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Policy Forum

Racial Segregation in Metropolitan Chicago Housing

By Tyrone Forman and Maria Krysan

The United States is experiencing rapid demographic changes that are altering its racial and ethnic landscape, particularly in urban centers. According to the 2000 census, 56 percent of residents of the 100 largest U.S. cities are nonwhite. Moreover, there is diversity in the composition of this nonwhite population. For instance, Chicago, historically a black and white city, is now 36 percent black, 31 percent white, and 28 percent Latino, with the remaining 5 percent mainly being Asian. Growing racial and ethnic diversity has not always meant increasing racial integration in the nation’s major metropolitan areas. The Chicago metro area ranks as the fifth, sixth, and ninth most residentially segregated metropolitan area in the United States for blacks, Latinos, and Asians, respectively. Residentially segregated neighborhoods in our urban centers like Chicago remain among the most salient reminders of our nation’s history of racial injustice.

Extreme housing segregation is connected to persistent racial discrepancies in quality of health care, education, jobs, and other public and private sector services. Studies investigating the effects of residential segregation for young African Americans have concluded that the elimination of residential segregation would lead to the disappearance of black-white differences in earnings, high school graduation rates, and unemployment.

Why does residential segregation in Chicago persist 40 years after the passage of the Fair Housing Act of 1968? Effective policies to counteract segregation require a clear understanding of why it persists. We address this question using survey data collected in Cook County in 2005 and the 2000 Census.

Measuring Segregation in Chicago

Residential segregation is the degree of physical separation between groups (e.g. racial and ethnic) in terms of where they live. One popular measure is the dissimilarity index, which gauges how evenly or unevenly different groups in a metropolitan area are dispersed across neighborhoods. A value of 100 indicates total segregation of two groups, as when, for instance, all neighborhoods are either 100 percent Latino or 100 percent white. A value of zero (complete integration) means every neighborhood has the same percentage of whites and Latinos as there are in the metropolitan area. The City of Chicago would score zero on the Latino dissimilarity index if every neighborhood were 28 percent Latino. Values above 60 indicate a very high level of segregation, values between 30 and 59 indicate moderate segregation, and values of less
than 30 indicate low segregation. In the City of Chicago, black-white separation has been high for decades, with the dissimilarity index peaking at 92 in 1970 and remaining as high as 81 in 2000. Values for Latinos and Asians are lower, but still moderately high, roughly 60 and 45, respectively, in recent decades.

**Explanations for Racial/Ethnic Residential Segregation**

The three most common explanations for racial residential segregation are: 1) in-group preferences; 2) economic status; and 3) discrimination.

Residential segregation could persist because most members of most racial and ethnic groups feel more comfortable living with their own kind. One elaboration on this theory posits that white reluctance to live with blacks is rooted, not in racial antipathy, but in fear of economic liability, as whites associate integrated neighborhoods with higher crime and diminished property values. The research evidence on this point is inconclusive. A second elaboration posits that black segregation comes from a strong and unchanging African American preference for densely black neighborhoods. However, no studies have found many blacks preferring totally black neighborhoods; more typical is a preference for 50 percent black/50 percent white neighborhoods.

A second possible explanation for residential segregation is economic. Racial/ethnic minorities might not live near whites, generally, because they have fewer financial resources and thus cannot afford to live in the same areas. Are the high levels of residential segregation in Chicago income-based? For blacks, no; for others, yes, in part. According to Figure 1, black-white dissimilarity indices within income groups in the Chicago metropolitan area barely change as income rises: the most affluent blacks are nearly as segregated as their poorest counterparts. In contrast, dissimilarity indices for Latinos and Asians fall by about one-third when comparing those with higher incomes to those with lower.

A third explanation for racial segregation is persistent discrimination against racial/ethnic minorities within the housing market. Even as explicitly racial covenants have vanished, it could be that subtle steering and marketing practices take their place. Social scientists typically measure differences in the treatment of white, black, and Latino home seekers by means of a housing audit. White-black or white-Latino auditors are matched on social background characteristics, and then sent to randomly selected landlords/real estate agents to rent

---

**Figure 1. Average Segregation Levels of Blacks, Latinos, and Asians from Non-Latino Whites by Income, Chicago Metropolitan Area, 2000**
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an apartment or purchase a home. The best available nationwide housing audit data indicate that minorities encounter unlawful discrimination approximately one out of every five times they inquire about renting or purchasing a home.\(^5\)

**Data and Findings**

The survey data reported here were collected by the University of Illinois at Chicago’s Survey Research Laboratory (SRL) between August 2004 and August 2005. SRL conducted face-to-face interviews with 789 randomly selected black, Latino, and white Cook County householders aged 21 and older. The interviews were conducted in English or Spanish depending on respondent preference.

We know from audit studies that housing discrimination remains a problem nationally. However, while audit studies measure subtle aspects of housing discrimination that might not otherwise be revealed, they fail to measure a range of other aspects of housing bias. In our survey, we asked if, based on their race or ethnicity, respondents felt that they had experienced a landlord/real estate agent not renting or selling to them, racial steering, bias in the mortgage industry, or neighbors who made life difficult for them. Figure 2 shows that four in 10 blacks (41 percent), one-third of Latinos (32 percent), and just one in five (18 percent) whites report experiencing at least one form of housing discrimination based on their race/ethnicity. We also asked our respondents if they were aware of a friend or relative who had experienced at least one of these forms of housing discrimination. The results closely matched the first-hand reports: almost half of African Americans (44 percent), approximately one-third of Latinos (30 percent), and a little more than one in 10 whites (13 percent) responded affirmatively. In short, racial/ethnic discrimination in housing appears to be an ongoing reality in the lives of African American and Latino Chicagoans.

We now turn to neighborhood preferences. What are the preferences of Chicagoans? To answer this question we asked Cook County residents to imagine their ideal neighborhood (where they would feel most comfortable) and describe the racial and ethnic mix of it. In general, it appears that Chicago blacks, Latinos, and whites report a similar commitment to living in racially and ethnically diverse neighborhoods. First, all three groups choose a racial/ethnic mix that includes a substantial proportion of other racial/ethnic groups. For example, whites put equal numbers of blacks (13 percent), Latinos (12 percent), and Asians (12 percent) in their ideal neighborhood. Second, blacks, Latinos, and whites in Cook County want their own group to be largest in their ideal neighborhood. Yet, whites are the only group that prefers that their racial group be in the majority (56 percent).

Although these data about “ideal neighborhoods” shed light on the environs people say they prefer, we know very little about how these preferences play out in the real world. The data just reported are based on a hypothetical neighborhood, and in many cases the neighborhoods people describe are simply not available in the metropolitan area. So, what happens if we ask about real-life communities? We can learn about neighborhood preferences by examining the racial composition of the communities in which Cook County residents have actually searched for housing.

We showed our survey respondents a map that identified 41 communities in the Chicago metropolitan area that differed in important ways with respect to racial composition, social class characteristics, and geographical location. Blacks, Latinos, and whites were asked, among other things, whether they had searched for housing in any of these communities in the past 10 years. We sought to

---

**Figure 2. Percentages of Respondents Reporting Housing Discrimination, by Race**
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answer the question, “What are the racial/ethnic characteristics of the communities in which white, black, and Latino Cook County residents have actually searched for a place to live?”

Figure 3 classifies the communities named by respondents according to whether they have majorities of the respondent’s own race, some other race, are a mix of those two types, or were not among the communities on our map. A number of important contrasts emerge. First, 45 percent of whites have searched only in communities where whites are in the majority (that is, constitute more than 50 percent of the population); and just 4 percent have searched where any other group is in the majority. Second, approximately one in four whites have looked in both neighborhoods where they are the majority and where they are the minority. (The remaining one-fourth of white respondents have either not searched for housing in the last 10 years, or have searched in communities that were not identified on our map, whose racial composition we do not know.) For blacks and Latinos in Cook County, house hunting is a very different experience. Just 8 percent of blacks have looked only in majority (more than 50 percent) black communities. Moreover, one in five blacks has searched exclusively in communities where blacks are in the minority. Mostly, then, blacks have searched in both kinds of communities—those where they are in the majority and those where they are in the minority. Indeed, 81 percent of blacks included in their search locations a community where they are in the minority. These results severely challenge the view that blacks prefer to self-segregate in majority-black neighborhoods.

Latinos show a similar pattern. Fully 35 percent of Latinos searched only in communities where another group was in the majority. An additional 37 percent of Latinos searched in both communities where they were in the majority and ones in which they were in the minority.

Conclusion and Policy Implications

Our analysis reveals several things. First, money is not the powerful explanation that conventional wisdom might suggest. Although segregation levels are reduced for Asians and Latinos with greater financial means, the same is not true for African Americans.

Second, our results demonstrate the complexity of the preference explanation. While Cook County residents of all three racial/ethnic groups included in the study profess an interest in diverse neighborhoods in principle, when we examine the expression of those preferences in the form of actual search locations, we discover far less evidence of a commitment to diversity on the part of whites. African Americans and Latinos seek out many different community types, even though, given patterns of segregation, we know they end up in communities that are highly segregated (especially blacks). This disjunction between blacks’ and Latinos’ preferences and their actual neighborhoods probably originates, at least in part, in barriers presented by discriminatory treatment, in the form of exclusion, steering, and unfriendliness.

Third, our analysis indicates that 42 years after the most ambitious effort to end housing discrimination in Chicago (i.e., the Chicago Freedom Movement led by Martin Luther King Jr. and Al Raby), African Americans and Latinos in Cook County continue to report substantial levels of unfair—and illegal—treatment in the housing industry.

What are the policy implications of these findings? First, our survey data reveal a need for increased federal and state resources for the vigorous enforcement of anti-discrimination laws in housing (i.e., Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968).
Discrimination still occurs, and enforcement is necessary.

Second, given the limited financial capacity of blacks and Latinos as compared to whites (in Chicago in 2000, median household incomes for blacks, Latinos, and whites were $29,000, $37,000, and $49,000, respectively), we need land-use policies which reverse decades of exclusionary zoning laws that set minimum floor space and lot size requirements and maximum density limitations. While usually appearing racially neutral, these policies often restrict suburban housing opportunities for racial and ethnic minorities by limiting affordable housing in these areas. Illinois has adopted inclusive legislation (e.g., 2003 Affordable Housing Planning and Appeal Act), but more is needed. One example is Montgomery County, Maryland’s ordinance requiring that in developments of 50 or more units, 15 percent of the units must be affordable to households below 65 percent of the median income. A policy prescribing mandatory set-asides in communities lacking affordable housing may lead to more racially/ethnically and economically diverse communities.

Third, altering preferences that work against integration is a far more complicated policy goal. However, according to our data, members of all three racial/ethnic groups report, in the abstract, a desire for greater levels of integration than presently exist. The challenge is to create situations where those abstract preferences can be translated into behavior. The affirmative marketing component of fair housing legislation is consistent with this need. Affirmative marketing refers to the active promotion of racially diverse, majority black, and majority Latino neighborhoods to whites and the encouraging of Asians, blacks, and Latinos to consider moving into majority-white neighborhoods. Organizations and entities that make individuals of all races and ethnicities aware of housing opportunities that are pro-integrative, and that help break down the barriers to integrated housing decisions, should be promoted and funded aggressively. In sum, dismantling the rigid housing color line that exists in Chicago will take concerted effort by residents, real estate agents, developers, community leaders, and legislators.

The Institute of Government and Public Affairs seeks to improve public policy and government performance by producing and distributing cutting-edge research and analysis of public policy issues and providing public engagement that enlightens and educates elected officials, students and the general public. The institute was created in 1947 by resolution of the Illinois General Assembly.

IGPA is distinct among premier policy research units because of its dedication to public service. Its work not only advances knowledge but also provides practical assistance to government and public policy makers. The faculty and professionals at IGPA are dedicated to responding rapidly to the challenges facing society and assisting government to meet those challenges. They are also out front with innovative research, cutting-edge education, pragmatic training, and informed consultation. IGPA faculty hold joint appointments with departments such as political science, economics and sociology.

IGPA forges partnerships with civic organizations and state associations, such as the Jane Addams Hull House Association and the Illinois Municipal League, to open policy discussion to a broader audience beyond government and academia.

IGPA focuses on critical issues in governance, health policy, public finance, race and public policy and social policy.
Racial Blind Spots
A Barrier to Integrated Communities in Chicago

Maria Krysan
Institute of Government and Public Affairs
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**The Problem**

The Chicago metropolitan area is and has long been among the most racially segregated cities in America (Mumford Center 2001). While historically a “black-white” metropolis, as with many U.S. cities, the area has seen a great increase in racial/ethnic diversity in recent decades. As of the 2000 Census, the six collar counties comprising the Chicago metropolitan area were approximately 17 percent Latino, 57 percent non-Latino white, and 19 percent non-Latino black (U.S. Census 2000).

Despite this diversity, it is still the case that blacks are particularly residentially segregated from whites, though Latino-white and Asian-white segregation levels are also quite high. For example, according to the Lewis Mumford Center (2001), in 2000, one of the most common indicators of the level of racial residential segregation (the dissimilarity index) ranked Chicago as the fifth most segregated in terms of black-white segregation (index of dissimilarity of 81), and the third most segregated in terms of black-Latino segregation (index of dissimilarity of 77). White-Latino segregation is lower—both relatively and absolutely—ranking 11th in the country (with an index of dissimilarity of 62).

Regardless of the Fair Housing Act of 1968, which banned discrimination on the basis of race/ethnicity in the sale and rental of housing, now 40 years later, patterns of housing segregation in the Chicago metropolitan area have changed little. Despite being illegal, discrimination in housing persists, albeit somewhat less frequently and often in more subtle ways than in the past (e.g., Turner et al, 2002).

But discrimination is just one of the barriers to housing integration. In this report, we draw attention to another: racial “blind spots” in community knowledge. In particular, we explore whether there are substantial racial/ethnic differences in the communities that people know about, and, further, whether the racial/ethnic composition of a community importantly shapes whether a person knows about a community. If community knowledge is patterned in this way, these “blind spots” may be a mechanism through which housing segregation is perpetuated. That is, knowledge of a community is most surely a precursor to a successful move to a particular community. To take one example, if racially integrated communities are only well-known among a certain racial/ethnic group, then its prospects for maintaining that integration are uncertain.

Residential segregation is either perpetuated or diminished through the aggregation of many individual-level decisions about where to move. Based on a considerable amount of research, we know quite a lot about what kind of places people say they would like to live, vis-à-vis racial composition (Farley et al. 1994; Charles 2006). Based on these data, it has been argued that whites and African Americans hold incompatible preferences about the racial composition of the neighborhoods they would like to live in: whites want relatively few African Americans in their neighborhood while African Americans prefer a more even mix of whites and blacks.

However, it is also the case that the kinds of neighborhoods in which whites and blacks say they would be willing to live generally are more integrated than the neighborhoods and communities in which they actually reside. This disjunction is likely due to a variety of reasons including a range of discriminatory treatments, as well as the possibility that whites, in particular, overstate their interest in integration when asked in opinion surveys.

This report centers on an additional reason—people of different races and ethnicities have different knowledge—or “blind spots”—about communities and so lack the tools necessary to ultimately make moves that fit these preferences.

**The Data**

In 2004-2005, the Survey Research Laboratory at the University of Illinois at Chicago conducted the Chicago Area Study, a scientific survey of 789 randomly selected adults 21 years and older living in households in Cook County, Illinois (Krysan, et al. 2005). The pool of respondents was about equally divided among whites, African Americans, and Latinos. The Chicago Area Study was an in-person survey that lasted about an hour, and included questions about neighborhood characteristics, housing experiences, and a variety of attitudes.

To measure individuals’ levels of familiarity with various kinds of communities, the survey respondents were given a map identifying 41 communities throughout the Chicago metropolitan area (see Figure 1). The communities included both suburbs and neighborhoods within Chicago. They were asked to identify any of the communities or neighborhoods that they “don’t know anything about”. The communities were selected so that they included a variety of communities—those in the city and outside; those with expensive housing and those with more modest home prices; those that are racially segregated and those that are integrated.

**Do blacks, whites, and Latinos have different community “blind spots”?**

Because we are interested in barriers to integration, our focus throughout this report is on the absence rather than the presence of knowledge. That is, we are interested in whether community “blind spots” are the
same or different depending on the racial/ethnic background of the survey respondent. Our first picture of this comes from asking the question: Which communities did at least one-third of survey respondents say they “know nothing about”? And, in particular, does this differ depending on the race/ethnicity of the respondent?

Table 1 shows the list of communities that 33 percent or more of the survey respondents within a particular racial/ethnic group said they “didn’t know anything about.” The first clear message is that Latinos have more than twice as many communities as whites and blacks that meet this criterion. Despite the greater number of communities on the Latino list as compared to the white list, however, it is also the case that whites and Latinos have more of the same “blind spots” compared to whites and African Americans.

In particular, there are 10 communities that at least one-third of whites and one-third of Latinos similarly “know nothing about” (shown in bold on the table). In contrast, there are just three communities that more than one-third of whites and more than one-third of African Americans (and one-third of Latinos) “know nothing about.” It is striking that none of the communities appear only on the black and white lists. Thus, the “racial blind spots” of whites and blacks are only minimally overlapping; and while Latinos have more “blind spots” than whites, the communities that appear among those “blind spots,” are quite similar for Latinos and whites in Chicago.

Generally, the communities that are unknown by more than one-third of whites are those that have some or a substantial African American population. These range from all-black neighborhoods like Bronzeville and South Shore to racially mixed neighborhoods like Beverly, Homewood/Flossmoor, and Matteson. It is noteworthy then, that the “blind spots” for whites include several communities that are racially integrated—some of which are majority white (Beverly and Homewood/Flossmoor).

The pattern for African Americans is different. Their list of relatively unknown communities includes all-white and geographically distant communities like Libertyville and Crystal Lake as well as a handful of racially and ethnically diverse Chicago neighborhoods (Uptown, Albany Park, and Logan Square).

More than one-half of the 41 communities were “unknown” by one-third or more of the Latino respondents. It is difficult to summarize the “community type” because it includes communities that are segregated (Arlington Heights, Bronzeville) and integrated (Bridgeport, Uptown); that are in the city (Hyde Park, Ashburn) and far away (Libertyville, Aurora). The only kind of community that is not a “blind spot” for Latinos are those where there is a substantial Latino population—places like Humboldt Park, Cicero, and Pilsen/Little Village.

**DO BLACKS, WHITES, AND LATINOS OF THE SAME SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC BACKGROUNDS STILL HAVE DIFFERENT RACIAL “BLIND SPOTS”?**

Because housing is segregated by income as well as by race/ethnicity, some racial/ethnic differences in community knowledge may be due to differences in social and economic background and other factors, such as the length of time in the metropolitan area. Our next analysis takes into account these differences, and asks a slightly different question from the previous one: to what extent does the lack of knowledge about any given community differ for whites, blacks, and Latinos, above and beyond any differences in background? Table 2 summarizes the results of a series of analyses that control for background differences and tests whether white, black and Latino knowledge differences are eliminated or whether they persist even after these controls are included. Our discussion of the results begins with white-black comparisons, then moves to white-Latino, and finally black-Latino comparisons.

