing boundaries, room for community and network building, lack of clarity on MR work and image, and lack of artist recognition.

Figure 8: Key Themes of Organizational Challenges (by number of code applications)
Lack of Resources and Recognition for Staff

“And Movement Research cannot offer me what I need to survive to, like, prioritize this job.” – Staff Member

The most prevalent organizational challenge was overwhelmingly the lack of resources and recognition for staff. Staff often cited burnout and feeling overworked. Multiple stakeholders felt that the wages were low, and that some labor was unfairly unpaid. Some felt that there was too much work and programming with too few resources. For part-time and contract employees, the lack of benefits makes them feel unstable and poses a barrier in their long-term well-being. Some staff also felt as though their identity as artists wasn’t valued or supported.

Lack of Support for Experimentation and Pushing Boundaries

While experimentation was cited as an organizational strength by some, others cited a lack of support for experimentation or pushing boundaries. Focus group participants mentioned the rigidity of the organization, a delayed response to change, hierarchical power dynamics, and a lack of transparency or information sharing as unsavory aspects of MR’s culture. Participants felt they were not supported in institutional change, changing the organizational culture, or encouraging a diversity of dance styles. A few individuals also mentioned that they hoped for “decolonizing experimentation,” meaning that free experimentation was reserved for white dance-artists rather than all.

Room for Community and Network Building

While community was cited as an organizational strength, it was also explored as an area for improvement. Some felt there should be more collaboration, emphasis on relationship building, partnerships with other organizations and colleagues, more connectedness with the local community, and more intentional information sharing outside of existing social circles. A few participants also expressed a desire for MR to acknowledge the toll current events had on its community, and how reaching out to check in, especially after local tragedies (for example the April 12, 2022 Sunset Park subway shooting4), would help foster community and connectedness.

Lack of Clarity on Work and Goals

“A lot of people meet, a lot of ideas percolate, it’s very messy. It also feels informal in the worst and the best ways at the same time.” – Publications

Less common but still present in conversations was the idea that MR’s work and goals were not always clear. Further, it was unclear how all of MR’s programs and values align. Processes for collaboration, gathering input and making decisions are not defined. For example, one remarked that MR involves many people in projects which leads to the generation of an overwhelming number of ideas. This dynamic makes it challenging to prioritize and decide upon a focused scope of work. Similarly, because the scope of programs is so vast, it was expressed that the depth of those programs and their relationship to MR’s core principles didn’t always feel clear. Dance Makers in the Schools echoed this and expressed how difficult it is to explain MR’s programs and activities to school administrators.

---

5. STRENGTHS IN DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION PRACTICES

Four key strengths in MR’s diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) practices were discussed in the focus groups: MR’s support of accessibility and disabled artists, MR’s diverse populations, MR’s inclusive and welcoming culture, and MR’s consideration of issues related to DEI.

Supportive of Accessibility and Disabled Artists

“Movement Research, like ultimately did, I think, you know, to an extent...come to my backing, like in terms of like, you know, trying to make access a tool or like, sorry, access a priority for the festival as much as we possibly could, given the limited budget.” – Disabled Artist

The most mentioned strength in DEI practices was the improvement in MR’s accessibility practices and commitment to supporting disabled artists. While about two-thirds of those references were made in the focus group with disabled artists, it was also discussed with five other stakeholder groups. Focus group participants discussed how disabled artists were given opportunities to create, teach, and perform; provided paid opportunities; given space to rehearse, perform, and observe; and given autonomy to implement their mission. MR’s support for and investment in general accessibility (to an extent) was also discussed. The community building at MR for disabled artists was also valued.

Diverse Population

Participants felt that there are diverse populations engaged with MR. When the notion of “diverse” was mentioned, participants referred to a variety of characteristics including age, disability, race, ethnicity, gender identity and expression, identity as a person of color, as an indigenous person, identity as an immigrant, a member of the LGBTQAI+ community, and the intersection of two or more of these identities.
Some of the ways in which participants experienced the diversity of those engaged with MR included how MR creates communities for various groups, features diverse artists and faculty, is inclusive, has diverse representation, collaborates with immigrant diasporas, and collaborates with diverse populations through schools. The notion of diversity was usually considered in the context of the perception of MR as a predominantly white institution both historically and presently.