**1.) HOW DO LEVELS OF COMMUNITY KNOWLEDGE COMPARE FOR WHITES AND AFRICAN AMERICANS?**

Column 2 in Table 2 summarizes the comparison of white and black community knowledge for the 41 communities and shows that there are 20
TABLE 1
Communities where 33 percent or more of a particular racial/ethnic group don’t know anything about a community (CAS 2004).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whites</th>
<th>African Americans</th>
<th>Latinos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Chicago (39%)</td>
<td>North Chicago (41%)</td>
<td>North Chicago (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwood Park (39%)</td>
<td>Norwood Park (54%)</td>
<td>Norwood Park (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Chicago (44%)</td>
<td>West Chicago (43%)</td>
<td>West Chicago (54%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashburn (65%)</td>
<td>Ashburn (69%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly (43%)</td>
<td>Beverly (50%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronzeville (55%)</td>
<td>Bronzeville (46%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Club Hills (43%)</td>
<td>Country Club Hills (63%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey (42%)</td>
<td>Harvey (56%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homewood/Flossmoor (38%)</td>
<td>Homewood/Flossmoor (63%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matteson (49%)</td>
<td>Matteson (68%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Park (56%)</td>
<td>Morgan Park (60%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympia Field (45%)</td>
<td>Olympia Fields (71%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shore (48%)</td>
<td>South Shore (45%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Heights (37%)</td>
<td>Arlington Heights (42%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Lake (54%)</td>
<td>Crystal Lake (60%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downer’s Grove (34%)</td>
<td>Downer’s Grove (47%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libertyville (55%)</td>
<td>Libertyville (64%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uptown (33%)</td>
<td>Uptown (37%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukegan (46%)</td>
<td>Waukegan (49%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilsen/Little Village (35%)</td>
<td>Albany Park (43%)</td>
<td>Aurora (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin (42%)</td>
<td>Bolingbrook (46%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenview (40%)</td>
<td>Bridgeport (37%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan Square (35%)</td>
<td>Hyde Park (46%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lakeview (33%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Naperville (44%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oak Lawn (38%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skokie (37%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schaumburg (37%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=14   n=13   n=28

Codes:
On both black and Latino lists.
On black, white and Latino lists
On white and Latino lists
On one racial/ethnic group only
Note: There are no communities that overlap white and black only.
The percentages in parentheses after each community are the percentage of each group who said they “didn’t know anything about” the community.
communities where whites and blacks have the same level of knowledge (identified by the “=” sign). These include two of the six “all white” communities, all of the “mostly white” communities, and many of the racially mixed communities that include significant percentages of Latinos. In short, some of the relative racial “blind spots” for African Americans have disappeared once taking into account background characteristics: all-white Downer’s Grove and Norwood Park are equally (un)known among whites and blacks of similar social and economic backgrounds.

Of the remaining 21 communities where whites and blacks had different knowledge levels, whites have more relative “blind spots” than blacks (indicated in the column as “W > B” for whites “don’t know” at higher levels than blacks). White’s “blind spots” included many racially mixed communities from mixed but majority white communities of Beverly, Homewood/Flossmoor, and the Loop to mixed but majority black communities like Matteson, Olympia Fields, and Morgan Park. “Blind spots” also include all of the communities that are “all black” and two of the three “mostly black” communities. Indeed, just four of the 21 communities that had racial differences are ones where blacks have less knowledge than whites (indicated by “B=W” on Table 2): Waukegan, Libertyville, Crystal Lake, and Arlington Heights. Three of these four relative “blind spots” are all-white suburban communities, and the fourth is a racially mixed community in the far north (Waukegan).

In summary, the results in Column 2 of Table 2 show that patterns of community knowledge are certainly shaped by race: whites are far less likely than blacks to be familiar with communities that are racially diverse or predominately African American. Additionally, blacks are less familiar than whites with communities that are both distant from the city and predominately white.

2.) How do levels of community knowledge differ for whites and Latinos?

Twenty-two of the 41 communities show similar knowledge levels between whites and Latinos. Of the remaining 19 communities (where Latinos and whites differed in their level of knowledge), the vast majority (14) are communities where whites are less knowledgeable than Latinos (indicated by a “W>L” in Column 3). These communities are about divided between those communities comprised of about one-third Latino residents and those with substantial black populations. Thus, Latinos know more than whites about communities where their own group lives (e.g., Pilsen/Little Village, Melrose Park); but Latinos are also more likely than whites to know about areas with substantial black populations like Austin, Bronzeville, South Shore, Maywood, Morgan Park, and Beverly. The five communities that whites are more knowledgeable about than Latinos—once controlling for respondent background characteristics—are all/mostly white Arlington Heights, Crystal Lake, Libertyville, and Schaumburg, and racially mixed Waukegan.

3.) How do levels of community knowledge differ for Latinos and African Americans?

Twenty-five of the 41 communities are equally unknown by Chicago area Latinos and African Americans. This includes a wide range of communities with different racial compositions—from all white to racially mixed. Of the remaining 16 communities, there are a few more that Latinos are less likely to be familiar with (the 10 that are indicated with a “L>B” in Column 4 of Table 2) than that African Americans are less likely to be familiar with (the six that are indicated with a “B>L” in Column 4 of Table 2). However, there is a clear racial pattern. Most of the communities that Latinos are less familiar with are those with more than a handful (though not necessarily a majority) of African Americans. For their part, all of the communities that African Americans are less familiar with are communities where almost one-half or more of the residents are Latino—places like Cicero, Berwyn, Pilsen/Little Village, Melrose Park, Humboldt Park, and Logan Square.

Conclusions and Implications

Knowledge of a community likely has an important impact on where people end up living. If one does not know anything about a community, one is probably unlikely to search there; or at the very least, the costs associated with acquiring information about “unknown” communities is much higher than “known” communities. Those who consult with real estate agents in the process of a search may be introduced to communities they never considered. But it is likely that many people approach an agent with a particular geography already in mind.

Moreover, in another question in our survey, we learned that there is substantial racial matching between client and agent: the great majority of whites, blacks, and Latinos are assisted by a real estate agent of their same racial/ethnic background. Thus, although agents’ “blind spots” are likely to be fewer than those of their clients, this race-matching of agent and client may further aggravate the barrier of community knowledge, or at the least it minimizes the improvements that a real estate agent might offer.

What do our maps tell us about the racial features of community knowledge? First, many of Afri-
### Table 2

Racial/ethnic differences in lack of community knowledge, by community racial composition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Type</th>
<th>Black v. White</th>
<th>Latino v. White</th>
<th>Black v. Latino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All White</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Heights</td>
<td>B&gt;W</td>
<td>L&gt;W</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Lake</td>
<td>B&gt;W</td>
<td>L&gt;W</td>
<td>L&gt;B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downers Grove</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libertyville</td>
<td>B&gt;W</td>
<td>L&gt;W</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwood Park</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Lawn</td>
<td>W&gt;B</td>
<td>W&gt;L</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mostly White</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenview</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake View</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naperville</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaumburg</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>L&gt;W</td>
<td>L&gt;B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Black</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>W&gt;B</td>
<td>W&gt;L</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronzeville</td>
<td>W&gt;B</td>
<td>W&gt;L</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shore</td>
<td>W&gt;B</td>
<td>W&gt;L</td>
<td>L&gt;B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mostly Black</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Club Hills</td>
<td>W&gt;B</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>L&gt;B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey</td>
<td>W&gt;B</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>L&gt;B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maywood</td>
<td>W&gt;B</td>
<td>W&gt;L</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Hispanic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilsen/Little Village</td>
<td>W&gt;B</td>
<td>W&gt;L</td>
<td>B&gt;L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mostly Hispanic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicero</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>W&gt;L</td>
<td>B&gt;L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed B-W White Majority</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>W&gt;B</td>
<td>W&gt;L</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homewood/Flossmoor</td>
<td>W&gt;B</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>L&gt;B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loop</td>
<td>W&gt;B</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Park</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed B-W Black Majority</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matteson</td>
<td>W&gt;B</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>L&gt;B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympia Fields</td>
<td>W&gt;B</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>L&gt;B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Park</td>
<td>W&gt;B</td>
<td>W&gt;L</td>
<td>L&gt;B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed H-W White Majority</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berwyn</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>B&gt;L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed H-W Hispanic Majority</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melrose Park</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>W&gt;L</td>
<td>B&gt;L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed A-W White Majority</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skokie</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed Two Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt Park</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>W&gt;L</td>
<td>B&gt;L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan Square</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>W&gt;L</td>
<td>B&gt;L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Chicago</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed Three Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Park</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashburn</td>
<td>W&gt;B</td>
<td>W&gt;L</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolingbrook</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeport</td>
<td>W&gt;B</td>
<td>W&gt;L</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park</td>
<td>W&gt;B</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>L&gt;B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Chicago</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uptown</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukegan</td>
<td>B&gt;W</td>
<td>L&gt;W</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

“=” means no statistically significant difference between the two groups; B>W means blacks “don’t know” more, etc.

Results based on logistic regression models controlling for education, income, age, gender, presence of children under 18 years in the household, whether currently married, number of years living in the Chicago metropolitan area, and if the respondent was born in the U.S.
can Americans’ (relative to whites) “blind spots” can be explained away by social class characteristics. Once we compare whites and blacks with equivalent social and economic characteristics, it is the distant and all-white suburbs that are more unknown among African Americans. Whites, for their part, are largely unaware of heavily African American communities. But importantly, they are also less likely than African Americans to know about some of the black-white integrated communities. Of the mixed black-white communities included in this study, only Oak Park is equally well-known among blacks and whites. Interestingly, Latino-white integrated communities are equally “unknown” among blacks and whites.

Latinos, again once controlling for background characteristics, are quite knowledgeable about a wide range of communities; more so than whites and blacks. The patterns are predictable: compared to blacks, they know more about the heavily Latino communities but less about heavily African American communities. Compared to whites, they are more knowledgeable about heavily African American communities and in just a few cases less knowledgeable about all white communities.

Taken together, we see that each racial/ethnic group’s knowledge of communities is, perhaps not surprisingly, generally greater about communities in which their group has a presence than about communities where few of their co-ethnics live. But in comparison with Latinos and African Americans, whites are much more unaware of integrated black-white and Latino-white communities. African Americans (compared to whites of similar social class characteristics) are quite knowledgeable about a range of communities, but to the degree that African Americans have “blind spots,” it is for all-white suburban communities. Without such background controls, it is clear (from Table 1) that community knowledge is racialized for blacks, whites, and Latinos.

Based on community awareness alone, segregation will be perpetuated if racial/ethnic groups are only knowledgeable about communities in which their racial/ethnic group predominates. Our results suggest that this is largely the case for whites, but less so for blacks and Latinos. Since whites also make up a majority of the region’s population, their lack of knowledge could disproportionately perpetuate segregation. Communities that are already integrated, in order to maintain that integration, will require continued movement into them by members of all racial/ethnic groups. Our results suggest that some such places—like Homewood/Flossmoor and Beverly—constitute a racial “blind spot” among whites. Efforts should be made to overcome this, to ensure that all racial groups are aware of all the options available to them.

Among African Americans, the challenge is slightly different. Particularly once controlling for background characteristics, African Americans are, if anything, more knowledgeable (than whites especially) about a wide range of communities. The questions then become: Why aren’t African Americans moving to some of these places? What are the further barriers to integration in these neighborhoods?

One possibility is that African Americans’ knowledge about these communities is negative. That is, perhaps these communities are perceived by African Americans as heavily white, and hostile to African Americans. In this case, working to dispel the stereotypes—or realities—of these communities as unwelcoming of African Americans is necessary.

Finally, among Latinos, we see the interesting pattern that once controls are included—especially for the length of time living in the metropolitan area—Latinos are quite knowledgeable about a wide range of communities. However, without these statistical controls (in Table 1), the message is quite clear: Latinos, many of whom are newcomers to the Chicago metropolitan area—are unaware of a great many different communities—at levels far higher than whites or African Americans.

The Fair Housing Act of 1968 prohibits racial/ethnic discrimination in the rental and sale of housing and enforcing this is an important goal of this act. But a perhaps less well-known feature of the Fair Housing Act—one that was reinforced by President Clinton’s Executive Order 12892—is that HUD is compelled to “affirmatively further” the goals of equal/fair housing. That is, in addition to its responsibilities to ensure that housing discrimination does not occur, it is also obligated to create programs that help to break down other barriers to racial residential integration.

At a most basic level, racial integration requires that individuals of different racial and ethnic backgrounds move to similar places. But if there are substantial racial “blind spots” about the options in one’s metropolitan areas, then affirmative moves by all races and ethnicities are less likely. Getting people of all races/ethnicities to consider—and ultimately make—moves that further the goal of racial integration in housing is an important component of fair housing policy and legislation. Our results suggest that this kind of affirmative marketing—educating residents about the variety of housing options available—is a critical first step in this process: there are substantial racial “blind spots” in community knowledge which must be overcome.

Affirmative marketing policies and programs that attempt to make individuals aware of the broad
range of possible communities in which they might live—that is, to shed light on these “blind spots”—are a fruitful direction for policymakers and community leaders. Such programs are less intrusive than other forms of racial integration policies that have recently come under constitutional review and political attack. Many fair housing organizations rightfully focus on enforcement of fair housing laws, and researchers and government agencies necessarily conduct studies to gauge the extent of discrimination. Given the continued evidence that fair housing laws are violated, these efforts are critical. But this research highlights that affirmative marketing programs are an important complement.

In the Chicago region, the Oak Park Regional Housing Center (http://www.apartmentsoakpark.org/) has been working on this problem for decades. It works to make apartment seekers aware of housing options that break down their racial “blind spots” by providing a free apartment referral service that encourages affirmative moves. That whites, blacks, and Latinos are all equally likely to be knowledgeable of Oak Park is one measure of their success. To break down the racial “blind-spots” of the entire region, though, a regional solution is necessary.

A new non-profit based in the Chicago area, MoveSmart.org (www.movesmart.org), is another example of an innovative program seeking to break down community “blind spots.” In this case, the organization is working to create an online, interactive affirmative marketing resource. Given the increasing use of the Internet in housing searches (in our 2004 survey we found that 38 percent of people who had searched for housing in the last 10 years had used the Internet; a number that has and will surely continue to increase), this is a potentially powerful tool for reducing racial “blind spots” in the metropolitan area. The resource seeks to provide homeseekers with a single website that provides an array of neighborhood information that is currently available in sometimes difficult-to-reach and disparate locations on the Internet. It will contain information about neighborhood amenities, quality of life indicators, affordable housing opportunities, services, programs and community-based organizations. It will also include guides, tools, calculators, worksheets, and an innovative social network tool to facilitate connections between new neighbors and with various community organizations.

These and other programs that seek to increase awareness across all racial/ethnic groups about the kinds of communities that are in their “blind spots” are called for and resources targeted at this problem would be a fruitful step towards breaking down the persistent pattern of racial residential segregation.
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INTRODUCTION

This guidebook provides a visual snapshot of the ways in which municipalities can affirmatively further fair housing for residents. The tools contained within this document range from basic strategic planning concepts to required documents which address a community’s vulnerabilities and impediments associated to fair housing.

The guidebook is meant to introduce fair housing best practices to communities that need exposure to the planning and implementation process. It may be the case that not all steps will be applicable to each reader; it will be up to the user to determine which step is the most helpful. Though this guidebook lays out best practices, in order to have a comprehensive analysis and plan for fair housing, communities should consider the Oak Park Regional Housing Center or another entity certified by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development for affirmative furthering of fair housing consultation.

There are fair housing policies and underused assets which can provide the foundation for progress. It is time to build upon these strengths to create racial integration and promote diverse investment. The Oak Park Regional Housing Center is motivated to help municipalities become more culturally vibrant communities. We strongly believe that the collaboration with fair housing agencies such as the Oak Park Regional Housing Center will affirmatively further fair housing and create a bright future.

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

CHAPTER 1: Fair Housing Policy
CHAPTER 2: The Benefits of Fair Housing
CHAPTER 3: Stakeholder Identification
CHAPTER 4: Partnerships and Regional Collaboration
CHAPTER 5: Strategic Planning, Measurable Goals
CHAPTER 6: Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Report
CHAPTER 7: Fair Housing Ordinance
CHAPTER 8: Fair Housing Action Plan
CHAPTER 9: Communication and Marketing
ADDITIONAL FAIR HOUSING RESOURCES
CONTACT OAK PARK REGIONAL HOUSING CENTER
CHAPTER 1:
FAIR HOUSING POLICY

FAIR HOUSING ACT OF 1968
Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (Fair Housing Act), as amended, prohibits discrimination in the sale, rental, and financing of dwellings, and in other housing-related transactions, based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, familial status (including children under the age of 18 living with parents or legal custodians, pregnant women, and people securing custody of children under the age of 18), and handicap (disability).

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964
Title VI of the Civil Rights Act prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin in programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance.

HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1974
Section 109 of Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex or religion in programs and activities receiving financial assistance from HUD's Community Development and Block Grant Program.

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990
Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act prohibits discrimination based on disability in programs, services, and activities provided or made available by public entities. HUD enforces Title II when it relates to state and local public housing, housing assistance and housing referrals.

ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS ACT OF 1968
The Architectural Barriers Act requires that buildings and facilities designed, constructed, altered, or leased with certain federal funds after September 1969 must be accessible to and useable by handicapped persons.

PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDER 11063
Executive Order 11063 prohibits discrimination in the sale, leasing, rental, or other disposition of properties and facilities owned or operated by the federal government or provided with federal funds.

PRESIDENTIAL EXECUTIVE ORDER 12892
Executive Order 12892, as amended, requires federal agencies to affirmatively further fair housing in their programs and activities, and provides that the Secretary of HUD will be responsible for coordinating the effort. The Order also establishes the President's Fair Housing Council, which will be chaired by the Secretary of HUD.
CHAPTER 2:
THE BENEFITS OF FAIR HOUSING

A fair housing market is one in which no consumer is more burdened in making housing choices than any other consumer. Affirmatively furthering fair housing goes beyond uncovering discrimination & developing affordable housing. It must encompass policies that encourage racial and ethnic integration and include accessibility & housing for larger families. Affirmatively furthering fair housing is accomplished through implementing policies, practices, programs, and development that promotes integration.

The Fair Housing Act of 1968 prohibits the refusal to sell, finance, rent to, or negotiate with any person on the basis of:

- RACE OR COLOR
- GENDER
- FAMILIAL STATUS (PRESENCE OF MINOR CHILDREN)
- NATIONAL ORIGIN
- RELIGION
- DISABILITY

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development states that equal access to rental housing and homeownership opportunities is the cornerstone of this nation’s federal housing policy. Housing discrimination is not only illegal; it contradicts in every way the principles of freedom and opportunity for all citizens.

The importance of fair housing goes beyond a physical structure. Affirmatively furthering fair housing creates a housing market which is open, inclusive, and fulfills the diverse needs of all community residents. Fair housing reconnects neighborhoods by ensuring access to quality housing, regardless of race, gender, religious views, familial status, or disability. All citizens have the opportunity to live in close proximity to high-achieving schools, employment opportunities, transportation options, banking services, grocery stores and retail, public services, and public space. Local government reaps benefits from promoting integration by lowering costs for social services, improving revenues through strong property values, and providing a desirable community where households and businesses can thrive.

Local government’s response to changing demographics and racial disparities will determine the region’s future. Correcting inequities and promoting equal opportunity for all residents are the essence of what government should do. Increasing the focus on fair housing benefits everyone and allows disadvantaged residents to lead more prosperous lives.
CHAPTER 3:
STAKEHOLDER IDENTIFICATION

It is important to identify the necessary participants for fair housing planning and analysis. Stakeholder involvement provides an insightful lens on local issues and rallies citizen support for proposed developments. Additionally, honest community engagement keeps residents informed, creates a sense of ownership, and enables public accountability. Identifying stakeholders and understanding their potential role and position in the process are important conditions to achieve the overall fair housing goals. This can help to identify possible conflicts and coalitions between stakeholders, and how these in turn may affect your planning process in terms of policy integration, resource availability and overall legitimacy.

To obtain a comprehensive picture, four types of stakeholders should be distinguished according to their specific power position in the process:

- **RESIDENTS**: Population immediately affected by fair housing policies; solicit direct input
- **LOCAL BUSINESSES & INSTITUTIONS**: Can rally community support, provide financial resources, and contribute skills and expertise; solicit direct input
- **PERSPECTIVE RESIDENTS**: Potential participants in the integration of the community
- **REGIONAL ALLIES**: Wider community over which you have minimal control, but should remain included for resources, support, and research

In addition, consider the role of existing local champions – key individuals who may play a significant role in mobilizing resources and creating alliances - because of their personal skills and recognition among local actors. Such persons can have an extraordinary influence on the process, both positively and negatively. Their role requires an early strategic assessment.
CHAPTER 4: PARTNERSHIPS & REGIONAL COLLABORATION

Through partnerships and regional collaboration, entities can combine assets to obtain local support, attract necessary funding, and provide the required project management and operations experience. Bringing groups to the table can be accomplished by articulating the connection of the policy or program to their mission and communicating potential benefits of the plan.

Although there is no single approach to collaboration or partnerships, several principles have emerged to help which should be adapted to the unique circumstances of each place or region.

- **CATALYST**: Focus on a compelling purpose or interest
- **LEADERSHIP**: Organize around collaborative leaders
- **REPRESENTATION**: Mobilize and engage the right people
- **FIT**: Define the region to match people’s interests
- **CAPACITY**: Assemble the necessary resources
- **STRATEGY**: Determine where you want to go & how
- **IMPLEMENTATION**: Move from vision to action
- **EVALUATION**: Learn as you go and adapt as needed

REGIONAL COLLABORATION:
Addresses issues transcending political and jurisdictional boundaries at a regional level; can augment existing government institutions or be ad hoc in nature

INTERJURISDICTIONAL COLLABORATION:
Leverages external resources, align internal strategies to collectively address common issues and goals that cross municipal boundaries, and capture resulting efficiencies

PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS:
Contractual agreements formed between the public sector and a private entity that allow for greater private sector participation in the delivery and financing of infrastructure projects
CHAPTER 5:
STRATEGIC PLANNING,
MEASURABLE GOALS

Strategic planning for affirmatively furthering fair housing requires developing strategic policy priorities for the community. After identifying fair housing priorities, plan and coordinate the implementation of initiatives that support these priorities.

VISION. Establishing a vision is a way for your community to integrate your fair housing goals into the wider vision of your community. A vision is a statement that expresses where your community wants to be in the future. For local governments embarking on the fair housing process, a vision can help to establish what an integrated community looks like. By articulating where you like to see your community in the future, your community will have something to refer back to throughout the fair housing effort. A vision statement also acts as a call to action and can be a catalyst to inspire change. Ideally, it should incorporate the values that are important to your community while also communicating the purpose and intended outcome of your fair housing ordinance and action plan.

Below are key questions to consider while establishing your vision:
- What do you want to accomplish with your fair housing plan?
- What does an integrated community look like to you?
- What sort of impediments to fair housing affect you region?
- Who are your target audiences: council, stakeholders, citizens?

GOALS. Once you have completed your vision, you can shape your fair housing goals. Goals should be phrased in reference to the fair housing impediments that threaten your community. They will act as high level intentions which your community will strive towards. Consider the unique market demand and housing stock of your community when developing housing goals for a municipality.

OBJECTIVES. Having identified community goals, you can begin to set specific objectives. Objectives refer to the ways in which your community intends to overcome the impediments that have been identified and represent the path towards achieving your wider vision. Some objectives might be specific, while others might be broad and thus more challenging to measure. Remember that fair housing objectives will vary from one community to another based on the unique characteristics of each area.

TARGET. To the extent possible, identify what your objective is striving to accomplish using targets. Targets can be set as a defined timeframe and/or relevant numerical standards to measure progress. Keep in mind that numerical standards will likely only be possible in cases where baseline data is available.
CHAPTER 6:
ANALYSIS OF IMPEDIMENTS TO
FAIR HOUSING REPORT

According to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Analysis of Impediments (AI) Report is a review of impediments or barriers that affect the rights of fair housing choice. It covers public and private policies, practices, and procedures affecting housing choice. Impediments to fair housing choice are defined as any actions, omissions, or decisions that restrict, or have the effect of restricting, the availability of housing choices, based on race, color, religion, sex, disability, familial status, or national origin. The AI serves as the basis for fair housing planning, provides essential information to policy makers, administrative staff, housing providers, lenders, and fair housing advocates, and assists in building public support for fair housing efforts. Conducting an analysis of impediments is a required component of certification and involves the following:

- An extensive review of a State or Entitlement jurisdiction’s laws, regulations, and administrative policies, procedures, and practices;
- An assessment of how those laws affect the location, availability, and accessibility of housing;
- An evaluation of conditions, both public and private, affecting fair housing choice for all protected classes; and
- An assessment of the availability of affordable, accessible housing in a range of unit sizes.
- An analysis of whether the community has sufficient, accurate, and current information to understand and document all of its fair housing impediments.

WHAT DATA IS INCLUDED IN AN AI REPORT?

- Introduction and executive summary of the analysis
- Demographic data regarding the jurisdiction’s population and housing
- Maps showing minority and low-income concentration, and assisted housing
- Other relevant data such as employment and transportation
- Mortgage and rehabilitation lending patterns by race and ethnic group
- Availability of accessible housing stock for residents with disabilities
- Findings resulting from complaints and fair housing litigation
- Results of fair housing testing activity, if available
- Impediments in the public and private sector
- Occupancy requirements that might unlawfully limit group homes for persons with disabilities of families with children
- Geographic patterns related to the use of housing choice vouchers and siting of assisted housing
- Efforts to assist and serve persons who have limited English proficiency to function more effectively in the housing market and assert their rights under civil rights law
CHAPTER 6 CONTINUED:
ANALYSIS OF IMPEDIMENTS TO FAIR HOUSING REPORT

GUIDELINES FOR SUB-GRANTEES.
Sub-grantees of federal funds are not required to draft an Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Report, although every municipality benefits from an examination of barriers to affirmatively furthering fair housing, unique to each community.
Sub-grantees should consult the granting jurisdiction's Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Report in order to help shape their Fair Housing Action Plan.

FEDERAL RESOURCES.
Below are federal resources which provide guidelines for affirmatively furthering fair housing or illustrates the need to follow fair housing mandates as grantees and sub-grantees of federal dollars.

Fair Housing Laws and Presidential Executive Orders
Consolidated Plan and CDBG Fair Housing Requirements
HUD Fair Housing Planning Guide
Westchester County Fair Housing Settlement
Overcoming Structural Barriers to Integrated Housing
CHAPTER 7: FAIR HOUSING ORDINANCE

FAIR HOUSING ORDINANCE. After completing the analysis of impediments to fair housing report, a municipality must adopt or update current fair housing ordinance that is based on evidence in the AI and is inclusive of the protected classes within the Fair Housing Act, state equivalent law, and any local ordinances. The fair housing ordinance should not be independent of a comprehensive plan because the resulting goals may relate to other aspects of the community’s development. While comprehensive plans are typically designed for long-term use, fair housing may need more frequent review due to market and demographic shifts.

RECOMMENDED SUB-HEADINGS FOR FAIR HOUSING ORDINANCE:

- Declaration of policy
- Define protected classes
- Detail unlawful housing practices
- Exemptions and exceptions, if any
- Administrator authority and responsibilities
- Fair housing complaints and procedures
- Additional remedies
- Education and public information
- Untruthful complaints or testimony
- Penalty
- Severability
- Effective date
CHAPTER 8:
FAIR HOUSING ACTION PLAN

FAIR HOUSING ACTION PLAN. Once the impediments to fair housing are identified, communities must take action to overcome the effects of these barriers. Many communities will find that there are far more impediments to fair housing than they are able to address in a single year. Similarly, there are numerous programs and policies to affirmatively further fair housing. A fair housing action plan, with defined fair housing objectives, will make the task of establishing priorities, taking actions, and evaluating results far easier for municipalities.

MINIMUM STANDARDS FAIR HOUSING ACTION PLAN SHOULD ADDRESS:

- **COMPLAINTS**: A procedure for receiving fair housing complaints. If the municipality does not have investigative and adjudicative body and procedure, provide a procedure for referring fair housing complaints to an agency for intake and adjudication
- **MARKETING**: Information about fair housing rights available for all residents and prospective residents; plans for marketing to under-represented groups
- **TRAINING**: Real estate professionals and multi-family property owners should attend and complete an annual fair housing training session that covers the requirements and protections of the Fair Housing Act, state equivalent law, and any local ordinances
- **AFFIRMATIVE PLANS**: Solicit local lenders for affirmative lending plans and require local residential builders during the permit process to provide affirmative marketing plans
- **AFFORDABILITY**: Conduct an analysis of the affordability of both rental and owner-occupied housing and address the need for any future development of affordable housing in the community as it relates to improved integration
- **CURRENT ORDINANCES**: Review all zoning ordinances, building codes, and occupancy codes for compliance with the Fair Housing Act, equivalent state law, and the Americans with Disabilities Act
- **DEVELOPMENT**: Prioritizing economic development and infrastructure to ensure community equity
CHAPTER 9: COMMUNICATION & MARKETING

The way in which you communicate the accomplishments of your adaptation effort will be dictated by the kind of plan your community has created. There are a variety of communication methods that can be employed including a community event, press release, issue briefs, reporting, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNICATION</th>
<th>PROS</th>
<th>CONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Event</td>
<td>• More likely to get participation</td>
<td>• Costly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Opportunity for community involvement</td>
<td>• May only reach small number of people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press Release</td>
<td>• Minimal costs</td>
<td>• Difficult to ensure that its read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reaches wide audience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>• Formally documents progress</td>
<td>• Only reaches a small, mostly internal audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Minimal costs</td>
<td>• Is not accessible to wider audience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMUNITY AWARENESS. When introducing new fair housing laws and programs into a community it is important to encourage public participation early to help address concerns and result in better programs for residents and the municipality. Stakeholder and citizen involvement provides an insightful lens on local issues and rallies citizen support for proposed developments. Honest community engagement keeps residents informed, creates a sense of ownership, and enables public accountability.

AFFIRMATIVE MARKETING. Affirmative marketing differs from general marketing activities in that it specifically targets potential tenants and homebuyers who are least likely to apply for the housing, in order to make them aware of available housing opportunities. If possible, adopt programs that seek to overcome the informational biases that lead people to have little knowledge of your community or negative views about your community. Additionally, it is important to enact policies which provide resources to community organizations that work with real estate agents, landlords, and civic leaders to make the community attractive and accessible to all races.

COMMON METHODS TO AFFIRMATIVELY MARKET:

- Identifying populations that are least likely to apply without special outreach, and tailoring affirmative marketing requirements to project owners accordingly
- Communicating the equal housing opportunity message in outreach to the general community; may be inserted into direct mail solicitations, requests for proposals, and related advertising
- Require all advertisements, brochures, and other written material for housing be published in multiple languages, in order to reach non-English-speaking audiences
ADDITIONAL FAIR HOUSING

RESOURCES

Access Living
www.accessliving.org
(312) 640-2100

Business and Professional People for the Public Interest (BPI)
www.bpichicago.org
(312) 641-5570

Center for Neighborhood Technology
www.cnt.org
773-278-4800

Chicago Area Fair Housing Alliance
www.cafha.net

Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP)
www.cmap.illinois.gov
(312) 454-0400

Cook County – Commission on Human Rights
www.cookcountygov.com
(312) 603-1100

Illinois Department of Human Rights
www2.illinois.gov/dhr
(312) 814-6200

Lawyers Committee for Better Housing
www.lcbh.org
(312) 347-7600

Metropolitan Mayors Caucus
www.mayorscaucus.org
(312) 201-4505

Metropolitan Planning Council
www.metroplanning.org
(312) 922-5616

Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law
www.povertylaw.org
(312) 263-3830

State of Illinois
www.illinois.gov
(312) 793-3500

U.S. Census
www.census.gov
301-763-INFO (4636)

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
www.hud.gov
(312) 353-5680
The Oak Park Regional Housing Center offers technical assistance in a number of areas, including fair housing planning, implementation, and advocacy as well as landlord training, first-time homeownership, and affirmative marketing.

If you have questions, please contact:

Rob Breymaier, Executive Director at rbreymaier@oprhc.org
Morgan P. Davis, Fair Housing Policy Analyst at mdavis@oprhc.org

For information about our fair housing model, please visit:

WEBSITE:
www.oprhc.org

PHONE:
708.848.7150

ADDRESS:
Oak Park Regional Housing Center
1041 South Boulevard
Oak Park, Illinois 60302

ABOUT THE OAK PARK REGIONAL HOUSING CENTER
The Oak Park Regional Housing Center (OPRHC) is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization founded in 1972 offering free services to housing seekers and housing providers. The primary service area is Western Cook County however services are available to people throughout the Chicago region. The OPRHC provides apartment referrals, technical assistance to property owners and managers, homeownership counseling, fair housing policy analysis and fair housing training and education.
A recent study published by the Manhattan Institute, *THE END OF THE SEGREGATED CENTURY: Racial Separation in America’s Neighborhoods, 1890-2010*, declares that American neighborhoods are nearing the end of racial segregation. The report has received a flurry of attention especially from those tuned into ongoing housing and education debates regarding racial segregation and disparities in opportunity.

By using census data in this way— to purport the “end of racism in housing”—we see this report as part of a very troubling trend in which the dialogue regarding race and opportunity is further buried in public discourse. Further concerning is that to some, this report may offer a refreshing take on an emotionally charged issue. Many would welcome the silencing of opposing views that have long emphasized the perpetual racial undertones influencing housing, education, and employment. For those not in the business of analyzing data or assessing housing trends, the media’s poorly covered, superficial analysis of studies espousing these views often produce utter hopelessness—conveying the troubling realities of systemic racism, yet offering no tangible solutions to the issues. By glossing over any substantial dialogue about race in this country, we have created a society that too often feels “burnt out” on racism and ready to “move on already.” The Manhattan Institute study fills this niche quite nicely.

A dichotomy of opinions related to race relations in the U.S. has erupted since the election of President Obama. There is an overarching tendency, especially among whites wishing to shed residual “white guilt,” to herald the end of racism and black disadvantage by pointing to the election of a black president. The Manhattan Study furthers this perception in that it overstates and oversimplifies the gains made in integration over the last century. Although the notion that we may be embarking on an era of race neutrality seems inspiring, it does not reflect the complexities of racial segregation, particularly in housing, that arise out of multi-faceted forces including public policies, private sector investment, and public perceptions about race. Conversely, many fair housing advocates conclude that despite the tremendous achievements of some African Americans in our society, the continued existence of racially concentrated areas of poverty (or ghettos as the report refers to them) negates the supposition that race is no longer a factor in determining one’s ability to prosper in our society.

Numerous reports starkly contradict the Manhattan Institute study and specifically cite the continued racial incongruences in opportunities that are inextricably linked to persistent segregation in housing.

The Manhattan Institute report utilized two of the most common segregation indexes which are dissimilarity\(^1\) and isolation\(^2\). However, the Manhattan Institute sorted racial groups in an unusual method, using black and non-black. This placed non-Hispanic whites, Latinos, Asians, and other racial groups into the non-black category. The grouping of all non-black populations is problematic for a number of reasons. First, housing segregation is not only an issue for African Americans. Other minorities experience segregation and combining all non-black populations together glosses over the existence of segregation and discrimination faced by Asians, Latinos, and Native Americans. Secondly, grouping all non-black races inflates the progress of integration. The progress reported can be partially attributed to the integration of two or more minority groups. While inter-minority segregation is not entirely a non-black issue, it is certainly not an issue only facing African Americans.

---

1. The dissimilarity index measures the evenness of a group’s population distribution across a broad region. The resulting number indicates the percentage of the two measured groups’ population that would have to change residence for all members to be equally distributed.
2. The isolation index measures exposure to other groups. The resulting number indicates the extent to which minority members are exposed only to one another.
integration is something to be applauded, this methodology avoids the true segregation between black and non-Hispanic white residents. By using this methodology, the authors were able to artificially reduce the levels of dissimilarity. This black and non-black grouping helps to explain the augmented conclusions of their report.

When housing data is analyzed with dissimilarity and isolation indexes and each race is individually identified, the average African American still lives in a metropolitan housing market, where to achieve complete integration, more than half the black population would have to move. Douglas Massey, Sociology Professor at Princeton University and Gregory D. Squires, Sociology and Public Policy & Public Administration Professor at George Washington University reveal that “More than forty years after the passage of the Fair Housing Act, two thirds of all black urbanites continue to live under conditions of high segregation and nearly half live in metropolitan areas where the degree of racial isolation is so intense it conforms to the criteria for hypersegregation.”

The Manhattan Institute reports that American cities are more integrated than they’ve been since 1910 and all-white neighborhoods are “effectively extinct”. This idea is supported by their statistic that only 0.5 percent of neighborhoods are without black people, compared to 20 percent a half-century ago. Although it is less and less likely to come across an all-white neighborhood, the broad assertion that all-white neighborhoods are extinct is misleading since many of these “integrating” neighborhoods have extremely underrepresented minority populations when juxtaposed with the housing patterns that would be seen in a truly free market. Just because a handful of minorities reside in a neighborhood, this does not inherently promise racial integration in that area. Minorities can still be geographically isolated from white residents within the community. William Frey of the Brookings Institution supports this concept, asserting “The average white lives in a neighborhood that is 78 percent white and 7 percent black.”

One of the ways the report masks the persistence of segregation is to simplify the rise of black suburbanization and immigration as an explanation for the decline in segregation. Although African Americans have the freedom to move into suburbs, they still experience segregation in a number of suburban areas. Segregation is not a static phenomenon restricted to central cities. The containment of black neighborhoods can evolve into new areas and re-segregation can occur, both sub-regionally and within suburban municipalities that may seem diverse as a whole but experience substantial segregation within. Also troubling, studies indicate that whites remain hesitant to integrate, particularly with blacks, due to a fear of higher crime and declining property values. George C. Galster of Wayne State University states “Because we have moved further from attaining this last goal of eliminating minority poverty ghettos, race relations in this Nation continue to be poisoned by stereotypes generalized from ghetto behaviors. Rationalization of these stereotypes provides a basis for justifying continued discrimination and self-segregation by Whites.” The sensationalized media reports of crime and violence in urban ghettos furthers racial stereotypes and heightens fears of racial integration.

Tyrone Forman and Maria Krysan point out in a more recent report that although all racial groups appear to be more committed to racial integration, whites, when actually making housing choices, do not put this

---

commitment into practice. This report examined racial segregation in metropolitan Chicago housing and found that, “black-white dissimilarity indices within income groups in the Chicago metropolitan area barely change as income rises: the most affluent blacks are nearly as segregated as their poorest counterparts.” According to this report the Chicago area is ranked fifth among the nation’s most segregated cities. This type of “hypersegregation” is indeed a dynamic force in the Chicago region and reports like the Manhattan Institute’s seriously downplay the severity of segregation and the dramatic role this can play in access to opportunity.

However, the Manhattan Study does point out one important factor that can be agreed upon by fair housing advocates-- that the Fair Housing Act put in place stipulations making discriminatory practices in housing illegal and that this was the cornerstone of integration in the latter half of the last century. Public perceptions seem to be catching up with this critical piece of legislation. Troubling however, are the ideas that the Fair Housing Act has done its job, people are less racist, the housing market is more free, white flight and redlining are things of the past, and therefore there is no longer a need for policy interventions to influence housing practices. While 44 years of individual private enforcement have been instrumental in validating the rights of protected persons, it has proven to be a poor remedy for structural segregation.

If we as a society are ready to free ourselves of the roots of racial segregation and look to a future in which opportunities are not limited by race, we must be willing to have an open and honest dialogue about what this truly means. We need to push for public policies that mirror these changing attitudes—because without them our tainted past will forever influence our future. We must push for policies and practices that affirmatively further fair housing, which will reap benefits beyond an integrated housing market. As neighborhoods integrate they will advance integration in other arenas, including schools and social networks. The integration of our communities will ensure more equitable investment and development across our cities and regions. We must analyze the policies that although seem neutral when taken at face value, produce discriminatory effects that contradict the value of a housing market in which people are truly free to choose where they would like to live. If we want further integration we must lay the foundation for that integration to flourish.

Progressive housing policies can work to reverse historic patterns of segregation that defined the past century. This is especially true in metropolitan areas with seemingly insurmountable barriers to racial equity. Residential segregation has declined; however the conclusion that we are nearing the end of segregation implies that mitigating segregation in American communities is no longer a priority. We must celebrate the progressive strides within racial segregation, but remain honest about the continued geographic separation taking place in our metropolitan regions nationwide.

---


7 “The Chicago metro area ranks fifth, sixth, and ninth in the most residentially segregated metropolitan area in the United States for blacks, Latinos, and Asians, respectively” (Ibid).
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The Chicago Area Fair Housing Alliance (CAFHA) is a consortium of fair housing and advocacy organizations, government agencies, and municipalities committed to the value of fair housing, diversity, and integration. CAFHA works to combat housing discrimination and promote integrated communities of opportunity through research, education, and advocacy.
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I. Overview

Still perceived as prosperous white enclaves, suburban communities are now at the cutting edge of racial, ethnic, and even political change in America. Racially diverse suburbs are growing faster than their predominantly white counterparts. Diverse suburban neighborhoods now outnumber those in their central cities by more than two to one. 44 percent of suburban residents in the 50 largest U.S. metropolitan areas live in racially integrated communities, which are defined as places between 20 and 60 percent non-white. Integrated suburbs represent some of the nation’s greatest hopes and its gravest challenges. The rapidly growing diversity of the United States, which is reflected in the rapid changes seen in suburban communities, suggests a degree of declining racial bias and at least the partial success of fair housing laws. Yet the fragile demographic stability in these newly integrated suburbs, as well as the rise of poor virtually non-white suburbs, presents serious challenges for local, state, and federal governments.