**Inclusive and Welcoming**

“The first time that I performed in New York City was in Movement Research and I was undocumented. And yet Movement Research found a way to compensate me for my performance even when I was undocumented. And they allowed me to speak about it openly and without discretion as well.” - Disabled Artist

The inclusive and welcoming nature of MR was also discussed as it relates to DEI practices. MR was described as income inclusive, inclusive to LGTBQAI+, welcoming to disabled individuals, and supportive of undocumented individuals. Some participants appreciated the inclusivity and accessibility of MR’s online classes, language (including American Sign Language and Spanish speakers), and free classes. More generally, feeling comfortable and welcome at MR was a common theme in several focus groups.

**Consideration and Commitment to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Practices**

MR’s commitment to improving its DEI practices, acknowledgement of DEI responsibilities, and openness to questioning were also mentioned in focus groups.
6. CHALLENGES IN DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION PRACTICES

Focus group discussions also revealed challenges with DEI practices. Twelve key themes emerged in these discussions: unmet needs for disabled community, tokenizing, institutionalized whiteness, lack of clarity on DEI and social justice commitment, lack of diversity and representation, lack of inclusion of broader community, compensation issues, need for formal spaces for affinity groups, lack of network building, lack of accommodation to different circumstances, bias, and lack of indigenous recognition.

Figure 10: Key Themes of DEI Challenges (by number of code applications)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number of Code Applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unmet Needs for Disabled Community</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokenizing</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalized Whiteness</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Clarity on DEI and Social Justice Commitment</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Diversity and Representation</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Inclusion of Broader Community</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation Issues</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Formal Spaces for Identity Groups</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Accommodation to Different Circumstances</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Indigenous Recognition</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unmet Needs for Disabled Community**

“*But I feel like there’s so much I have missed as a person with disabilities and chronic illness that I see non-disabled artists at MR have access to, and I know I’m not the only one.*” –Disabled Artist

Several unmet needs for the disabled community were discussed: accessibility barriers, disabled artists feeling isolated from other artists, how the website wasn’t accessible, and how not all classes and workshops were disability-friendly. One person thought that MR’s publications have done well with racial equity but not with accessibility. Another person was told by an instructor they shouldn’t be at a class because of their disability. There was discussion of how disabled dancers checked in with one another behind the scenes to see how accessible and inclusive an instructor would be, rather than feeling comfortable just showing up. Physical access barriers to events, classes, and social situations were also discussed as obstacles for disabled artists and for the cultivation of a community of disabled artists. Some mentioned how it didn’t always feel like there was community buy-in for accessibility, and that they felt there were side conversations about the “inconveniences of accessibility” that are ablest, and more generally that “ablism runs rampant in non-disabled artists.” Several participants also discussed how the disabled artist community felt very isolated.
Tokenizing

“And within that identity, what can be done, because I feel that when we talk about the gala, and the representation of us [artists of color] on social media, and in the images, I think all of those are earnest, and maybe even wholehearted attempts of making us feel welcome. But it was the effect of it all...Yeah, I think I might better appreciate Movement Research owning the fact of its history, such to a radical degree, that we can continue to name, how we don’t feel welcomed. And it doesn’t have to be a screeching halt of conversation.” – Artist in Residence

Several individuals mentioned a feeling of MR tokenizing people of color. A few specific examples of tokenizing include not identifying artists of color by name when shown in photos, the way photos of artists of color are used and archived without consent, and artists of color feeling a need to perform at fundraising events like the gala. Similarly, there was discussion surrounding feelings of needing to represent one’s identity group and that artists of color’s experiences felt collapsed and truncated. Some felt that anti-racism efforts were performative.

Institutionalized Whiteness

“Are we going to continue only hiring white bodies to oversee brown bodies, and just give pockets of like, space to make things for our community happen? Or is it going to be an institutional change from the ground up. And what I mean by that is, it’s great to have the AOCC. And it’s great to have spaces for, for such individuals and communities to come together to make decisions. But if those decisions are only impacting small programming or small events, it’s not really coming from within the institution. And oftentimes what folks don’t like to acknowledge is that it means certain people need to just not be in power anymore. And that’s really I think the difficulty with a lot of these reflections and like, attempts to change. The truth is, white people are going to have to be okay with giving up power. And, and what does that what does that look like?” – Member of Artists of Color Council

Several focus group participants also expressed feelings that MR had institutionalized whiteness with white homogenous culture and white homogenous spaces. One individual mentioned that the cultural life of the MR community could stand to be more inclusive of BIPOC backgrounds.