By mid-century, the increasingly metropolitan nation that is the United States will have no racial majority. Last year a majority of the children born in the United States and nearly half of students in U.S. public schools were non-white. 2 Almost 60 percent of U.S. population lives in the 50 largest regions, 80 percent in its metropolitan areas. At the same time, a growing number of central-city blacks and Latinos experience apartheid levels of segregation and civic dysfunction. In comparison, integrated suburbs, despite challenges, are gaining in population and prosperity. Given these trends, ensuring successful racially integrated communities represents the best policy path for the nation’s educational, economic, and political success.

Stably integrated suburbs are places where whites and non-whites can grow up, study, work, and govern together effectively. Integrated communities have the greatest success eliminating racial disparities in education and economic opportunity. While non-whites in integrated communities have seen improvements in education and employment, non-white residents of segregated urban communities are further behind than ever. In integrated communities, whites and non-whites have the most positive perceptions of one another. Integrated suburbs are much more likely to be politically balanced and functional places that provide high-quality government services at affordable tax rates than high-poverty, segregated areas. In environmental terms, they are denser, more walkable, more energy-efficient, and otherwise more sustainable than outer suburbs. They also benefit from their proximity both to central cities and outer suburban destinations.

1 The terms “integrated” and “racially diverse” will both be used to describe municipalities and neighborhoods with non-white population shares between 20 and 60 percent. At the municipal scale, this broad measure may mask segregation at smaller scales, undermining the use of the term “integrated.” However, the municipality is also the dominant scale for the local housing and land-use policymaking that is most likely to affect integration and segregation rates. School policy (through school districts) is also often pursued at roughly this scale. Thus, while many of these municipalities are likely to be segregated at neighborhood scales, policy-making institutions—city councils or school boards, for instance—are much more likely to be integrated. In addition, if a municipality meets the criterion, this means that local policy institutions exist at scale large enough to fruitfully pursue integrative policies. The use of the term at the neighborhood scale, defined as a census tract for the purposes of this work, is much less problematic, as census tracts are generally much smaller than municipalities.

These communities also reflect America’s political diversity. On average, they are evenly split between Democrats and Republicans, and are often the political battlegrounds that determine elections. They are more likely than other suburbs to switch parties from one election to another and, as a result, often decide the balance of state legislatures and Congress as well as the outcomes of gubernatorial and presidential elections. Policy makers could pay a political price for failing to connect with “swing” voters in these integrated suburban communities.

Yet, while integrated suburbs represent great hope, they face serious challenges to their prosperity and stability. Integrated communities have a hard time staying integrated for extended periods. Neighborhoods that were more than 23 percent non-white in 1980 were more likely to be predominately non-white by 2005 than to remain integrated. Illegal discrimination, in the form of steering by real estate agents, mortgage lending and insurance discrimination, subsidized housing placement, and racial gerrymandering of school attendance boundaries, is causing rapid racial change and economic decline. By 2010, 17 percent of suburbanites lived in predominantly non-white suburbs, communities that were once integrated but are now more troubled and have fewer prospects for renewal than their central cities. Tipping or resegregation (moving from a once all-white or stably integrated neighborhood to an all non-white neighborhood), while common, is not inevitable. Stable integration is possible but, it does not happen by accident. It is the product of clear race-conscious strategies, hard work, and political collaboration among local governments. Critical to stabilizing these suburbs is a renewed commitment to fair-housing enforcement, including local stable-integration plans, equitable education policies and incentives that encourage newer, whiter and richer suburbs to build their fair share of affordable units.

If racially diverse suburbs can become politically organized and exercise the power in their numbers, they can ensure both the stability of their communities and the future opportunity and prosperity of a multi-racial metropolitan America.

II. The Pattern of Diversity

A. Residential and School Segregation

America is one of the most racially, ethnically, and economically diverse nations on earth. According to the Bureau of the Census, America will have no single racial majority in its


4 For the purpose of this study predominately non-white is defined as more than 60 percent non-white.

5 In part because there is no equivalent to HMDA data for insurance, far less is known about insurance than mortgage lending. See Greg Squires and Sally O’Connor, “The Unavailability of Information on Insurance Unavailability and the Absence of Geocoded Disclosure Data,” Housing Policy Debate 12, no. 2 (2001): 247.
IV. Opportunities and Challenges

A. Opportunities

In the new multi-racial America, diverse suburbs now represent the best hope for realizing the dream of equal opportunity. The population of racially diverse suburbs in the 50 largest metropolitan areas is now greater than the combined population of the central cities in those metros. These integrated communities and neighborhoods offer the best chances to eliminate the racial disparities in economic opportunity that have persisted for decades. They offer the most equal access to good schools and a clear path to living-wage employment for all their residents. They are the places where whites and non-whites have the best relations and the most positive perceptions of one another. They offer the best chances for people of color to participate and succeed in the educational and economic mainstream.

Scholarly evidence on the benefits of school integration highlights the importance of integrated communities. Extensive research literature documents that racial and economic segregation hurts children and that the potential positive effects of creating more integrated schools are broad and long-lasting. The research shows that integrated schools boost academic achievement (defined as test scores, attainment (years in school and number of degrees) and expectations), improve opportunities for students of color, and generate valuable social and economic benefits including better jobs with better benefits and greater ease living and working in diverse environments in the future. Integrated schools also enhance the cultural competence of white students and prepare them for a more diverse workplace and society.

Attending racially integrated schools and classrooms improves the academic achievement of minority students (measured by test scores).19 Since the research also shows that integrated schools do not lower test scores for white students, they are one of the very few strategies demonstrated to ease one of the most difficult public policy problems of our time—the racial achievement gap. Other academic benefits for minority students include completing more years of education and higher college attendance rates. Long-term economic benefits include a tendency to choose more lucrative occupations in which minorities are historically underrepresented.20


Integrated schools also generate long-term social benefits for students. Students who experience interracial contact in integrated school settings are more likely to live, work, and attend college in more integrated settings. Integrated classrooms improve the stability of interracial friendships and increase the likelihood of interracial friendships as adults. Both white and non-white students tend to have higher educational aspirations if they have cross-race friendships. Interracial contact in desegregated settings decreases racial prejudice among students and facilitates more positive interracial relations. Students who attend integrated schools report an increased sense of civic engagement compared to their segregated peers.

Diverse suburbs recommend themselves in many other ways as well. In general, they show many fewer signs of social or economic stress than central cities and non-white segregated suburbs—the other community types with significant numbers of minority households. They offer higher incomes, lower poverty, better home values, and stronger local tax bases (Table 2). They also show many characteristics associated with economic and environmental sustainability—they are denser, more likely to be fully developed (and therefore more walkable) and to be located in central areas (offering better access to transit), and are home to more jobs per capita than predominantly white suburbs or exurbs (Table 1 and Maps 3 – 8). Additionally, revitalizing and redeveloping these communities through increased density, walkability and transit is more environmentally sustainable than the all-too-common practice of abandoning these areas in favor of new, low-density, automobile dependent communities built on greenfield land. Finally, diverse suburbs are politically mixed, providing the potential for meaningful political participation and limiting the risks associated with dominance by a single party.


B. The Challenge of Resegregation and Economic Decline

Resegregation is the primary challenge facing many diverse communities and neighborhoods. Many currently integrated areas are actually in the midst of social and economic change—change that is often very rapid. Integrated communities in the United States have a hard time staying integrated for more than ten or twenty years, and many communities that were once integrated have now resegregated and are largely non-white. The process is driven by a wide variety of factors, including housing discrimination, inequitable school attendance policies, and racial preferences shaped by past and present discrimination.

Data for municipalities and census tracts clearly show the vulnerability of integrated neighborhoods to racial transition. Table 3 summarizes racial transition in municipalities in the 50 largest metropolitan areas between 2000 and 2010. In just 10 years, 160 of the 1,107 communities (16 percent) classified as diverse in 2000 made the transition to predominantly non-white. A similar percentage of predominantly white municipalities made the transition to diverse.26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2000 Classification</th>
<th>Predominately Non-white</th>
<th>Diverse</th>
<th>Predominately White</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predominately Non-white</td>
<td>309 (99%)</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>312 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse</td>
<td>160 (16%)</td>
<td>838 (82%)</td>
<td>19 (2%)</td>
<td>1,017 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominately White</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>527 (18%)</td>
<td>2,482 (82%)</td>
<td>3,009 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>2,501</td>
<td>4,338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2000 and 2010 Censuses of Population.

26 Table 1 does not show exurbs. Since exurbs are defined by urbanization rate in 2000 in both years—2010 urbanization data are not yet available—none made the transition to another classification during the period.
Neighborhood (census tract) data for a longer period provide better indicators of how vulnerable integrated areas are to racial transition. Table 4 summarizes the data for racial transition in census tracts in the 50 largest metropolitan areas for the period between 1980 and 2005-09.\(^27\) It shows how neighborhoods of all types changed during the 1980s, 1990s, and 2000s. Neighborhoods that were integrated in 1980 were much less stable than predominantly white or predominantly non-white neighborhoods. More than a fifth (21 percent) of the census tracts that were integrated in 1980 had crossed the 60 percent threshold into the predominantly non-white category during the 1980s. Another 28 percent of them had made the transition by 2000 (more than doubling the total to 49 percent). By 2005-09, only 56 percent of the neighborhoods that had been integrated in 1980 had become predominantly non-white. Another four percent became predominantly white during the period, leaving only 40 percent of the 1980 integrated neighborhoods in the 2010 integrated category.

The analysis also shows that once a neighborhood makes the transition to predominantly non-white it is very likely to stay that way. Predominantly non-white neighborhoods were, by far, the most stable group—93 percent of neighborhoods that were in this group in 1980 were still predominantly non-white 25 years later.\(^28\) This highlights how rare another often-cited risk to traditional minority neighborhoods—gentrification—actually is. Contrary to widespread fears of gentrification, the data clearly show that once a neighborhood becomes predominantly non-white it virtually never reverts to predominantly white. Just two census tracts out of the nearly 1,500 that were predominantly non-white in 1980 became predominantly white in the next three decades, and only seven percent of them became diverse. Similarly, only four percent of diverse neighborhoods became predominantly white during the period. If gentrification involves bringing more middle-income family households into previously segregated neighborhoods then metropolitan America actually needs much more gentrification, not less. Indeed, in most cases, it could just as aptly be called “urban racial reintegration” rather than “gentrification”.\(^29\)

---

\(^27\) The most recent data with census tracts boundaries consistent with earlier years are from the Census American Community Survey, which reports averages for the period from 2005 to 2009 for census tracts. Census tracts in the more recent 2006-2010 data are not contiguous with earlier years and cannot be used for this comparison.

\(^28\) The percentage was even higher in central cities—94 percent of 3,647 census tracts that were predominantly non-white in 1980 were still non-white in 2005-09. By 2005-09, central cities had 5,876 census tracts qualifying as predominantly non-white, compared to 4,697 in suburbs. At the same time, they had only 3,426 diverse tracts compared to 8,196 in suburbs.

\(^29\) At the same time, there are a few significant cases (at least in large cities like New York, San Francisco, Washington D.C., Chicago) where the racial composition of traditionally black neighborhoods have become whiter and if not predominantly white, then different enough to create real animosities. See generally, Bruce Norris, *Clybourne Park: a Play* (New York: Faber and Faber, 2011); Nathan McCall, *Them* (New York: Washington Square Press, 2004).
History

A stroll down any of the beautiful streets in Shaker Heights makes it hard to imagine the simple beginnings from which this City sprang. That the City has successfully grown and evolved in so many important ways over the last 100 years is a testament to its solid foundation.

Anchored by physical and social planning, consistent and proactive leadership, and residents deeply committed to the prosperity of the community, the City is well positioned to seize the opportunities of the 21st century and meet the challenges of its next 100 years.

The North Union Shakers, a utopian religious sect, originally settled Shaker Heights in 1822. Known as The Valley of God’s Pleasure, the settlement encompassed 1,366 acres. The dreams of the North Union Shakers faded with Cleveland’s emergence as an industrial metropolis in the late 19th century. Horseshoe Lake, the Lower Lakes, and a handful of streets were all that remained of the North Union settlement by the late 1800s.

In 1905, developer brothers Oris Paxton and Mantis James Van Sweringen saw potential in the land and took an option on a small portion of it. They envisioned creation of an exclusive, utopian residential suburb built around the ideals of the Garden City movement. To make it even more appealing, their plan included two rapid transit lines to whisk residents downtown in half the time it took on a standard streetcar. One hundred years later, the Rapid is still providing easy access to Cleveland and remains one of Shaker’s most desirable and unique assets.

Integrating the natural landscape with the built environment was a key component of the Garden City movement and a guiding development principle for the brothers. Strict enforcement of building setbacks and spacious, lushly planted tree lawns further enhanced the environment. Marshall and Green lakes were formed by damming Doan Brook, which, along with the original two lakes created by the North Union Shakers, created some of the choicest properties in the Shaker Village. Planners created an intentional hierarchy of streets to limit traffic in residential neighborhoods, creating a quiet, idyllic environment.

Street names, according to some sources, were chosen by an employee of the F.A. Pease engineering company, an admirer of English fiction, who was responsible for laying out the streets. Legend has it that he used an old English postal directory to name many of the streets.

By 1912, Shaker Village was incorporated and in 1931 the charter was approved, establishing the City of Shaker Heights. The combination of the natural beauty of the community and easy access to rapid transit enticed hundreds of families to build homes here during the 1920s and 1930s. This explosive growth was trumpeted in early Van Sweringen advertisements, declaring that families moved to Shaker Heights at a rate of one a day.

To ensure that their vision of Shaker was maintained in the midst of rapid growth and home construction, the Van Sweringens implemented a set of development guidelines mandating everything from setbacks, building heights, architectural styles, and material choices and colors. The brothers insisted that each home be architecturally unique.
This led to houses designed within one of three proscribed styles, English, French or Colonial, but embellished with small details of differing styles. Block after block of architecturally distinguished homes emerged. Currently, an impressive 80 percent of the City is located in the Shaker Village National Register Historic District, an acknowledgement that forward thinking and planning resulted in a valuable and enduring asset: the houses of Shaker Heights.

These standards of quality and strict development controls were applied to all homes in the Shaker Village, from the palatial to the most modest. It is the reason that many two-family homes throughout Shaker Heights have a distinctive design in which a single front door leads to separate entrances for each unit on the inside, giving the appearance of a single-family house. Winslow Road, the City's only street made up entirely of two-family homes, offers many examples of this design concept. In 2007, the street was officially recognized with a local historic district designation.

Educational, religious, and recreational institutions were important parts of the vision for the Shaker Village. In order to entice these institutions to relocate from Cleveland, the Van Sweringen brothers offered land to them free of charge. Institutions that responded to the offer include Hathaway Brown School, Laurel School, University School, Plymouth Church, and Shaker Country Club.

In 1922, the Shaker Heights Public Library opened in a room at Boulevard Elementary School. The collection included mostly children's books. The public's appetite for library services grew quickly. By 1951, the Main Library was housed in a newly constructed building containing more than 6,000 titles in what is today the Stephanie Tubbs Jones Community Building.

The Library expanded again to include a second branch, Bertram Woods, which opened in 1960. The award-winning Library now boasts a collection of over 200,000 books. Thirty thousand people hold Shaker library cards today, more than half a million people use the libraries each year and more than one million items are borrowed.

For many decades Shaker Heights enjoyed growing prosperity and stability. Schools, libraries, recreation opportunities, the Shaker Heights Historical Society, and many businesses grew and thrived. The Van Sweringens would have thought they had achieved their vision of an idyllic community filled with happy families enjoying the American dream of homeownership, children playing in the yard, and a new car in the garage. But their vision was deficient in one important respect: inclusiveness.

By the mid-1950s, national and local events surrounding racial desegregation forced the leadership and residents to reexamine long-held beliefs and ultimately to redefine the City. Years of restrictive covenants limited the numbers of black, Catholic, and Jewish families living in Shaker Heights.

In 1948, a U.S. Supreme Court decision made deeds with restrictions based on race illegal. In 1956, there was a bombing of a new home being built by a black family in Ludlow. These two events set into motion a sea change in Shaker that ultimately created the racially and economically diverse City we live in today.

Black families began to settle in the Ludlow neighborhood, which fast became the first landing spot for black families leaving Cleveland. After the 1956 bombing, both black and white neighbors came together to help the family rebuild and to begin a conversation about the future of their neighborhood and their City. It was a moment of unity, perhaps uncomfortable, but it was the foundation for a new day and the beginning of the peaceful integration of Shaker Heights.

Out of these first tentative steps toward inclusion, the Ludlow Community Association (LCA) was born in 1957. Its mission was to maintain Ludlow as a stable, vibrant, and racially balanced neighborhood, and to facilitate the racial integration of other neighborhoods. So successful was the effort to diversify Shaker's neighborhoods that local and national media profiled Shaker's peaceful, planned integration efforts. And so began a new chapter in the City's history.
The mission of the LCA was solidified and enhanced over the following decades. Several other initiatives were established to further the goals of successful citywide integration. In 1967, the Shaker Housing Office was established as part of the City's Department of Community Services to ensure the stable integration of neighborhoods. The Office provided services to encourage both white families to move into predominantly black neighborhoods, and black families to move into predominantly white neighborhoods. Efforts were also made to achieve racial balance in the schools through a voluntary busing program in the 1970s. In 1986, the Fund for the Future of Shaker Heights was formed to continue the proactive integration of neighborhoods through the provision of a down payment loan program to assist families making a pro-integrative move. Maintaining and celebrating the diversity of present day Shaker Heights has become a part of a shared value system and is a defining characteristic of the city.

The Nature Center at Shaker Lakes, now a beloved institution, was born from the same intense effort on the part of active citizens that was evident in the formation of the Ludlow Community Association. In 1964, park land at the City's western edge was threatened by a proposal from Cuyahoga County Engineer Albert Porter to build two eight-lane freeways with an interchange. A group of residents, who became known as Clark Freeway Fighters, waged a fierce battle for several years resulting in a change of plans and the creation in 1966 of the Nature Center. The City continued to prosper despite a population loss connected in large part to the shrinking population of the City of Cleveland. In response to that, and to further facilitate the integration of the schools, the City closed and repurposed four of its nine elementary schools in 1987. The Main Library was able to expand by moving into the former Moreland Elementary School. New institutions also were created. The Shaker Family Center, formerly Sussex Elementary, has become a gathering place for families with young children. Two other schools, Ludlow and Malvern, became homes to specialized private non-profit schools serving specific needs of school-age children.

As the 21st century dawned, the City's Strategic Investment Plan (SIP) was created to lay out goals and priorities, particularly as they pertained to attracting private investment to help secure its prosperity. The document still serves as the framework around which development plans are made and offers yet another example of the steady leadership and planning that define Shaker Heights.

Between 2000 and 2010, guided by the SIP, the City undertook several development projects to augment the City's green space and built environment. Honoring the principles of the Garden City movement, the City's largest green space, Horseshoe Lake Park, was revitalized. Developed in the 1930s and 1940s around one of the original Shaker sawmill ponds, the park features picnic pavilions, playground equipment, and walking trails used by residents nearly year 'round. In 2007, land adjacent to the Shaker Boulevard Rapid tracks was repurposed as a paved trail for use by walkers, runners, and bike riders.

During this period, significant public and private investment was made in the Shaker Town Center area, including Shaker Commons on the south side of Chagrin. Also included were infrastructure improvements, investment in roads and streetscape work. The crown jewel of the refurbished district was a firehouse completed in 2005, the first new civic building constructed in years.

Also in 2007, a complete renovation of Thornton Park, the City's primary recreation facility, was undertaken. The enhanced pool, playground, skate park, basketball court, tennis courts, sledding hill, and an indoor ice rink hum with the active engagement of residents of all ages at all times of the year. It is at once a multi-purpose recreation facility and a community gathering place.