For example, an individual commented that MR doesn’t necessarily feel present in places where local residents go, such as public spaces or NYCHA developments. In that way, MR as an institution may feel like a predominantly white space that is not inclusive and welcoming to local communities, and therefore it misses out on engaging with and supporting local residents in spaces that are more a part of their everyday lives.

Participants also suggested that the tokenizing and collapsing of experiences of BIPOC artists, as described in the previous section, is caused by the white culture of the institution that minimizes the diversity of BIPOC life experiences. The white organizational culture was also cited as a reason why white institutions like MR don’t seem to always care about violence against brown bodies. Participants discussed how most people in positions of power are white, and how some of them should be okay with giving up their power. The Artists of Color Council was described as a step in the right direction, but the decisions made by the council (programming and small events) are not believed to hold as much transformational power as decisions made by white people in power.
FINDINGS

Lack of Clarity on DEI and Social Justice Commitment

Some expressed a concern about MR’s lack of clarity on its commitment to DEI and social justice. Specifically, participants discussed a lack of leadership commitment to DEI, lack of an internal program review, lack of accountability structures, lack of anti-racist dialogue, and how the mission statement doesn’t include a social justice component.

Lack of Diversity and Representation

“It’s a very white community, right, like the people who come to my workshops or to my classes, whether in person or on Zoom, tend to be very white.” –Faculty Member

Focus group discussions included a lack of diversity in terms of race, immigrant status, disability status, and age. More specifically, the lack of immigrant and BIPOC students and audience members, lack of representation from indigenous communities, lack of representation from disabled artists, lack of older dancers, and lack of prioritizing women of color were all discussed in the focus groups.

Lack of Inclusion of Broader Community

Another unmet DEI need expressed in the focus groups was a lack of inclusion of the broader community. This included a lack of accessibility/inclusivity for BIPOC populations and the local community, a lack of neighborhood relationships and engagement, and a lack of focus on bridging different communities together.

Compensation Issues

“Because it is historically known that it’s very difficult to get your money on time from MR. And waiting, you know, when people have responsibilities, bills, they have to sustain themselves. That’s, that’s a level of racism. That’s a level of discrimination that is very real and that people utilize to hurt black and brown people.” –Member of Artists of Color Council

Some discussed inequitable compensation issues during the focus groups, including inequitable compensation for disabled artists, barriers to paid participation for undocumented dancers, lack of financial inclusion, and lack of pay equity.

Need for Formal Spaces and an Archive for Affinity Groups

Several participants desired a more formalized space for disabled artists and a more formalized space for indigenous artists. There was also a desire for the acknowledgement and preservation of culture and thought from immigrant, disabled and BIPOC dance-artists, as there is a lack of an archive and documentation of work from these communities.

Lack of Network Building

DEI-related partnerships and mentorship opportunities were both discussed as unmet needs for artists, including for BIPOC artists, the immigrant population, and the disabled population. These partnerships and mentorship opportunities were discussed in terms of connecting with organizations and movements outside of MR as well as connecting with other MR community members (similar to the need for affinity groups described in the last section).
There was also a specific desire to have MR build relationships with immigrant and BIPOC centered social justice movements. One participant mentioned how there were one-off opportunities and events but that there isn’t quite a lasting impact or relationship from that.

**Lack of Accommodation to Different Circumstances**

Focus group discussion also included a feeling of a lack of accommodation for certain circumstances, including different social and class contexts and artists who are parents. Specifically, it was felt that different work schedules (morning/day/night) were not necessarily accommodated and how that was disadvantageous to BIPOC artists.

**Lack of Indigenous Recognition**

“I haven’t read or heard Movement Research’s land acknowledgement recently.” – Curator

Focus group discussion included a lack of indigenous acknowledgements at MR and a lack of recognition about native territories and relationships.

**Bias**

Microaggressions by teachers and staff biases were both mentioned in the focus groups. One participant said they’ve had negative experiences with some white teachers at MR who say “micro-aggressive things that are just inappropriate.” Another mentioned how staff racial and ableist biases might be affecting the language and programming chosen and who that is available to.