Responding to the market demand for new housing for young professionals and empty nesters, three upscale condominium developments were built: Sussex Courts, South Park Row, and Avalon Station. By the end of October 2011, residents had begun moving into Library Court, newly constructed apartments specifically designed for adults 55 and older. The tradition of high quality housing for which Shaker is known is evident in each of these developments.
The dawn of the 21st century also brought macro and micro economic upheaval, which led to local economic challenges in the City. Diminished tax revenue due to a global recession, deep cuts in state and federal support, and a weakened housing sector required that City leaders exercise fiscal discipline and thoughtful long-term planning in order to maintain the same high level of services and quality of life for which Shaker is known.

As part of the long-term planning of the early part of the new century, City leaders turned their focus to the need for a broader tax base to bolster the City's financial position. Created as a strictly residential community, Shaker's aging infrastructure and a changing economy required strides in a different direction. With the completion of a comprehensive economic development plan in 2010, the City directed resources toward revitalization of two major commercial districts: Warrensville/Van Aken and Chagrin/Lee.

When completed, the Warrensville/Van Aken area will be transformed into a transit-oriented, walkable district designed to attract new commercial and retail activity centered on a public transportation hub.

Anchoring the Chagrin/Lee project is a bold public-private partnership, Shaker LaunchHouse, an early-stage business accelerator and shared entrepreneurial office space. It is proving to be one of the region's most progressive economic development ideas. LaunchHouse has a clear mission: to nurture entrepreneurial ideas into profitable businesses. The Shaker Heights Development Corporation has an equity stake in LaunchHouse's portfolio companies. In time, these ventures are expected to contribute to the revitalization of Lee Road and the overall economic growth of the City and possibly the region, making Shaker Heights once again a model and a leader.

As the City celebrates its Centennial, we can look to the past and reflect on the present to see that the identity of the community has evolved from a shared set of beliefs to a shared set of values. The passionate commitment of residents – to each other and to the continued growth and prosperity of Shaker Heights – is the cornerstone of these values and identity. It is what keeps people here and brings people back. It is our most defining characteristic.

An old advertisement from the Van Sweringen Company says, "Most communities just happen; the best are planned." Many of the major milestones in the history of Shaker stand as prime examples of good planning, strong leadership, and resident engagement, and persist as hallmarks of the Shaker Heights legacy. They have made this city distinctive and have enabled it to adapt to changing times and changing needs. These characteristics tether us to our past, provide a springboard into the future, and fuel us on a confident path into our next 100 years.
A Planner Should Be Flexible

April 7th, 2009
by PCJ Editor Wayne Senville, reporting from Shaker Heights, Ohio

“Flexibility … that’s the most important part of my job,” Shaker Heights Planning Director Joyce Braverman told me. She even carries a small reminder of this in her purse, the world famous — and very flexible — Gumby.

As Braverman peered out over stacks of maps and reports, I asked her what her job in this inner-ring Cleveland suburb involved. She ticked off a long list of “to do’s”: working on the Shaker Town Center redevelopment project; seeking funding for a major transit-oriented development plan at a key intersection; attending numerous public meetings; staffing an active planning commission and architectural review board; coordinating with the City’s separate housing and economic development departments; dealing with a growing number of foreclosed homes; and “doing a lot of grant writing.” You need to be flexible to handle such a diverse assortment of tasks.

The Cleveland inner suburb of Shaker Heights

Flexibility also is a good way of thinking about Shaker Heights. I say that because Shaker provides its residents a considerable amount of flexibility in their housing choices. You’ll find a very wide range of housing types and housing prices in this suburb of 27,245. About 40% of the housing stock consists of two-family homes and apartments. At the other end of the spectrum, you’ll find no shortage of million dollar homes.

Historically, Shaker Heights as a community has pro-actively sought to maintain a mix of housing and, as a result, a mix of incomes and ethnic backgrounds. “Diversity helps make a place,” Braverman noted.

Years ago, Shaker Heights even had a city department titled “the Department of Pro-Integration” — sending out a message that Shaker wanted to be an racially integrated community.
This viewpoint is still reflected in city policy and programs, and in community attitudes. For example, since 1986 the non-profit “Fund for the Future of Shaker Heights” has provided home loans for owner-occupied housing “in areas in which the purchasers will enhance the racial diversity of the neighborhood.” The Fund matches up to 10% of the purchase price up to a maximum of $18,000.

Census data for 2000 shows that Shaker Heights has remained integrated, with 61.7% white population, and 34.5% African-American. There has also been a growing proportion of Asian and Hispanic residents, though the total is still relatively small (for example, the Asian population grew from 1.9% to 3.8% between 1990 and 2000).

Interestingly, Shaker Heights’ diversity is part of what attracts quite a few people to the community, including those who work at the nearby Cleveland Clinic and Case-Western Reserve University. In fact, my sister-in-law, Cheri Shapero (a Shaker Heights resident) handed me a copy of the April/May issue of *Shaker Life Magazine* which featured articles on “Shaker’s International Flair,” highlighting why families from Lebanon, India, the Netherlands, and Serbia chose Shaker Heights as their new hometown.

In reading through the articles, it also struck me how diversity, when paired with high quality public schools and an attractive, walkable environment, seemed to especially resonate with those from abroad.

*yes, Shaker Heights even has its own magazine, published by the City’s Communications & Outreach Department and distributed free every other month to all Shaker Heights residents.*
Ludlow: Our Civil Rights Landmark

In January 1956, a bomb exploded on Corby Road in the Ludlow neighborhood where a home was being built for a young African-American couple. That terrible incident was the catalyst for the peaceful integration of Shaker Heights. It spurred small groups of neighbors to start meeting in living rooms to get to know each other, build community, and stop panic selling.

Those conversations expanded into block meetings and gatherings at Ludlow Elementary School and area churches. All this led to the 1957 establishment of the Ludlow Community Association by residents who wanted to maintain their neighborhood as a wonderful place to live and raise a family. In 1961, it incorporated in order to make short-term loans to prospective buyers.

After World War II, African Americans had begun moving into the Ludlow neighborhood from nearby Cleveland. One such family was that of Louis and Jeannette Stokes, who bought a home on Albion Road so that their four children would have a good education in the Shaker Schools. The oldest, Shelley, recently articulated – in her Goucher College master’s thesis in historic preservation – the importance of the Ludlow Community Association in the context of the national civil rights movement. In the process, she claimed the story of her family’s history.

Shaker Heights is in the National Register of Historic Places as a Garden City, but, in Shelley’s view, that does not go nearly far enough. Her 2011 thesis, “Recognizing Ludlow – A National Treasure: A Community that Stood Firm for Equality,” makes the case that the U.S. National Park Service should amend Shaker Heights’ inclusion in the National Register to reflect its full heritage – that is, for Shaker to be given its due not merely as a Garden City, but as a national historic landmark for civil rights, and for the Ludlow neighborhood to be recognized as a civil rights heritage site.
I hope conversations about my research will continue so that one day the National Park Service will amend Shaker’s inclusion in the National Register to recognize our community’s work on open housing and civil rights. – Shelley Stokes-Hammond

She writes in her thesis that the founders and members of the Ludlow Community Association were “pioneers who reversed the tide of white flight, blockbusting, and resegregation... They maintained and protected equal access to home ownership and a good education for the entire community of residents – black, white, Asian, Christian, Jewish – and persuasively argued that the value of that community was greater because it was integrated.”

And these visionary neighbors had neither the Civil Rights Act of 1964 nor the Fair Housing Act of 1968 as bedrock for their actions.

Her thesis also includes a history of the African-American experience in housing and education, from slavery to the middle of the 20th century. She notes that from the early days of Shaker Heights until the mid-1950s, the majority of African Americans living in the city were servants. The Van Sweringen Company had instituted restrictive covenants to create club-like privacy in Shaker and reserved the right to approve or veto the purchase of property. These deeds effectively excluded African Americans, Jews, and Catholics from buying in Shaker, even though the Supreme Court had ruled against such practices in 1948.

Shelley and her sisters Angela Stokes and Kathryn Foster Manuel are Shaker Heights High School graduates; their brother, Chuck, and sister, Lori, finished school in Maryland, because the family moved to Silver Spring in 1970, following their father’s election to the United States Congress.
States House of Representatives.

Because Shelley’s teacher and principal at Ludlow Elementary School encouraged her writing, she majored in English at Ohio University. After graduation, she worked for the Bell Telephone system in Maryland for 18 years and was among the first African Americans in management there. Since 1997, she has been a development and public relations officer at Howard University.

This past June, Stokes-Hammond made her case for Ludlow’s inclusion as a civil rights heritage site at a program hosted by the Shaker Heights Public Library, where Shaker Life caught up with her.

What are some of your memories of growing up in the Stokes family?

My father was a civil rights and criminal defense lawyer. He knew what was happening in Ludlow. We moved there in 1960, when I was going into the fifth grade.

I spent a lot of time with my grandmother, Louise Stokes. When I was little, I liked to look at her photo album and family Bible, which contained many names and dates. I asked her lots of questions, so she told me stories about my extended family. Later on, she asked me what I’d learned in college, and I began telling her about a class I’d taken in African-American history. When I got to sharecropping, she said, “I know. We called it ‘croppin.’”

I hadn’t realized that this was part of my history, and later visited the only member of my grandmother’s family who hadn’t migrated north from Wrens, Georgia. The place where they grew up was torn down, but next door – and still standing – were the slave quarters. With that, all the pieces came together for me: the African-American experience and home.
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And that led me to think about the difference Shaker made. It’s such a journey. Each of us has a role to play in this life process; each of us is another link in the chain.

Tell us how growing up in Ludlow helped you advocate for your own children.

I left Bell because I needed to be at home with my sons, who had encountered discrimination in school. They were attending a math-science magnet school in Chevy Chase, Maryland, and were being treated as if they weren’t capable. I fought grade when his family became the first African Americans in Sussex. He remembers that a lot of window curtains flew open in houses on the block on the day they moved in, and that “someone came out and said, ‘Well, where are the Milters?’ My dad said, ‘We bought this house.’ We eventually had some very nice neighbors. Some folks probably did move away, but there were no problems that I know of once we moved in.”

“My dad didn’t come up easy,” he says. “He survived World War II and was one of the first African-American IRS agents. My mom was a very determined lady. So this little housing thing was a blip compared to all the other things that they had handled in their lives.”

Nonetheless, of the Milters’ straw buy, he says, “In my view, what Carolyn and Burt did was participate in the civil rights movement. I applaud them.”

Ernest Senior died in 1972. Jackie, who became ill, recently moved to Georgia to be with her son, which put the Townley Road house on the market again – for the first time since 1967.

Why did you decide to earn a degree in historic preservation?

Growing up in Ludlow, I knew that learning was valued, and not just for the credentials. I thought about going to law school, but then I discovered Goucher College’s historic preservation program, and it seemed like a way to continue what I learned from my grandmother’s Bible and the stories she told.

It took six years to earn my master’s degree, because I was raising my three sons and working full-time. I took every class that gave me the opportunity to build on my story, from historic documentation to nonfiction writing. I didn’t find the
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connection between my story and historic preservation until Betsy Bradley [former Shaker resident and Goucher adjunct faculty] made the link. She pointed out that Shaker Heights is recognized on the National Register of Historic Places because of the Van Sweringens and Frederick Law Olmsted – not because of the community’s work with integration and civil rights. I also met [Shaker resident and local history librarian] Meghan Hays along the way, and she became director of my thesis.

Your thesis says that Shaker’s designation on the National Register of Historic Places should be amended to include Ludlow as a civil rights landmark.

Yes. For many years, historic preservation didn’t include the cultural past. Then, places and events in the south – Central High School in Little Rock and the hotel where Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. was assassinated – received official recognition. But there is nothing to reflect what was happening in the north in the late 1950s and 1960s. During that same time period, African Americans were moving into Ludlow. Many had slavery in their pasts – why else the restrictive covenants? – but they also had the American dream of owning a home.

Because of the Ludlow Community Association’s work against those covenants, Shaker Heights meets the updated federal criteria to be designated a national historic landmark for civil rights. It is time for Ludlow to receive the recognition it deserves. I hope conversations about my research will continue so that one day the National Park Service will amend Shaker’s inclusion in the National Register to recognize our community’s work on open housing and civil rights.

What do you do for fun?

Being in school gave me happiness. Researching subjects that go back to when I was eight or nine years old did something for me – I am supposed to share these stories. And I count my time – even by phone – with my sons, loved ones, and people who lift my spirit as fun and happiness.
International Flair

Families from all parts of the world solidify Shaker’s reputation as a diverse and internationally minded community. By Nancy O’Connor

Stefanie Jansen traveled from the Netherlands to Cleveland in July 2007 with a “must have” list in hand. Her husband Etienne was being transferred to the Highland Heights office of a Dutch multinational company, Philips, for three years, and the hunt was on for a home for the family.

“On my list was ‘good school district,’ ‘close to facilities’ such as shops, schools, and library, and ‘sidewalks,’ so I could still walk or ride my bike,” says Stefanie, who has two young daughters. Relocation specialists showed the couple several eastside communities but, she says, “Shaker had all the items on my list and more. The beautiful old houses, the trees, and people walking on the sidewalks with dogs and strollers – it just felt like home.”

For Mohammad Irfan, a professor of Mechanical Engineering from Pakistan, the opportunity to do post-doctoral work at Case Western Reserve University on a Fulbright Scholarship meant moving to the Cleveland area with his wife and two school-aged children. For him, the quality of the school district was paramount in deciding where to settle.

“My wife and I searched different websites for school rankings,” he says. “The Shaker Heights public schools were consistently ranked as among the best in Cleveland. Choosing a school for our children, sitting across oceans and continents, was a big leap of faith. So before arriving in Cleveland, we contacted the schools by email and got a very positive response. Upon arrival, we took our children to the school administration and everyone was very friendly to us and made the children feel very comfortable in a foreign land.”

He finds that “Shaker stands out for the diversity in its student population, coming from all over the world. My son is learning Chinese in second grade. That is what I call an international approach to education.”

The Jansens and Irfans are just two of many families from all parts of the world who contribute to Shaker’s international flair and solidify its reputation as a diverse and internationally minded community. In any given year, the Shaker Heights School District enrolls students from more than 40 countries, the children of researchers, business executives, medical professionals, educators, graduate students, and others drawn to the area by Cleveland’s corporate, medical, and higher education institutions.
Walkability

While the quality of schools is among Shaker's key selling points, the City's appeal doesn't stop there. Shaker native Marge Russell Judd, who specializes in "selling" Northeast Ohio as president of Executive Arrangements in Beachwood, says, "Organizations hire us to help create positive first impressions during recruiting or relocation. We help the professionals and their families fall in love with Northeast Ohio, to understand the quality of life available to them here, and to explore what their options are in places to call home."

Shaker holds particular appeal to Western Europeans, she finds. "They want pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods. They are accustomed to walking, biking, and pushing strollers where they need to go. They appreciate Shaker's urban lifestyle amenities, like having the Rapid a close walk from home and the dining and shopping available at Shaker Square and the Warrensville-Van Aiken centers."

Shaker also attracts those who want neighborhoods with character, she notes. "They are looking for a unique, individual home, not a cookie-cutter development. They take one look at a place like Shaker, with its curb appeal, trees, and winding streets, and it feels good."

Judd's two largest clients — The Cleveland Clinic Foundation and University Hospitals — are also the two largest corporate employers in Northeast Ohio. According to the Greater Cleveland Partnership, Cleveland also boasts 11 Fortune 500 companies, another 13 Fortune 1000 companies, and 150 international companies from 25 different countries, contributing to a steady influx of international talent in the region.

Shaker's Community Information Specialist Judy Steehler is in regular contact with the human resource departments at many of these companies, providing them with Shaker Heights information packets for prospective and relocating employees. She also offers complimentary tours of the City, arranges school visits, and shows rental properties. (Homebuyers are referred to realtors.)

About a third of the 150-200 potential new residents Steehler works with each year are from other countries. Most, she finds, have researched the City online before setting foot in Shaker Heights.
“The Cleveland Clinic, University Hospitals, Case Western, and other employers provide links on their websites to Shaker’s site [www.shakeraline.com] to help people explore their housing options,” Steehler says.

Consequently, she says, many newcomers arrive knowing exactly what they are looking for. “Many of the Asian families, for instance, know they want to settle in the Boulevard area, because of its large international population and proximity to University Circle. For others, living within walking distance to a grocery store is important, as many wives of transplants don’t drive. Close proximity to Family Connections at Shaker Family Center is a priority for some families with small children, who have learned about its playgroups and Learning English as a Family program.”

Internet Influence

Glenda Moss, registrar for the Shaker Heights School District, can also attest to the growing influence of the Internet on families moving here from overseas.

“Almost all new families have seen our website [www.shaker.org] and know something about us when they first visit. They are impressed with our school offerings and say they’ve heard we have a great school system.”

On the large world map that hangs in the registration office, new families are encouraged to identify their home countries with a push pin. “You’d be hard pressed to find a country anywhere in the world without a pin,” Moss says.
Glenda Moss, the Shaker School District's registrar, in her office where a welcome poster greets families in 25 languages.

She is hopeful that more foreign high-school-aged students will choose to spend a year studying in Shaker, now that the District has become authorized to issue special 1-20 visas for students. "We have one student from China here this year, living with relatives in Shaker Heights, and another expected to come next fall," Moss says. 1-20 visa students pay full tuition and their own personal expenses, and must arrange for their own housing.

Once they arrive, international students and families find Shaker Heights a very hospitable community. Says Stefanie Jansen, "People made us feel welcomed and helped us get acclimated within no time. They invited us for dinner and social get-togethers, and introduced us to other families."

Initially, her daughters Laura, 5, and Audrey, 4, spoke no English. "In Holland, English is taught at schools starting at the age of 12. So the girls' only knowledge of English was some Dora-the-Explorer English. But when they started preschool, they mastered English in only a few months."

Many families take advantage of the English as a Second Language programs offered in Shaker, including free classes at the Shaker Heights Public Library and Family Connections. (See sidebar.) Each public school building also offers ESL instruction to help students quickly gain the communication skills they need.
English Made Easy

A number of free language programs are available to Shaker’s international residents who desire to strengthen their English skills.

FOR STUDENTS:
- Each Shaker Heights public school building offers the services of a specialist in English as a Second Language (ESL) who works with students to help them become proficient as quickly as possible. The ESL teachers structure classes around the needs of their students, depending on their strengths and the areas where they need more practice.

FOR ADULTS:
- English in Action class for adults meets Tuesday evenings, 7-9 pm at Shaker Heights Public Library, 16500 Van Aken Boulevard. For more information, call (216) 991-2030.
- Free English class for adults meets Tuesday mornings from 10-11:30 am at Plymouth Church, 2860 Coventry Road. For more information, contact Ellen Potter, (440) 247-6146.

FOR FAMILIES:
- Learning English As a Family (LEAF) meets Monday evenings from 6:40-8 pm at Family Connections at Shaker Family Center, 19824 Sussex Road. A home visit program is also available. Call (216) 921-2023 for more information.

According to Family Connections Director Joanne Federman, the value of an ESL program can go beyond language acquisition. “In our Learning English As a Family classes, we also educate international families about community and area resources and American customs and holidays, and we help them know what to expect when entering Shaker schools,” Federman says.

Family Connections also facilitates networking and friendship-building through its toddler play groups, open gym sessions, and social events, including an annual International Potluck Dinner.

However long their stay in the States, finding a global-minded community like Shaker Heights is a godsend for many international families.

“Cleveland, with its Midwest values, is a well-kept secret when it comes to a high-quality standard of life while raising a family,” says Jansen. “Shaker Heights offers beauty, good schools, and an international-oriented community with a lot of young families. We signed an assignment contract for, in principle, three years— but hopefully we will end up staying longer.”
Summary

During the last three decades, the United States has become more racially and ethnically diverse. We examine this trend at the local level, where the consequences of increased diversity for the economy, education, and politics regularly prompt debate, if not rancor. Decennial census and ACS data spanning the 1980-2010 period allow us to determine (a) the pervasiveness of diversity across America, focusing on metropolitan, micropolitan, and rural areas and places, and (b) the community characteristics that correlate with diversity.

We find that almost all communities—whether large immigrant gateways or small towns in the nation's heartland—have grown more diverse. However, the data show a wide range of diversity profiles, from predominantly white communities (a shrinking number) to minority-majority and no-majority ones (an increasing number). The pace of local diversity gains, as well as shifts in racial-ethnic composition, has similarly varied.

While surging Hispanic and Asian populations often drive these patterns, other groups, including African immigrants, Native Americans, and multi-racial individuals, contribute to the distinctive mixes evident from one community to the next.

As for the correlates of diversity, communities with large populations, abundant rental housing, and a range of jobs are more diverse. So are those where the government and/or the military is a key employer. Locationally, diversity tends to be higher in coastal regions and along the southern border.

In short, a growing number of Americans now live in communities where multiple groups—Hispanics, blacks, and Asians as well as whites—are present in significant proportions.
Key Findings

The United States, once ‘white-dominant,’ is increasingly multi-hued, multi-lingual, multi-ethnic. Over the last three decades, immigrants from Latin America, Asia, and elsewhere have expanded the population of minority residents beyond African Americans. If this trend continues, the United States will eventually have as many ‘minority’ as ‘non-minority’ residents. ‘Majority-minority’ communities already exist, not just in California, Hawaii, and the Southwest but closer to the heartland as minority group members gravitate toward new destinations.

This brief traces the evolution of America into a diverse society, with a special focus on the local scene. It puts a mirror to the changing face of our metropolitan, micropolitan, and rural communities, showing which ones have grown more diverse from 1980 through 2010 and pinpointing key community characteristics that correlate with diversity. The following insights emerge:

- Virtually all types of communities have become more racially and ethnically diverse since 1980. However, they vary in the magnitude of diversity, its composition, and its pace.
- Burgeoning Hispanic and Asian populations have contributed to a major transformation, reducing the number of all-white places and increasing the number of minority-majority and no-majority ones.
- As of 2010, the most diverse communities in the U.S. are disproportionately western, southern, and coastal metropolitan areas and their principal cities and suburbs. Diversity rankings (from top to bottom) have remained quite stable over time.
- Other than location, the community characteristics related to diversity are (a) large total and foreign-born populations; (b) high rental occupancy, as a community needs a supply of rental housing to accommodate newcomers; (c) a range of occupational options, including entry-level jobs; and (d) a low minority-to-white income ratio.
- ‘Company towns’—where the company is the government and/or the military—are also diverse. Retirement and education enclaves do not show the same correlation with community racial-ethnic diversity.
Subtle Forms of Discrimination Still Exist for Minority Homeseekers

HUD regularly sponsors a decennial study to monitor discrimination in the rental and sales markets. *Housing Discrimination Against Racial and Ethnic Minorities 2012*, the fourth study in the series, estimates current discrimination against black, Hispanic, and Asian homeseekers compared with white homeseekers and explores the incidence of sales steering, variations in discrimination, and unequal treatment of minority homeseekers in specific metropolitan areas. HUD and local fair housing organizations use the data collected from this study to inform future efforts to combat all forms of housing discrimination.

**Paired Testing Measures Differential Treatment**

These discrimination studies use the paired-testing methodology. During the testing, one minority and one white individual tester of the same age and gender pose as homeseekers with similar family circumstances, jobs, and education levels. Both applicants are unambiguously well qualified for the advertised units in terms of income. The test identifies differential treatment between minorities and whites by housing providers by recording instances in which whites were favored and those where minorities were favored, and presents the difference between the two as a net measurement of discrimination against minorities. Researchers acknowledge that the testers are not representative of the average minority renter or homebuyer — in many metropolitan areas, minority residents have lower average incomes than white residents. In addition, this measurement takes into account instances of potential reverse discrimination, lowering net discrimination against minorities.

Paired testing was used to evaluate the treatment of homeseekers during three phases in the rental and sales processes: making the rental/sales appointment, meeting with rental housing providers/sales agents in person, and inspecting available rental units/for-sale homes. Testing was conducted in 28 metropolitan areas around the country to gain current national estimates of discrimination and in the 8 largest black and 8 largest Hispanic metropolitan areas to gain valid local estimates of rental discrimination.

**Housing Options for Minorities Are Limited**

Researchers found that across the study areas, taking all three phases of the paired-testing process into account, minorities are at a disadvantage compared with whites primarily in two of the three phases:

During the rental inquiry process, black, Hispanic, and Asian renters were as likely as white renters to be able to arrange meetings with rental agents. Black renters learned about 11.4 percent fewer available units during these meetings and were shown 4.2 percent fewer units than equally qualified white renters. Hispanic renters learned...
about 12.5 percent fewer available units and were shown 7.5 percent fewer units than whites. Asians learned about 9.8 percent fewer available units and were shown 6.6 percent fewer units than whites.

During the inquiry process for homebuyers, Hispanic and Asian homebuyers were as likely as white homebuyers to be able to obtain an appointment with a sales agent; however, black homebuyers were slightly less likely than white homebuyers to do so. Black homebuyers learned about 17 percent fewer homes and were shown 17.7 percent fewer homes than equally qualified white homebuyers. Asian homebuyers learned about 15.5 percent fewer available homes and were shown 18.8 percent fewer homes than whites. Hispanics did not learn about or view a significantly different number of homes than whites.

Minority homeseekers whose ethnicity was easily identifiable experienced more discrimination than did minorities who could be mistaken for white. In terms of steering, most available homes for rent and purchase that were shown to the testers were located in majority-white neighborhoods; however, the difference in the neighborhoods’ racial makeup (percentage of white residents) shown to minority homeseekers and white homeseekers was not significant. Similarly, no significant differences existed in the incidence and severity of discrimination by metropolitan area or region. Overall, having their searches limited by rental and sales agents’ discriminatory practices increases the cost and time minorities need to spend on finding a suitable home and constrains the choices available to them and their families.

Tracking Discrimination over Time

Although researchers could not use the 2000 and 2012 studies to make direct comparisons of discrimination because of changes in the testing methodology and in the housing market (including the steep rise in Internet use when searching for a home), researchers have been able to use the reports to summarize general trends since 1977, as shown in figure 1.

**Figure 1. Long-Term Trends in Discriminatory Treatment of Blacks and Hispanics**

![Graph showing long-term trends in discriminatory treatment of blacks and Hispanics.](image)

In 2012, homeseekers were much less likely to be denied access to available units than in 1977. (Because Asian homeseekers have been included in the studies only since 2000, long-term data are not available). Discrimination against Hispanics in general has dropped to fairly low levels since 1989, the year the first study of discrimination against Hispanics was done.

The study attributes part of the positive changes in housing opportunity to the Fair Housing Act as well as to changes in rental and sales agents’ social views. Although these changes have curtailed the most severe types of housing discrimination, more subtle forms of discrimination still exist in the rental and sales markets, and these forms of discrimination are almost impossible for individuals to detect themselves. The researchers suggest that targeted fair housing enforcement and education can address these discreet forms of discrimination. Local fair housing organizations can conduct similar paired testing — especially in the sales market, where greater levels of discrimination are present — to expose unequal treatment in specific neighborhoods or by specific companies. Such efforts have historically focused on black communities; expanding their use in Hispanic and Asian communities could be particularly beneficial. This report continues HUD’s ongoing efforts to understand the discrimination that still exists for minority homeseekers and can help to inform strategies to promote fair and equitable housing opportunities for all.
Study Finds Racially Diverse Suburban Communities Growing Faster than White Suburbs but Resegregation Threatens Prosperity and Stability

JULY 20, 2012—Racially diverse suburbs are growing faster than white suburbs, but resegregation threatens their prosperity and stability, according to a study entitled, "America's Racially Diverse Suburbs: Opportunities and Challenges," released this week by the Institute on Metropolitan Opportunity at the University of Minnesota Law School.

Long perceived as predominantly prosperous white enclaves, suburbs are now at the cutting edge of racial, ethnic and political change in America. The study finds the number of racially diverse suburbs, municipalities ranging from 20-60 percent non-white, increased from 1,006 to 1,376 between 2000 and 2010 in the 50 largest U.S. metropolitan areas (a 37 percent increase). Fully 44 percent of suburban residents in these areas now live in racially diverse communities, up from 38 percent in 2000. Moreover, racially diverse suburbs are growing faster than white suburbs, and the number of diverse neighborhoods in suburbs is now more than twice the number found in central cities.

"Diverse suburbs represent some of the nation's greatest hopes and its gravest challenges," says study co-author Myron Orfield, director of the Institute on Metropolitan Opportunity. "The rapidly growing diversity of suburban communities suggests a degree of declining racial bias and at least the partial success of fair housing laws. But the fragile demographic stability in these newly diverse suburbs presents serious challenges for local, state and federal governments."

The study finds that racially diverse suburban communities have many attractive features, including relatively strong tax bases, low poverty rates, and strong local economies. They also are more walkable and energy efficient. According to Orfield, these findings are consistent with other research showing that diverse communities have higher graduation rates for minority students, better access to college and middle-income jobs, better race relations, greater civic engagement by all, and enhanced ability to cope with America's increasingly diverse workplaces.

However, while representing great hope, these diverse suburbs face challenges, the most serious being resegregation. The study finds that many of these communities are in the midst of racial, social and economic transition, abetted by mortgage lending and insurance discrimination, subsidized housing placement, exclusionary zoning, and racial gerrymandering of school attendance boundaries.

The study proposes a number of public policy changes to help to stabilize diverse communities:

- Creation of local stable integration plans with fair housing ordinances, incentives for pro-integrative home loans, cooperative efforts with local school districts, and financial support of pro-integrative community-based organizations.
- Greater enforcement of existing civil rights laws including the Fair Housing Act, especially the sections related to racial steering, mortgage lending discrimination and location of publicly subsidized affordable housing.
- Adoption of regional strategies to limit exclusionary zoning and require affluent suburbs to accommodate their fair share of affordable housing.
- Adoption of metropolitan-scale strategies to promote more diverse schools.

"Resegregation is common but not inevitable," says Orfield. "Stable integration is possible but it does not happen by accident. It is the product of clear race-conscious strategies, hard work, and political collaboration among local governments. Racially diverse communities represent the best model for the nation's educational, economic and political success."

ABOUT THE INSTITUTE ON METROPOLITAN OPPORTUNITY
The Institute on Metropolitan Opportunity at the University of Minnesota Law School investigates the ways that laws, policies and practices affect development patterns in U.S. metropolitan regions. Through top-level scholarship, mapping, and advocacy, it provides the resources policymakers, planning officials and community organizations need to address reform in taxation, land use, housing, metropolitan governance and education. More information is available at [http://www.law.umn.edu/metro.html](http://www.law.umn.edu/metro.html).
Wright, Holloway, and Ellis

Data from the 2010 Census have offered up another benchmark for use in tracking the feel-good demographic story of America’s steady desegregation. Edward Glaeser and Jacob Vigdor looked at the latest statistics earlier this year and went so far as to declare, in a widely circulated paper for the Manhattan Institute, that we have reached "THE END OF THE SEGREGATED CENTURY."

Their best evidence is condensed in this chart, which tracks two common academic indices of segregation over the past 120 years (tracing the peak of segregation following the Great Migration of blacks out of the South into Northern cities, through its persistent decline over the last four decades):
American cities, the authors concluded, are more integrated today than they’ve been at any point over the past century. Although, as a number of dissenters were quick to point out, "more integrated" does not necessarily mean "we’re finally done desegregating." (Nor does it mean we have done anything about the growing problem of economic segregation.)

There is a certain cognitive dissonance to much of this data: Nationwide statistics suggest more blacks and whites now live side-by-side, but plenty of communities have seen no such effect. It appears as if the once-prevalent all-white neighborhood has gone virtually extinct. But its all-black counterpart has not. The number of multi-ethnic neighborhoods in America is on the rise, but recent research suggests that when blacks move out of predominantly black neighborhoods, they usually head to… other predominantly black neighborhoods.

So are we supposed to pat ourselves on the back here, or what?

Researchers Richard Wright, Steven R. Holloway, and Mark Ellis have offered a more useful way to think about this: New forms of diversity are emerging in America, but so, too, are new forms of segregation. Wright, a professor of geography at Dartmouth, explains it this way in the following video:

Rather than thinking of segregation and diversity as being on a continuum from segregated to diverse, moving linearly between those two points, our research admits to the possibility of folds in that continuum. You can have segregation and diversity in the same place, at the same time.

In other words, many cities are seeing an increase in integrated neighborhoods and an increase in segregated ones at the same time. Here’s Washington, D.C., as captured in the 1990, 2000 and 2010 censuses, from the researchers’ work:
The deep orange swaths are white-dominant census tracts with low diversity; light orange covers majority-white neighborhoods with moderate diversity; dark green covers black neighborhoods with low diversity; and light green covers majority-black neighborhoods with moderate diversity. The time sequence above shows that much of the all-white Washington suburban region has now become moderately diverse. But the dark green area (black neighborhoods with scant diversity) has expanded, too, to the east of the city.

Here is the complicated picture in Atlanta, where mostly black neighborhoods are not so much as disappearing from the city’s core as they are moving around it:

And Baltimore:
And Chicago:

And Dallas (where Hispanic communities are represented in purple):

You can look up the maps of 53 American cities (and every state) [here](#), but bottom line: No, it is not time to pat ourselves on the back yet.

Keywords: Atlanta, Baltimore, Chicago, Dallas, Washington, DC, Diversity, Segregation, 2010 Census

Finding Common Ground:
COORDINATING HOUSING AND EDUCATION POLICY TO PROMOTE INTEGRATION
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For the past eight years, UC Berkeley’s Center for Cities & Schools (CC&S) has engaged in action-oriented research focused on the challenges and promise of integrated and inclusive planning practices and policies. The Center has learned by doing that overcoming a century of siloed institutional practices is no small task. However, the benefits of bringing together city and regional planning agencies, on the one hand, and school districts/local educational agencies (LEAs), on the other, far outweigh the costs of maintaining the status quo.

In any given case the challenges are multiple: high concentrations of poverty and racial segregation in schools as well as neighborhoods; a growing achievement gap as reflected in test scores and high school graduation rates between more affluent, mostly white and Asian students and African American and Latino students; years or even generations of systemic neglect in infrastructure investments in school facilities and neighborhoods; and well-intended educational and planning policies that in many cases did more harm than good.

For CC&S and its allies, “integration” is both a means and an end: integrated and inclusive planning practices and policies are the means to truly sustainable communities; communities that are racially and economically integrated are more likely to survive and thrive.

Neighborhoods, cities and entire regions can structure inequality long before students and teachers even arrive at school. Planning represents a unique opportunity to drill down to these root causes of unequal and segregated schools: on the one hand, by repeatedly drawing attention to problematic housing and transportation policies that can structure inequality through land use plans and zoning policies that lead to fragmentation and urban sprawl; and, on the other, by supporting efforts for planners and educators to work together to create “win-win” situations. This approach has meant framing the profound connections between housing, transportation and education in ways that do justice to the complexity of the situation while keeping in mind that policy-makers, planners and educators need very practical ideas and tools that they can use to make a difference today.

The aim of this chapter is, first, to frame some of those connections with reference to the Center’s work and the work of others in the areas of housing, transportation and collaborative city-school-region initiatives; and, second, to explain how the lessons learned from this work is starting to inform regional, state and federal policy.
HOUSING, TRANSPORTATION, AND CITY-SCHOOL-REGION INITIATIVES

In this section, we offer a snapshot of the challenges and the promise of integrated and inclusive planning and policy making in the areas of housing, transportation and city-school-regional initiatives by describing some of our work with municipalities and school districts in the San Francisco Bay Area as well as a number of promising practices from around the nation identified in a recent survey and CC&S report.2

Housing: from Affordability to High Quality Homes and Schools.

CC&S has worked with some of the largest housing authorities in the Bay Area region and around the nation. Whether in San Francisco or the East Bay, this work often comes down to providing families and their children with choices that support integrated and diverse neighborhoods and schools. Over the past several years, for example, the Center has been involved with HOPE SF, an effort led by the San Francisco Mayor’s office and San Francisco Housing Authority to create mixed-income developments modeled on the federal HOPE VI housing program. Our 2009 study entitled Creating Pathways of Educational and Neighborhood Success lays out how the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) can work with HOPE SF to align planning and education policies and practices. After decades of a court ordered desegregation policy that had largely decoupled residence from school attendance, SFUSD school assignment policies now have a closer relationship between where families live and the schools they are assigned to by creating “zones”. The District, however, has maintained a priority for students in areas of concentrated poverty and low performing schools to choose a higher performing school anywhere in the city. To increase low income students’ choices further, HOPE SF is now coordinating and aligning its efforts with SFUSD to support mixed-income communities that have access to nearby high quality housing and schools. The goal over time is that revitalized neighborhoods will not only retain but attract new residents whose children are given greater access to good schools that are racially and economically integrated.3

In the East Bay, Oakland Unified School District (OUSD) and the Oakland Housing Authority (OHA) also have joined forces by finding new ways to include housing within educational policies, development, and decision-making. In the past, the district would rely largely on test scores as a measure of academic achieve-

“3 key points to finding the “win-win”:”

1. Housing: Regional and local planning offer important data/insight regarding population shifts and ability to strategically align housing and school planning development/siting

2. Transportation: New transportation plans/strategies (e.g., TOD) can include educational opportunities across “0-16” continuum – residential/workforce childcare centers – magnet schools - ... 

3. Collaborative Projects: Start small, build relationships, create systems change
ment. Today, however, OUSD’s research department is also responsible for gathering data on students whose families have Section 8 vouchers (federally funded rental housing assistance for low-income households) and other forms of assisted housing. As a result, the district is able to better understand how it is supporting students based on where students are living. This understanding in turn informs OUSD’s efforts to work with OHA. Here, as in San Francisco, local educational agencies are not only coordinating efforts with housing authorities. They are using every means available to understand the complexity of the local situation knowing that there is no one right way to achieve the goal of providing high quality educational opportunities for all. For example, in 2010 OUSD declared a district wide “full-service school” strategy that brings greatly needed social services and health care to support what superintendent Tony Smith calls “the whole child.”

Similar efforts to connect housing and education can be found in many communities around the country. While the federal housing policy HOPE VI was a success in many respects, it also proved the point that it is (at best) shortsighted to try and develop mixed-income housing without addressing the issue of access to quality schools in a comprehensive way. Today, federal programs such as HUD’s Choice Neighborhoods and the Education Department’s Promise Neighborhoods recognize that education and cross-sector policy making must play a greater role in mixed-income housing strategies, locally and regionally. Housing policies ranging from the revitalization of HOPE VI neighborhoods to inclusionary zoning policies (like those used in Montgomery County, Maryland since 1974) now address the issue of schools and integrated schooling in particular, recognizing that without structures and incentives for all families to access high quality schools, reversing patterns of concentrated poverty, fragmentation and urban sprawl is not likely.