7. **COVID-19 CHALLENGES**

“A thought that I was having was...how we’re really trying to push forward and forget. Um, I cannot, for personal reasons. And also just, how things are functioning, I’m having a really hard time being back in a studio space and trying to be creative. I don’t know what that is anymore. And personally speaking, I think one of the things to consider in the moving forward...is possibly okay, how do we meet this community that has a collective trauma that’s happening, especially as dance-artists?” – Artist in Residence

The impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on the dance community are impossible to ignore. These impacts were discussed in various capacities in the focus groups and fell under two main themes: stress on community and connection and emphasizing overall systemic and societal pressures.

Figure 11: Key Themes of COVID-19 Challenges (by number of code applications)
FINDINGS

Stress on Community and Connection

The most obvious and commonly cited COVID-19 related challenge was the sudden loss of in-person activities and how that diminished the sense of connectedness and community that MR thrives off. The limitations on physical dance space isolated community members and made it harder to engage in dance. There was an essence of missing the MR community during the pandemic and feeling less creative without having that communal energy to tap into. However, participants also praised the responsive shift of community building from physical to virtual. Yet, digital communication fatigue was also discussed.

Emphasizing of Overall Systemic Issues

Participants also discussed how COVID-19 emphasized overall systemic and societal pressures. One participant noted that while it might be too much to expect an organization like MR to facilitate financial support and funds for housing or food, it would be a resource that could allow an artist to focus on their creative development and ideas. Another participant discussed a desire for consistent work and pay so that affording basic necessities could be anticipated. Social justice issues were magnified, financial situations were stressed, childcare became more challenging, and burnout became common. The pandemic triggered a sort of collective trauma, which creates opportunity for discussion, connection, and collective healing.

8. INVENTORY OF FUTURE NEEDS

Figure 12: Priorities When Asked About Needs of MR and the Dance Community (by number of code applications)
Funding and Resources

“But with all of that beautiful kind of ethical value that’s placed on that work, there is really a lack of transformative, financial and other resources to support artists who, who, who carry themselves....And, and so we’re seeing that we aren’t able to support artists who can’t afford to be an artist in the way that they really are an artist....And artists are working with so many new materials, and they need so many different programs and spaces and like actual physical things, and people and bodies. And we can do a better job. I’ll say, I wish we could do a better job of supporting that.” –Colleague

By far, the most commonly discussed need at MR and the broader dance community was funding and resources. This code was applied 77 times. There was significant concern about a career in the dance industry as unstable and unsecure. This led to many comments on the financial needs and overall resource needs. Several participants discussed a need for personal finance and career guidance. Participants also discussed how there wasn’t enough resources at MR for the scope of work that is performed, and that perhaps focusing on less with more resources would better serve and compensate the MR community. A desire for higher wages was also frequently discussed by staff and dancers alike.

Program Administration and Operations

Various elements of improved program administration and operation were cited as future needs. This code was applied 42 times. These program administration related needs included an improved application process, improved community-led programming, consolidating programs, determining the audience of publications, executive leadership change, improved support from leadership, respecting the work of different staff teams, streamlining workflows, reducing inefficiencies, and restructuring the hiring process.

Integrating and Responding to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Needs

An improved integration of diversity, equity, and inclusion was an important need discussed in the focus groups. This code was applied 40 times. This theme relates to the DEI challenges explained earlier, but focus more on the explicit future needs of the organization and industry. These needs include tackling white supremacy and patriarchal whiteness in the dance industry and at MR, building inclusive environments for immigrant, BIPOC and disabled artists, focusing on creating more disability friendly spaces, adding intentional programming of disabled and BIPOC artists, integrating the disabled with the nondisabled communities, and engaging in more transformational advocacy and systems-level thinking.

Maintaining Virtual/Hybrid Programming

“But to be fully virtual...it seems like not quite right for Movement Research. Since unless it’s thematically for a particular festival and group of artists, if technology is really at the core of what they’re doing or something like that, like I could see that making sense. But as like a programmatic structure, I don’t think it’s like, I don’t think I could see that...I could see there being some like, official piece of the structure of Spring Festival that includes it, but kind of like, we really want you to do virtual offerings and ensure accessibility through that mode.” -Curator

“I would also say in continuing where it makes sense for the folks involved, for there to be streaming options for all in
person events. Or, again, the ones that make sense for that. We've gotten to a place of accessibility, that it would be unfortunate to roll back with a renewed emphasis on in personness.” –Faculty

Given the sudden and transformative shift in programming during the pandemic, there was significant conversation surrounding the role of virtual and/or hybrid programming the future needs of MR. This code was applied 20 times. While some thought virtual programming lacked the rigor and connection that in person did, others praised the flexibility that hybrid models allowed. One person suggested organizing a specific program around virtual attendance and focusing on the technological aspects of what that means for dance rather than transitioning to virtual programs across the board. Others highlighted how it will be important in the future to promote building community and connection in virtual spaces, and how that can even be synergistic to in person spaces. Because of the complexities of different geographies and schedules, maintaining hybrid class options was important for continued flexibility into the future.

**Community Building and Social Events**

The future need of community building and social events was applied as a code 18 times. These conversations included a desire for more social events and collective action/advocacy in order to build community and solidarity, engaging with the broader community more intentionally, and encouraging more collaboration within and outside of MR.

**9. LIMITATIONS**

The scope of this reflection process was limited and presents several areas for further exploration. The sessions were limited in that they all were held in the English language, that they required each individual to have a device and internet service to connect to virtual meetings, and that invited participants were known to MR. We did not gather the perspective of those who have not engaged with MR, and invited participants who did not attend the session did not have an alternative method of sharing their perspective. Our analysis was limited in that we did not segment responses based on the characteristics or demographics of each participant, which may have generated more detailed findings on how different groups experience MR. Lastly, there were many topics covered in each session, so further exploration and learning will be required to more deeply understand MR’s challenges and to guide the actions MR might take to overcome them.
Discussion

Out of the various findings above, there are five key “collective views” that have been gathered from the 80+ participants in the reflection sessions.

First, that MR’s essential work is in providing both a space and community for dance-artists to explore movement-based forms and ideas without an emphasis on product, performance or monetization. Participants shared the value of both the physical and abstract space for learning and working provided by MR, and the growth that has come from community, camaraderie, allyship and collaboration. As it has been for the past 40 years of MR’s history, this is an even more pressing need today in the dance-artist community as New York City’s spaces for the exploration and development of movement-based ideas are shrinking. Systemic issues related to the commodification of the arts, public and private funding structures and the increasing cost of living and lack of social-safety nets tend to preference the sale of “performance” over the development of movement-based ideas. MR is one of the only organizations dedicated to this and it will continue to be a critical and relevant need for the dance-artist community in the years to come.

Second, the community feels very positive on all of MR’s programs, learning opportunities, rehearsal spaces, workshops, and publications. The breadth and quality of MR’s offerings were noted by all, especially from peer organizations. The programs and activities that came up the most include affordable rehearsal space, the opportunity to present works-in-process at Judson Church, learning through MELT, exploring and developing ideas through residencies and publications.

Third, while acknowledging the overall appreciation for MR’s focus on and programs geared towards learning and developing ideas, historically marginalized groups (including immigrant, BIPOC, LGBTQAI+ and disabled community members) need more power, resources and accountability from MR. Thus far, MR’s central efforts include forming advisory groups and increasing representation. For example, MR has created space to explore opportunities to improve their programs and operations with the Artists of Color Council and the Accessibility Advisory Team. MR invested in a full-time staff position to improve accessibility across the organization and a part-time position to coordinate the Artists of Color Council. MR has also made efforts to increase representation and has numerous faculty, artists in residence and others engaged with MR from these communities.

While there have been some improvements made in MR’s programs and operations that were mentioned, particularly as it relates to accessibility, the community members who come from these groups continue to feel left out. These efforts have allowed individuals to find community, build friendships and develop generative relationships. But they do not feel as though they are resourced and empowered agents of change within MR. Often these spaces have the inverse effect of tokenizing groups and their concerns as peripheral to the central operation of MR. There is a feeling of urgency from these communities to move beyond discourse and see the institution of MR evolve and change. MR is not alone; unfortunately, these experiences are pervasive amongst organizations working with dance-artists, and MR is actually seen as a leader in anti-ableist and anti-racist work by some peer organizations. As MR looks to
the future, it will be critical to move beyond “creating space” and towards ceding power and resources to historically marginalized communities from immigrant, disabled, BIPOC, and LGBTQAI+ dance-artists so they can lead adjustments within MR.

Fourth, the work-load and demands on MR contract, part-time and full-time staff exceed what staff feel is feasible and reasonable. For part-time and contract staff, the demands and workload tend to outweigh the compensation-level, at times resulting in an hourly rate that is below New York State’s minimum wage. Most MR part-time and contract staff supplement their wages with additional higher-paying jobs, which they need to prioritize over their work with MR. A theme that emerged from historically marginalized groups, particularly immigrant and BIPOC artists, is that the contract, internship and part-time fee structure preferences individuals who have independent wealth, or the means to work for below a living wage. The compensation structure for contract and part-time roles creates a barrier for marginalized groups to work with MR, which compounds with the aforementioned issue of privileged groups holding more power and resources than others. This is especially true for MR’s internship opportunities.