Other promising developments in the field of coordinated housing and education planning include Washington, D.C., where a city-wide analysis shed new light on the complex relationship between residential and enrollment patterns. In 2007, the Washington D.C. Office of the State Superintendent commissioned a study to understand the causes and implications of rapidly declining school enrollment and how to retain and attract families. The 21st Century School Fund, the Brookings Institution, and the Urban Institute collaborated on the research, bringing together diverse expertise on educa-

Promising Practices

Local:
- Different strategies aligned goals
- HOPE SF and SFUSD – Redevelopment and Selected School Choice Options
- Oakland Unified/OHA - Full Service School and Public Housing Aligned

Regional:
- Rochester’s Regional Transit Service
  partners with LEAs – business subsidies, coordinated transfers,

- ABAG – Sustainable Communities Strategies integrates education data and planning

State:
- CDE partnering with Governor’s Strategic Growth Council (SGC)
tion, housing, and neighborhood change. The partners developed a sophisticated framework utilizing student, school, and neighborhood level quantitative data; focus groups with parents and high school dropouts; and meetings with city, education and housing officials in order to better understand the complex and dramatic changes occurring in the city. The 2010 report *Quality Schools, Healthy Neighborhoods and the Future of DC* now supports a more informed dialogue on enrollment retention and attraction strategies, school closure options, and school assignment policy changes. Moreover, the process and findings of the report shed new light on the oft-overlooked relationship between residential patterns and school assignment, effectively building bridges between city, neighborhood, and educational stakeholders’ interests.6

In Baltimore, housing vouchers are being used to increase access for very low income families to quality suburban schools. The Baltimore Housing Mobility Program (BHMP) provides families from high-poverty, disadvantaged urban communities with a new home and school in a lower poverty neighborhood. As a regional voucher program, BHMP significantly expands housing choices for low-income families. BHMP has overcome some of the biggest obstacles to using housing vouchers in neighborhoods with high-quality schools by increasing voucher rents and providing full-service housing mobility counseling to families (including information on educational choices). Previously, voucher holders in the federal Housing Choice Voucher Program (otherwise known as Section 8) were typically limited to living in “voucher submarkets” where racial and economic segregation is high and educational opportunities are limited. However, since 2004 more than 1,500 families from Baltimore have re-located to lower-poverty, more racially diverse suburban and city neighborhoods. To date, 88 percent of these families have chosen suburban counties. As a result, more than 1,200 low-income children are now attending high performing, mixed-income suburban schools. On average, only 33 percent of the students in these schools are eligible for free and reduced lunch compared with 83 percent in the original schools. Academically, from 69 to 76 percent of students scored proficient or higher on state math and reading tests after taking advantage of the voucher program compared with 44 to 54 percent in the original schools.7

Families, Schools, and Transit-Oriented Development: Ten Core Connections

1. School quality plays a major role in families’ housing choices.
2. A wide housing unit mix is needed to attract families.
3. Housing unit mix, school enrollment, and school funding are intricately related.
4. Children often use transit to get to and from school and afterschool activities.
5. Multi-modal transit alternatives support access to the increasing landscape of school options.
6. Mixed-income TOD provides opportunities for educational workforce housing.
7. TOD design principles support walkability and safety for children and families.
8. TOD brings amenities and services that can serve families closer to residential areas.
9. When schools are integrated with TOD planning, opportunities emerge for the shared use of public space.
10. TOD offers opportunities for renovating and building new schools in developments, which draws families.

Source: CC&S Putting Schools on the Map, p.3

**Transportation: Trends like Transit-Oriented Development and Smart Growth Can Be a Boon for Schools and Families with Children**

Like recent developments in housing, transportation planning is also beginning to pursue strategies to reverse decades of urban sprawl that resulted in greater racial and economic segregation. Like many other promising practices around the country, the Center’s work in the Bay Area and other parts of California has focused on transit-oriented development (TOD)8. Agencies such as the California Transportation Department define TOD as development that results in mixed land uses, higher than usual densities, and pedestrian friendly designs without being anti-automobile.

The rise of transit-oriented development largely has been driven by environmental and economic concerns. However, when it comes to the role that transportation plays in building family friendly communities with high quality schools, issues of social equity and integration invariably arise. Our focus has been on the connections between this important trend and a community’s ability
to support the whole child or what we now understand as "the whole life of learners."9 In 2010, the Center produced an exploratory study entitled *Putting Schools on the Map: Linking Transit-Oriented Development, Families, and Schools in the San Francisco Bay Area.*10 The study offers a rationale for linking TOD and public education; identifies important connections between families, schools and transportation (see excerpt at right); describes case studies from around the Bay Area; and makes practical recommendations for building on what works.

Another recent study by the Center entitled *Linking Transit-Oriented Development, Families, and School* sets out from the observation that more often than not TOD projects target empty nesters or young professionals and offer few options for families and their children. As such, the study describes how and why families choose where to live and how that relates to their perception of access to high quality schools. TOD has nothing to lose and every-thing to gain by recognizing the connections between transportation, schools and families’ efforts to make good decisions on behalf of their children. The fact is many low-income and African American and Latino families are leaving the very areas that are now being targeted for TOD. The Center makes the case that inclusive planning – with cities, schools and regional agencies collaborating together while inviting students, parents and other residents to participate in the planning process – can reverse this trend and prevent planners and policy-makers from repeating mistakes made in the past.

The Center’s latest report, for the What Works Collaborative, found a range of innovative practices that are showing how the transit and educational needs and goals of communities are being brought together thereby paving the way for integrated communities and schools. In Rochester, New York, for example, a regional transit provider has partnered with the local school district in
an effort to increase student ridership and expand transit services. Rochester’s Regional Transit Service (RTS) receives subsidies from local businesses and schools allowing it to maintain service while facing systemic funding reductions from the state. Today, 95 percent of students who use public transportation to get to and from school take advantage of the RTS Express Transfer Service, allowing students to travel directly from their school to their neighborhoods by bypassing downtown transfers. As a result, students and their families have come to see RTS as a more affordable and reliable option for getting to school as well as getting to work. Moreover, the school district is saving money as a result of the transit service: “Public transportation is also 30-40 percent less expensive for us than yellow school bus service. Those are dollars we can redirect to our schools and classrooms, where they can have the biggest impact on student achievement.”

In Baltimore, Maryland, the school district and transit provider partnered to provide free bus service to students. Baltimore City Public Schools (BCPS) has a long-established contractual agreement with the Maryland Transit Administration (MTA) to provide no-cost bus service to eligible middle and high school students. BCPS pays MTA for the service, which costs far less than what it would spend operating and maintaining its own school buses. Between 25,000 and 28,000 students use the program.

Addressing the needs of our youngest students and residents, several diverse, multiagency partnerships have formed to support families by creating childcare centers in transit-oriented developments. In San Jose, California, the Tamien Child Care Center opened at the Tamien CalTrain and light rail stations in 1995. The center enrolls nearly 150 children from 6 weeks to 12 years old. Incentives for families to use the childcare and transit include rail and bus discounts, priority enrollment, and tuition discounts for children of transit users. The collaboration was San Jose’s first working relationship between childcare and transit. Similarly, in Columbus, Ohio, the South Linden Transit Center opened in 1999 and includes a bus depot, daycare center, children’s health clinic, bank, and medical office. The 24-hour facility is designed to assist parents who work nontraditional hours and encourage their use of transit on their daily commute. The co-location of childcare with transit encourages parents to use transit by making drop-off to childcare easy and safe.

CONCLUSION: RECOMMENDATIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

We conclude this short report by offering the reader our latest thinking on integrating housing, transportation and education by drawing on our new report entitled Opportunity-Rich Schools and Sustainable Communities: Seven Steps to Aligning High Quality Education with Innovations in City and Metropolitan Planning and Development (prepared for the What Works Collaborative). This report offers the following recommended steps to coordinate school, housing and transportation planning more effectively at local and regional levels:

1. Just as Families Make Housing Choices Based on Perceptions of School Quality and Long Term Educational Opportunities for their Children, Planners and Policy Makers Need to Know the Educational Landscape Before They Can Effectively Support the Future of Neighborhoods, Cities and Entire Regions

Families with school-aged children seek out communities that offer quality schools and access to high-quality educational opportunities. As a result, housing unit mix, school enrollment, and school funding are intricately related. In California, as elsewhere in the United States, schools are funded based on enrollment, so changes to nearby housing can positively or negatively impact the amount of money school districts receive. As such, planners and policy makers must understand local educational policies and demographics, account for the region’s inventory of educational and workforce assets, and thoroughly assess physical school infrastructure.
2. Planners and Policy-makers Have Everything to Gain and Nothing to Lose by Fully Engaging School Leaders, Families and Young People in Planning and Redevelopment Projects

Identify multiple avenues for school district (“Local Education Agency (LEA”) personnel to engage in the planning process – and planners to engage in school planning and policy making. Opportunities for students and parents to similarly engage in local planning process are also important and can be especially powerful when connecting young people’s participation to classroom learning.

3. The Planning and Development Process Must Establish a Shared Vision and Metrics Linking High Quality Education to Economic Prosperity at Both the Community and Regional Levels

Cultivate leadership and champions, adopt the vision statement formally across institutions, develop common indicators to measure change, foster shared accountability, and increase the effective use of scarce resources. When schools are integrated into complete communities, opportunities emerge for shared use of public space. Community use of public school buildings and outdoor space (often called “joint use”) is an attractive amenity to families and residents with and without children. Partnering with school districts can leverage additional capital resources to improve existing school buildings and/or to create small, charter, magnet, or other specially focused schools.

4. Support the Whole Life of Learners and their Families through Design Principles that Promote Healthy and Safe Life Styles as well as Access to Services and Amenities

Provide comprehensive social services aligned to educational needs and opportunities, provide quality amenities to attract families and enrich students’ lives, and harness public and private funding to align program operations for efficiency. Complete communities support walkability and safety for children and families. Complete communities’ good design principles inherently address concerns of distances between home and school, traffic, and “stranger danger,” which may help increase walking and/or bicycling. Complete communities provide services and amenities that attract and support children and families, such as childcare centers, preschools, and parks located in walking distance to work, home, or transit.

5. Align Bricks and Mortar Investments to Support Mixed-Income Communities and Regional Prosperity

Establish schools as centers of opportunity-rich communities, ensure family-oriented, mixed-income housing, and pursue joint development. A wide housing unit mix is needed to attract families. Unit mixes that include 3- and 4-bedroom, apartments, and townhomes offer family-friendly options. Mixed income communities provide opportunities for educational workforce housing. The combination of modest teacher salaries and high housing costs form a constant challenge for many in the Bay Area. Complete communities could be an attraction for area public school teachers and their families.


Align transit options to support school choice and extracurricular opportunities, create incentives for multi-modal transportation choices by students and families, and site schools to maximize multi-modal transportation access. Multi-modal transit alternatives in complete communities support families’ access to the increasing landscape of school options. Children do not always attend their closest neighborhood school; access to these educational options hinges on access to safe, reliable, and affordable transportation. Children often use transit to get to and from school and after-school activities. Access to safe, reliable, and affordable transit facilitates students’ on-time and consistent arrival at school (reducing problems of truancy and tardiness) and to after-school activities that enhance their educational experience.
7. Institutionalize What Works to Secure Gains and Ongoing Innovation

Support formal communications and streamlined collaborative decision-making, measure change, assess impact, and leverage diverse resources to support families and create sustainable communities while balancing “what works” with “what could be”.

Deborah McKoy is the Executive Director of the University of California, Berkeley’s Center for Cities & Schools. Jeffrey M Vincent is the Deputy Director of the Center for Cities and Schools

ENDNOTES

1 Compare, for example, the connection that John Powell makes between urban sprawl and the civil rights movement: “Despite [a] growing body of work, few have made the connection between these negative consequences and the severe limitations that sprawl and fragmentation have placed on the civil rights movement.” Achieving Racial Justice: What’s Sprawl Got to Do with It?, Poverty & Race (Poverty & Race Research Action Council, Washington, D.C.), Sept./Oct. 1999.


3 See also Creating Pathways of Educational and Neighborhood Success, Ctr. for Cities & Sch., Univ. of Cal., Berkeley (June 4, 2009), http://hope-sf.org/PDFs/CCS_Hunters_View_Report.pdf.


9 See, for example, our use of this term in Deborah L. McKoy et al., supra note 2.

10 Ariel H. Bierbaum et al., supra note 8.

Why your block is more integrated

Don’t blame gentrification by wealthy whites

BY JACOB VIGDOR / NEW YORK DAILY NEWS

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2012, 3:59 AM

GABEL, PEARL/GABEL, PEARL

Gentrification — like these condos being built across the street from a Vinegar Hill public housing development — isn’t the real reason most cities are integrating.

Change — especially the slow, steady kind — can be a hard thing to notice. When we see the same people and places every single day, we often don’t register how they grow and evolve.

But when we stop to reflect — digging out an old photo album to size up the effect of time on a hairline or a house — the differences can be profound.

A slow, steady change has come to urban America — to New York City, its suburbs and places all over the country. It has been going on for nearly 50 years, and it is undoubtedly a good thing for society.

America’s neighborhoods are much less segregated than they used to be, and we need to appreciate the story of how it happened.

It’s not really about upper-income whites aggressively gentrifying black areas and forcing out long-term residents, as some suggest. It’s primarily a story of progress, of black families choosing to leave segregated cities and live in more diverse areas elsewhere.
First, the headline: As Edward Glaeser and I conclude in a new report from the Manhattan Institute, racial segregation is close to an all-time low. In a city like New York, you have to go back a full century to see anything like today’s level of racial integration. And in 1910, there were only about 90,000 black residents in the five boroughs — less than 5% of the population.

Over the next 60 years, nearly 2 million blacks moved to New York, drawn to the city from the rural South in search of jobs and an escape from Jim Crow laws.

As these migrants left the segregated South behind, they found new obstacles in the North. They could not buy some houses because of racial restrictions written into the deeds. Banks would refuse to issue mortgages in “redlined” black neighborhoods.

Most importantly, the racism blacks had hoped to escape could be found all over the North. Blacks moving into traditionally white neighborhoods were exposed to many threats and in many cases real violence.

Segregation reached its peak in the 1960s and early 1970s. By the mid-1970s, George Clinton & Parliament summed it up with the lyric, “God bless Chocolate City and its vanilla suburbs.”

But while cities simmered with racial tension, important events were setting the stage for an era of integration. The civil rights movement brought us the Fair Housing Act, which criminalized many of the acts of discrimination that had been taken for granted. The federal government withdrew its support for redlining.

Government also relaxed restrictions on immigration, which allowed waves of newcomers — most of them neither black nor white — to replenish many declining cities.

Public housing authorities started to get out of the business of constructing monolithic, segregated projects.

In New York, as elsewhere, it’s tempting to point to white gentrification as the cause of integration, but that’s been a small part of this hopeful story.

Movement out of the ghetto has been far more important than movement inward.

Today, it is close to impossible to find a pure “vanilla suburb.” In 1960, one in every five neighborhoods in large metro areas had no black residents. In 2010, that statistic applied to only one in 200 neighborhoods throughout the entire country.

Some of the no-longer-vanilla suburbs ring Northern cities; over the past 30 years, the black population of Nassau and Suffolk counties has increased by nearly 100,000. The real action, though, is in the Sun Belt. The Atlanta metro area was home to a half-million African-Americans in 1980. Today, 1.7 million blacks call the Atlanta region home — and on average, they live in neighborhoods that are one-third white.

Poverty might keep some families out of some neighborhoods these days, but race does not. That is a real accomplishment.

Vigdor is professor of public policy and economics at Duke University.

Read more: http://www.nydailynews.com/opinion/block-integrated-article-1.1014837#ixzz2ZsgKLcmS
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The Origins of the Baltimore Housing Mobility Program

Housing mobility emerged decades ago as a legal and policy response to the recognition that the nation’s deeply segregated housing markets deprive low-income African American families of the same level of opportunity available to whites. Beginning in the 1960s, public housing desegregation lawsuits filed on behalf of public housing residents sought to end the historical confinement of African Americans to high-poverty central city neighborhoods and public housing projects. The Baltimore Housing Mobility Program originated as a partial settlement of Thompson v. HUD, a public housing desegregation case filed in 1995. The program was
fully launched in 2003. Initially, two organizations were responsible for different facets of the settlement. Metropolitan Baltimore Quadel (MBQ) administered all of the vouchers in the program and provided mobility counseling to families receiving tenant-based vouchers. Innovative Housing Institute (IHI) handled mobility counseling for the smaller project-based voucher program and a homeownership component. In 2007, all facets of the program were consolidated under MBQ’s administration.

Metropolitan Baltimore Quadel (MBQ) currently administers the program under contract with the Housing Authority of Baltimore City (HABC) and under the oversight of HABC, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Maryland ACLU. MBQ has a critical partner in the Baltimore Regional Housing Campaign (BRHC), a coalition of local and national civil rights and housing policy organizations formed in the wake of Thompson to ensure that public policies and private investments are aligned to overcome historic divisions by race and class. Since 2005, the BRHC has supported innovative strategies to increase housing choice; promoted inclusive, mobility-friendly policies throughout the region; and attracted philanthropic investment in enhancements of the mobility program.

**Keys to Program Success**

The Baltimore Housing Mobility Program helps current and former public housing families and families on the waiting list for public housing or Housing Choice Vouchers gain access to private market housing in low poverty and predominantly white neighborhoods. Applicants who pass background checks and meet other eligibility criteria enroll in MBQ’s counseling program, where they are prepared to succeed as tenants in more competitive housing markets.

Participants are taken through budgeting and financial education and are guided by counselors who serve as motivational coaches. Bus tours introduce participants to the myriad of employment, education, and health-related amenities in high-opportunity neighborhoods. Participants save for a security deposit and, when they are ready to move, work with their counselor to find a house or apartment that suits their needs. A federal Housing Choice Voucher covers a portion of their rent. While the vouchers can be used throughout the Baltimore region, they are specifically targeted to housing units in neighborhoods where less than 10 percent of the residents are in poverty, less than 30 percent of the residents are minority, and less than five percent of all housing units are public housing or in HUD-assisted housing complexes.

Families receive two-plus years of post-move counseling to help them adjust to their new homes and communities and second-move counseling to minimize disruptive and unwanted moves out of opportunity neighborhoods due to market barriers. They also receive employment and transportation assistance to access the rich employment resources of suburban areas—access that could otherwise be limited by the region’s relatively weak public transit systems.
A SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ACHIEVEMENTS

Many Families and Children Helped
• 1,522 families moved to low-poverty, racially integrated suburban and city neighborhoods.
• 88 percent of families moved from the inner city to suburban counties.
• 1,277 children are now living in suburban school districts.

Dramatic Changes in Environment
• Neighborhoods moved from were 80 percent black and 33 percent poor; those moved to were 21 percent black and 7.5 percent poor.
• Median household income in old neighborhoods was $24,182 and in new was $48,318.
• Eighty-three percent of settled participants (those who have been in their homes for at least 14 months) say their neighborhood is better or much better than their old neighborhood.
• Upwards of 70 percent of settled participants say schools; safety and less crime and drugs; friendly neighbors and people; and a mix of different races and cultures; are the most positive features of their new neighborhood.

Significant Improvements in School Quality
• In schools in the new neighborhoods an average of 33 percent of students are eligible for free and reduced lunch compared with 83 percent in original neighborhoods’ schools.
• Almost a quarter of participating families moved to neighborhoods served by elementary schools with less than 10 percent of students eligible for the free and reduced lunch program.
• In the new neighborhoods’ elementary schools, 69 and 76 percent of students scored proficient or higher on state math and reading tests, compared with 44 percent and 54 percent in the original city schools.
• 88 percent of settled participants say they are satisfied or very satisfied with the schools in their new community.
• 89 percent of settled parents say their children appear to be learning better or much better in their new schools.

Enhanced Quality of Life
• Nearly 80 percent of participants, surveyed after they moved, say they feel safer, more peaceful, and less stressed.
• Sixty percent of participants say they feel more motivated.
• Nearly 40 percent of participants say they feel healthier.

Housing Stability
• Most families (62 percent) stayed in their original unit instead of moving when they became eligible to move from their initial unit.
• Only 19 percent of families who became eligible to leave their original unit moved from the suburbs back to the city.
• Families who made a second move went to neighborhoods that were less segregated and significantly less poor than the neighborhoods in which they lived before they joined the program.

Sources: MBQ administrative data (families affected); articles in preparation using MBQ and demographic data by Stefanie DeLuca and Peter Rosenblatt of Johns Hopkins University (Data for changes in neighborhood conditions, test scores in elementary schools, and housing stability, is as of 2007 and does not include families who were forced to move when apartment complexes were sold; see DeLuca and Rosenblatt 2009a and 2009b, endnote 4), a 2007 ACLU of Maryland survey of participants who lived in their new neighborhoods for at least 14 months (families perceptions of their neighborhoods and improvement in children’s performance in school); and a 2008 ACLU of Maryland survey of families who recently moved for the first time under the program (quality of life perceptions). Full details on the source documents and findings are provided later in this report.
Children Dream of a New Future

When Tamika Edwards, who grew up in Baltimore’s now-demolished Flag House Courts public housing high-rise, arrived at the top of the waiting list for a slot in one of Baltimore’s public housing projects, she turned the opportunity down. Though she disliked her distressed Upton neighborhood, she didn’t want to jump “from the frying pan to the fire,” she said. But when her oldest son, now 16, entered his early teens, she feared that he was starting to conform to the negative influence of peers in their troubled inner-city neighborhood. So she applied for the mobility program and moved her family to Elkridge, Md., even though the commute to her job as a medical technician in the city would be difficult.

“It did not bother me at all to move out here” she says. “I just wanted better and was willing to go just about anywhere. I was not sure what to expect but it has been all good.”