Many of MR’s full-time staff expressed tremendous burn-out, frustration and sense of hopelessness in the face of mounting pressures, demands, deadlines and community needs. This dynamic is also felt by those in the broader community, and many expressed concern over the well-being of MR staff. As formal and informal representatives of the “institution” full-time staff are often a sounding-board, or at the receiving end, of frustration felt by marginalized MR community members. This dynamic contributes to low morale, especially as MR staff do not have adequate resources and capacity to address or support the MR community’s current and growing needs. The personnel resources are not sufficient to meet the daily demands of operating MR’s existing programs and activities, and are certainly not sufficient to engage in future planning and strategic visioning to lead MR through the transformation that is desired.

Fifth, there is a universal concern about financial resources and funding both at the individual and organizational level. At the individual level, most participants are concerned about how to pursue their creative development while meeting their concrete needs (housing, food, healthcare). The absence of a social safety net (affordable housing, child care, health care, etc.), and the scarcity of funding for creatives often puts dance-artists in the position where they have to choose between their own survival or developing their art. Unfortunately, these challenges are felt more acutely by historically marginalized groups.

Similarly, at the organizational level, there is pressure to generate revenue and raise funds while encouraging new ideas and resisting the commodification of arts and artists. Public and private funding is limited and preferences performance and product, not learning or the exploration and development of ideas. This speaks to systemic and policy issues with how the arts are valued, supported, consumed and how public dollars are prioritized. And, it poses a particular challenge for MR as core to its purpose is not to be a presenting organization, but a laboratory for the development of movement-based ideas.
Recommendations

The reflection sessions signify the completion of an important first step in the work: a phase of learning and discovery. MR’s subsequent phases should involve determining priority areas, goals and making decisions on how to align and strengthen your internal resources and capacity to support this transformation. Presented below are recommended next-steps as well as tangible adjustments proposed from the reflection session participants. For each proposed activity we recommend that MR collaborate with all contract, part-time, full-time and Artists of Council and Accessibility Advisory Team members to determine priorities, goals and areas of focus and adjustment.

1. Identify 3 priority areas for MR to focus on in the next 1-2 years.
   - Review the strengths and challenges presented by participants in the reflection sessions and collaboratively decide on which challenges to address in the short term.
   - Invest significant staff time to implement these strategies, even if it means taking a pause on daily operations.

2. Identify opportunities to cede power, leadership and financial resources to the Artist of Color Council and the Accessibility Advisory Team.
   - Review all past recommendations provided by these groups and co-create a plan to put them into action.
   - Co-develop a process for future adjustments and a process for MR to remain accountable.

3. Increase personnel resources and capacity.
   - Conduct a comprehensive audit of all staff and personnel resources. Develop an inventory of all tasks and responsibilities. Collaborate with existing staff to understand how to make each position more feasible, better resourced and sustainable. Develop a wish-list of new staff positions from this analysis, and identify personnel resources that could be allocated differently.
   - Develop a plan to restructure contract and part-time staff positions into full-time positions.
   - Strengthen internal systems, policies and procedures and invest in a Human Resources position or function.
   - Dedicate personnel resources to development and fundraising with the addition of at least one full-time staff position, so that staff can focus on managing and operating existing programs.
   - Review and find opportunities to improve staff compensation packages, including salaries and benefits (medical, dental, retirement, etc.).
4. Review all existing program commitments, funding partners and revenue streams.

- In collaboration with existing staff, assess all existing programs and services. Identify programs that can be scaled back or phased out.

- Identify opportunities to shift existing funding and resources to help MR align to its goals.

- Appeal to existing funders and individual donors for grants to implement your new priorities.

- Explore avenues for earned revenue (for example: space rentals).

Recommendations from the Reflection Session Participants

Numerous recommendations were mentioned in the reflection sessions, and are presented in Figure 13 below. Ideas cover topics ranging from internal operations, programs and staffing.
**Figure 13: Recommendations Provided by Reflection Session Participants**

| Better/different use of resources | • Creating other income streams for staff  
| | • Focusing on existing programs/staff instead of growth  
| | • Consolidate programs  
| | • Full-time publications staff  
| | • Longer tenure in publications  
| | • More strategic use of space  
| | • Achieve more by doing less  
| | • Stipend for artist support  
| | • Access to free space  
| | • Budget/discretionary spending for staff  
| | • Stop the internship program  
| | • Not hold a Gala  
| | • Improve workflow/timelines  
| | • Create policies, procedures, employee handbook, etc.  
| New collective/shared spaces | • Archive library/online archive/shared collective space  
| | • Create a communication network  
| Community involvement | • Engagement in the community where MR works in  
| | • Collaboration with other community organizations  
| Networking/mentoring/career development opportunities | • More opportunities to share dialogue around dance and identity  
| | • Professional development for staff  
| | • Sharing professional part of dance (how to make a living)  
| | • Mentorship  
| Organizational training and reflection | • Annual/more frequent organizational reflection  
| | • Anti-racist and implicit bias training for teachers and staff  
| | • Anti-ableist training for teachers and staff  
| | • Preparation for Inclusive Teaching  
| Social justice involvement | • Engage in advocacy and systems-change  
| | • Dedicate time to focus on social justice work only  
| Other | • Create an artist pipeline around specific communities  
| | • Not give away rights to images in contracts  
| | • Provide tours of MR space for prospective school to see work |
Conclusion

Since its founding, Movement Research has been at the forefront of supporting and encouraging dance-artists in developing original and new movement-based ideas, expression, and forms. MR is poised to build on their unique role but with a renewed focus and purpose to center a community of dance-artists that have been historically marginalized. In its commitment to partner with impacted communities and transform its practices to center immigrant, disabled, BIPOC, and LGBTQAI+ dance-artists, MR has the potential to develop a new way for arts-organizations to align to their values, be accountable to community and nurture the well-being and creative development of staff and participants.
Appendix 1: Questions discussed in the Reflection Sessions

- Are there areas of virtual and/or in-person programming that could be improved or eliminated?
- What gaps in the dance-artist community exist that MR can help fill?
- How well is MR’s current staff and structure supportive of artists and the community?
- How can MR better support you?
- How can MR better connect with its community? What communities do not seem to be accessing MR and its programs?
- Do you feel that MR is welcoming and supportive to immigrant, BIPOC, LGTQAI+, and/or disabled artists? How should MR better support staff from these communities?
- How can MR address structural racism within the organization? How can MR engage in antiracist work?
- Is MR and its programs and resources accessible to different communities? Does MR seem accessible to you? Do its programs seem available to you?
- What communities do not seem to be accessing programs at MR?
- What challenges and needs exist for the dance-artist community? How can MR support artists with these challenges and needs?
- How has COVID shifted the dance-artist community’s practice? What can MR do to respond to this shift?
- In terms of programs, support and ideas: what is MR providing that you feel is essential? What is MR’s essential work?
- What is MR known for in the arts community?
- What challenges and needs exist for the dance-artist community?
- What will be the future needs of dance-artists? How can MR align to this future?
- What would you like MR to do in support of artists that it isn’t currently doing?
### Appendix 2: Description of Parent Themes for Focus Group Coding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential work</td>
<td>A description of the essential work of MR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Recommendations for improving MR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEI need met</td>
<td>Need of stakeholders/community that were/are met by MR related to disability, sexual orientation, race, ethnicity, and language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEI unmet need</td>
<td>Need of stakeholders/community that were/are not met by MR related to disability, sexuality, gender identity, race, ethnicity, and language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need met</td>
<td>Tangible or concrete needs of stakeholders/community that were/are met by MR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet need</td>
<td>Tangible or concrete needs of stakeholders/community that were/are not met by MR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future need</td>
<td>An anticipated future need for MR and the greater dance community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic positive</td>
<td>A positive experience directly related to what the program has chosen to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic negative</td>
<td>A negative experience directly related to what the program has chosen to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported in</td>
<td>Ways in which stakeholders feel supported through their connection to MR (i.e. organizational culture, nurturing of creativity, artistic voice, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not supported in</td>
<td>Ways in which stakeholders do not feel supported through their connection to MR (i.e. organizational culture, nurturing of creativity, artistic voice, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>External challenges and macro challenges to MR and the dance community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVID challenges</td>
<td>Challenges to MR and the dance community posed by COVID.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>