She loves her family’s new home and the diverse community of whites, blacks, Asians and Hispanics in which they live. Now with a car, work is just a 20 minute drive away. And at the suggestion of her closest neighbor, a nurse, she has enrolled in Howard Community College to pursue a nursing degree. Her children, now 16, 12, 10, and 5, have made friends in the neighborhood and at school. The curriculum in Howard County schools was challenging for them, Edwards says, but they have improved their grades from “C” to “A” and “B” averages and expanded their vocabulary, and now dream about their future. One child wants to be a teacher, another a nurse, another a lawyer. “Their schools and neighborhoods have shown them a different life and now they are different,” says Edwards, adding that she too now wants more for herself.

“[The program] has given me a chance of a lifetime … I am motivated to finish school … and I want to buy a house like the one I have. I got a taste of something good and I want more.”

MBQ not only provides counseling to families participating in the program, it administers the vouchers metropolitan-wide. To ensure the program’s success on the ground, MBQ continually markets the program to landlords and monitors the placement of voucher holders to avoid “clustering” tenants. Because participation in the program is voluntary, assisted, and gradual, families are moving when they are ready and eager for a better life, and successfully transitioning into stable communities throughout the Baltimore region.

Outcomes: Improved Quality of Life for Children and Families

Through the Baltimore Housing Mobility Program, more than 1,500 poor African American families have voluntarily moved from racially isolated high-poverty neighborhoods in Baltimore to low-poverty racially integrated suburban and city neighborhoods with lower unemployment, fewer recipients of public assistance, a lower percentage of high school drop outs, and better resourced and higher performing schools.

Families seeking a new beginning find a dramatic change in environment. The most common reason why participants volunteer for the program is to escape crime and to find a better and safer neighborhood, as cited by 86 percent of recent movers surveyed in 2007. A significant number of recent movers also cited “better and safer schools” as motivating factors in their moves. Overwhelmingly, participants reported finding these desired environments in their new neighborhood (summarized in the chart on p.5). This is largely due to the fact that almost nine out of 10 families have used their initial voucher to move to suburban counties. More than 95 percent of new movers surveyed in 2008 said their new neighbor-
hood is better or much better than their old neighborhood and families consistently report high levels of satisfaction with both their new neighborhood and their home. Counter to some fears, the suburbs have not been a hostile environment. A high percentage of new movers describe their neighborhood as friendly, and longer-term movers cite the mix of people of different backgrounds, race, and ethnicity as the most positive aspect of their neighborhood.

The benefits of the program go beyond the basic goal of accessing better housing in a safe environment. Positive outcomes for participants include an increase in quality of life, health, and educational opportunities, and potentially, employment. In their new, high-opportunity neighborhoods, participants say they feel safer, healthier, less stressed, more motivated, and more confident in the future facing their children. Parents also report that their children are doing better in school. Ninety-three percent of recent movers responding to a 2007 survey said that they were satisfied or very satisfied with the schools in their new community. Nearly as many longer-term residents (89 percent) said that their children appeared to be learning better or much better in their new schools.

Stability and retention are providing the foundation for success. By helping adults and children remain in opportunity neighborhoods, the Baltimore Housing Mobility Program is positioning families for long-term gains in educational attainment, health, and self-sufficiency. As of September 2007—four and a half years after the Baltimore mobility program’s inception and before the implementation of program-wide “second-move” counseling—most families (62 percent) who had been in their initial unit for a year and were eligible to make a second move were still in their initial unit. Most of the families who left their original units were not moving back to their old neighborhoods. According to this research, performed by Stefanie DeLuca and Peter Rosenblatt of Johns Hopkins University, only 19 percent of all of the families who could have moved at some point after the end of their first lease moved from the suburbs.
The Baltimore Housing Mobility Program is proving that poor African American families are able and willing to make it beyond the confines of traditional public housing neighborhoods and that low poverty and predominantly white neighborhoods are able and willing to enfold the new families into the fabric of the community. Bringing the benefits to more families and neighborhoods requires broader mobility reforms pushed by fair housing advocates including those promoted by the coalition members of the Baltimore Regional Housing Campaign. BRHC is working to eliminate local barriers to affirmatively further fair housing, such as Maryland’s stringent policy requiring local approval of housing developments financed through the Low Income Housing Tax Credit program.

On a national level, the lessons learned through the Baltimore Housing Mobility Program argue for extending mobility more broadly in the federal Housing Choice Voucher Program. The program provides a blueprint for using vouchers as a tool for strengthening disadvantaged minority families by connecting them to the educational and economic vitality of low-poverty, high-opportunity neighborhoods. When families move out of distressed neighborhoods and children do better in school and break out of the cycle of poverty, the benefits are significant and accrue to the whole of society.

Next Steps for the Program and Mobility Policy Nationwide

After six years, MBQ is still working to create a better program. Next steps for enhancing program administration include reducing large caseloads; expanding and strengthening post-move supports for families; streamlining processes for landlords; enhancing education, health, employment and transportation supports; and increasing development of housing units receiving project-based subsidies.

At the same time, MBQ’s partners and fair housing advocates are hoping to use the early and promising results of the program to expand housing mobility programs in the region and in the nation.

I am grateful and so happy to be a part of the program.
It has truly made a big difference in my life as well as my children.
—Program participant

New Homes, New Neighborhoods, New Schools: A Progress Report on the Baltimore Housing Mobility Program
In Houston, America's Diverse Future Has Already Arrived

by ELISE HU

July 01, 2013 3:00 AM

Buddhist monks sit outside a Zen Mobile store in southwest Houston.
Elise Hu/NPR

All this week, NPR is taking a look at the demographic changes that could reshape the political landscape in Texas over the next decade — and what that could mean for the rest of the country.

To see the speed of demographic change in Texas, look no further than its largest city — Houston. Only 40 percent of the city's population is non-Hispanic white, and by a Rice University count, it's the most racially and ethnically diverse city in America.

"Houston is an immigrant magnet," says Glenda Joe, a Chinese-Texan community organizer whose extended family came to Houston in the 1880s.

"Texas looks like me. I'm half-Chinese; I'm half-Irish," she says. "I also do business; I work with universities; I also ride horses. That's what Texas is."

At about 35 percent of the population, Latinos make up the second-biggest group in Houston after non-Hispanic whites or Anglos, according to Census numbers. But Asian-Americans are the fastest-growing group — doubling between the 1990 and 2010 census to about 7 percent.
"There is no majority group here, not even close," says Michael Emerson, a Rice University sociologist who studies Houston's demographic change. He and his research partners put together the 2012 analysis that gave Houston the title of most diverse metropolitan area in America. If you look at the four major ethnic groups — Anglo, black, Asian and Latino — all have substantial numbers in Houston, with no one group dominating. It comes closer to having an equal balance of each group than you would find in New York or Los Angeles.

The city's transformation to an international megalopolis happened quickly, and only within the past few decades. As the metro area shot to nearly 6 million people, 93 percent of all that growth was non-white.

"Houston runs about 10, 15 years ahead of Texas, 30 years ahead of the U.S., in terms of ethnic diversity and immigration flows," Emerson says. "So it is fundamentally transformed in a way that all of America shall transform."

Jobs fuel the transformation. The energy industry remains a huge player, but there's also the Texas Medical Center, burgeoning biotech and a bustling shipping port. Despite crippling humidity, long commutes and a reputation for refineries, Houston's cheap land, affordable homes and low barriers to doing business have lured immigrants from all over.

"You are here to make your fortune; you are here to move ahead in the world. You are about making things happen. There's no way that you could be a leader here in this community and not recognize that," says Houston Mayor Annise Parker, who is a minority among politicians. She's the only female mayor among the top 10 most populous cities, and she's one of the only openly gay politicians, period. And she's learned a few lessons about governing a place where different cultures combine.

"Too often what happens in a state capital or in Washington is that it is about parties and partisanship, not about the practical realities of running something. Cities have to run," Parker says.

For her, running the place means embracing the sociological situation. Houston is remarkably practical that way. Just ask seventh-generation Chinese-Houstonian Glenda Joe.

"It's inexorable. The change in terms of leadership, the change in terms of how we look — it's inexorable," Joe says.

![Figure 1. Houston Metropolitan Racial/Ethnic Demographics 1990-2010](image)

*Census numbers show Houston's changing racial and ethnic diversity.*

*Census figures, Kinder Institute of Urban Research*
WMAN Has Helped Unify Diverse Area For 40 Years Forum Celebrates Progress In W. Mount Airy

by Earni Young, Daily News Staff Writer

POSTED: March 25, 1999

West Mount Airy has remained a stable, racially integrated community for 40 years - by choice rather than circumstance.

In this shady, middle-class community, white families routinely buy homes on nearly all-black blocks, or vice versa, without comment or incident.

That is something of a miracle in a country where the vast majority of minorities live in hyper-segregated communities and cut off from mainstream American society.

"Despite 50 years of civil-rights activism, legislation and litigation, residential segregation by race remains a deep-rooted problem in American life," said Thomas F. Sugrue, associate professor of history and sociology at the University of Pennsylvania.

Philadelphia is no exception. In 1990, nearly 72 percent of the city's black population lived in predominantly black neighborhoods, compared with 67 percent in 1980, making it the fourth most segregated city in America.

The same census found that West Mount Airy, a community of 14,000 people, remains 52.6 percent white and 39.5 percent African-American. From 1980 to 1990, the number of white residents actually increased from 51.7 percent, indicating the community is not resegregating like so many other Philadelphia neighborhoods.

West Mount Airy's past, present and future will be discussed at a forum celebrating the West Mount Airy Neighborhood Association's 40th anniversary today, from 4 p.m. to 6 p.m. at the Germantown Jewish Center at Lincoln Drive and Ellet Street.

"This will be a chance to look back over a period of success and remind people that it took hard work, and it will take hard work in the future," said Sugrue.

WMAN was formed in 1951, when African-Americans began moving into what was then an all-white middle-class enclave. The community faced massive white flight and institutional disinvestment.

But instead of yielding to the block-busting tactics of unscrupulous real-estate agents and bailing out, many white residents chose to stay put and accept the new black residents.

Not everyone happily joined hands to sing "Kumbaya." Some early black residents recall having to use white "straw buyers" to conceal their racial identity. Others moved into their new homes in the dead of
night for fear of protests from white neighbors. The Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations banned real-estate solicitations in the area for much of the 1970s in an effort to halt panic selling.

There was some softening in market demand from white homebuyers in the early years. And at one point the balance between white and non-white residents hit the 50-50 mark. That is often the tipping point for an all-out exodus of the remaining whites and a complete racial turnover, but once again West Mount Airy bucked the trend, regaining white residents even as the city overall lost increasing numbers of white residents to the suburbs.

The neighborhood survived those early challenges, thanks largely to its strong, well-educated middle-class core and their decision to choose integration over flight, said Barbara Ferman, a Temple University professor who co-authored a study on integration in West Mount Airy.

Communities that are "diverse by direction" fare better economically and socially than those that are "diverse by circumstance," Ferman said.

It also helped that the first African-Americans to move into the neighborhood were also well-educated and middle-class. Even today, residents are mostly lawyers, teachers, doctors, executives, judges and civil servants.

Bob and Bernice Evans were typical of the black families who moved to West Mount Airy in the 1960s. Both were teachers. Resisting the trend to the suburbs, they moved to Ellet Street from an all-black neighborhood in Yeadon after some of their children left for college and the youngest was a senior in high school, Evans said.

The year was 1964, and thanks to WMAN's efforts, the Evanses say they can't recall any negative reaction to their arrival. "I liked the closeness of the neighborhood," Bernice Evans recalled. "It was very intimate, and everyone was friendly."

The Evanses paid $36,000 for their four-bedroom twin. It's worth more than four times that amount today. Although their block of Ellet has more African-American homeowners than in the past, the Evanses say there are still several white families on the block - two of them relative newcomers.

That still takes Bob Evans aback - and pleases him, too. "Most whites stay away from black people," said the World War II veteran. "It's different here."

Elsewhere in America, agents may advise middle-class black home-sellers to remove all racial identifiers before prospective white buyers come through, but not here, said Pat Henning, a real-estate agent and WMAN board member.

"We have any number of people who have moved here recently from the suburbs," said Henning, although she admits they're usually empty-nesters or singles who don't have to worry about kids and schools.
Many of the whites chose West Mount Airy because of its racial makeup. Like Sugrue, they have the resources to live pretty much anywhere they choose.

Said Sugrue: "I chose consciously to live in Mount Airy because I like the diversity there, and I want my kids to grow up experiencing diversity rather than living in ghettos of privilege and exclusion."

Most African-Americans, on the other hand, move to West Mount Airy for the housing stock and the upward mobility the neighborhood typifies, researchers said.

Race is no longer the big issue in West Mount Airy, said WMAN president Laurie Tarver. Initially organized around civil-rights issues, WMAN has shifted its focus to "more pressing issues [like] schools, crime and safety," she said.

That's not a bad thing, said Ferman. "There is something to be said for not addressing the issue of race, because if you keep looking at the race issue, you will never get past it," Ferman said.

Send e-mail to younge@phillynews.com
Regional Insights: Little room for growth without minorities  
June 2, 2013  
By Harold D. Miller

For many years, no matter what kind of good economic news our region received, it was always overshadowed by a lingering sign of economic decline -- our continuing loss of population.

After losing nearly 7 percent of our population in the 1980s (the largest loss of any region in the country), the Pittsburgh region was the only major region to lose population in the 1990s. Rather than slowing or reversing losses after 2000, population decline actually accelerated, and the region ended the decade with 3.1 percent fewer residents than it had in 2000, for a total cumulative 30-year population loss of 11 percent.

So it's hard to blame people for feeling optimistic about the fact that in both 2011 and 2012, the Census Bureau estimated that the Pittsburgh region had experienced a net increase in population. Unfortunately, though, the estimated growth has been very small. According to the Census Bureau, the Pittsburgh region added only 1,795 people between 2010 and 2011, and an even smaller number, 619 people, between 2011 and 2012. Those are minuscule increases in the region's total population of 2.3 million, and the fact that the increase was smaller in 2012 than 2011 is not a good sign.

What's holding our population growth back?

One of the biggest factors is likely the lack of diversity in our region. The largest source of population growth in every region in the country has been racial and ethnic minorities. But Pittsburgh has fewer minorities than every other major region in the country. The 2010 census showed that only 13 percent of the residents of our region were nonwhite or Hispanic -- the smallest percentage in any of the top 40 regions in the country.

The diversity of the Pittsburgh region's population has increased over the past 30 years, but only barely. Although the minority share of the region's population increased from 8 percent in 1980 to 13 percent in 2010, every other region of the country experienced significantly more growth in its minority population than the Pittsburgh region over that 30-year period. Today, on average, 45 percent of the residents of other major metropolitan regions are minorities.

Why does this matter?

If Pittsburgh wants its population to grow, attracting and retaining more minority residents isn't an option, it's a necessity. In fact, Pittsburgh's population losses during the 1980s, 1990s and 2000s would have been even bigger if not for the growth the region did have in its minority population. Over the past 30 years, the white population here declined by 16 percent, but the nonwhite population grew by 44 percent. Between 2000 and 2010, the number of white residents of our region declined by 5.6 percent, but because the minority population increased by 18 percent, our region's total population loss was held to only 3.1 percent.

Moreover, unless we attract more residents from other states and countries, our population will continue to shrink. Between 2010 and 2012, the Pittsburgh region had the lowest birth rate and the highest death rate among the top 40 regions, and it is still the only major region in the country with more deaths than births. So unlike any other region, Pittsburgh's population would have declined in 2011 and 2012 if it hadn't been for new residents moving here from other communities.

The subgroup that Pittsburgh has done the poorest job in attracting is foreign-born residents. Census estimates for 2011 indicate that only 3.3 percent of the Pittsburgh region's residents are foreign-born, the smallest
percentage among the top 40 metropolitan regions. There are almost twice as many foreign-born residents in Cleveland (6 percent), more than three times as many in Minneapolis (9.7 percent), and more than 10 times as many (36.4 percent) in Silicon Valley as here. Since census estimates show that we also rank last in the rate of international migration into the region, the gap will continue to widen. This will likely affect not just our population growth but also our job creation rate, since studies have shown that a high percentage of successful technology companies across the country have been started by immigrant entrepreneurs.

Pittsburgh's success a century ago derived from the entrepreneurship and labor of immigrants, so it's ironic that today Pittsburgh has become one of the least diverse regions in the country, and it's also likely that's a significant reason why our job growth also has been much slower.

Although it is not easy to change the diversity of a region, other communities have done it successfully. In fact, 30 years ago, Pittsburgh was not the least diverse of the major regions in the country the way it is today. Minneapolis was. In 1980, only 5 percent of the residents of the Minneapolis metro area were minorities. But today, 21 percent of the residents of the Minneapolis region are minorities.

The change in Minneapolis wasn't an accident. The community made a major effort to resettle southeast Asian refugees into the Twin Cities and to help migrant farmworkers become homeowners in rural areas. As a result, Minneapolis had the 11th-highest growth in Hispanic residents and the 12th-highest growth in Asian residents among the top 40 regions between 1980 and 2010.

By comparison, during the same time period, Pittsburgh ranked 37th and 35th in attracting Hispanic and Asian residents. Minneapolis still has a smaller percentage of African-American residents than Pittsburgh does, but it's had the second-highest growth in African-Americans over the past 30 years among major regions, whereas Pittsburgh has had the fifth-slowest growth, so Minneapolis will likely soon surpass us on that measure, too.

Expanding diversity certainly hasn't hurt the Minneapolis economy. Jobs in the Minneapolis region grew four times as fast as they did in Pittsburgh over the past decade. Moreover, the unemployment rate in Minneapolis in March was only 5.3 percent, significantly lower than the 7.1 percent unemployment rate in Pittsburgh, so it seems that attracting new residents has benefited everyone in the Minneapolis region.

Pittsburgh's lack of diversity is unlikely to change dramatically on its own. Public and private leaders in the region need to proactively focus on the issue and invest sufficient resources over a multiyear period to achieve success. Two strategies will likely have the most immediate impact:

• Encourage minority and international students to stay in the region after graduation. Thanks to our world-class universities, we're already attracting some of the best and brightest minorities in the world to our region. We just need to do everything we can to encourage them to stay here. Businesses in the region could help by offering minority students internships and jobs and also by serving as mentors and customers for students who want to become entrepreneurs.

• Help existing minority residents obtain the education, jobs and entrepreneurial assistance needed for success. Last month's column ("Regional Insights: Minorities Getting Left Behind Here," May 5, 2013) outlined ways to address the high rates of unemployment and poverty among our African-American residents. If we show African-Americans and other minority groups that they can be successful in our region, more will likely be willing to come here.
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NEWS
diversitydata.org named a Health Data All Star
diversitydata.org has been named a Health Data All Star, one of 56 prominent domestic resources for health data at the federal, state and local levels housed on the Health Data Consortium’s website. This list was compiled in consultation with leading health researchers, government officials, entrepreneurs, advocates and others to identify the health data resources that matter most.

Homeownership rates for blacks decline in three quarters of large metros: Latino and Asian shares of homeowners rise sharply
The housing crisis has had a particularly severe effect on black households, with black homeownership rates in three quarters of the 100 largest metro areas dropping between 2000 and 2010, according to the new diversitydata.org issue brief, “The Changing Face of Homeowners in Large Metro Areas”. Latino rates have also fallen nationally since 2007, but, in a majority of large metros, Latino gains made in the first part of the last decade have not been completely erased. Asian homeownership rates have experienced strongest growth. At the same time, ongoing demographic changes mean that minorities, particularly Latinos and Asians, now make up larger shares of homeowners in large metros than they did a decade ago. MAY 2012

Almost half of households with children in large metro areas now headed by a person of color
As of 2010, in the nation’s 100 largest metropolitan areas, only about 30% of households contained children, and almost half of these were headed by a person of color. “The Changing Face of Households with Children in Large Metropolitan Areas”, a new diversitydata.org issue brief, examines these trends and points to critical role that these households play in shaping our future workforce, voters and leaders. MAY 2012

Segregation of black children falls in most metro areas but remains high: Fewer metros experience segregation declines for Latinos
A new issue brief reveals that residential segregation for black children fell in 93 of the 100 metros between 2000 and 2010 but remains at high levels. Trends for Latino child segregation were mixed, but segregation levels fell in almost all of the most segregated metros. JULY 2011
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